

FREESTYLE SPORT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 16, 2002, Park City, UT

Attendance

FSC Chairman- Andy Wise

R&T Rep- Andy Hayes

Judges Rep- Bill McNice, absent, Jay Simson proxy

Development rep- Konrad Rotermond

Membership Rep(East)- Glenn Eddy

Membership Rep (CEN, RMD)- Lewis Sundquist, Don Banghart- one vote

Membership Rep (NOT, FW, INT, PNSA)- Mike Papke, Greg Gibeson, Steve Perkins, Pat Deneen- 1 vote

Sr. FIS Rep- Jeff Lange- absent

USSA BOD Athlete Rep- Craig Rodman

Athlete Rep- Mike Friedberg- absent

Athlete Rep- Jessica Davis

At Large- Steve Kenney

Head Coach- Jeffrey Wintersteen

Program Director- Polly-Jo Clark

Others in attendance- Deb Newson, Martin Sundquist, Sheryl Fine, Diana Williams, Matt Gnoza, Clay Beck, Dale Schoon, Rich Hilliman, Tom Kelly, Nikki Stone Spencer, Emily Boyle

Jeffrey Wintersteen (Head Coach)- Staff report. Twice a year I give a report of the USFST, last year was a big year and I would like to spend some time on it and hopefully you are interested. This past year was a great year, a great opportunity and a great challenge. I think it was perceived that there was also disappointment in each event where we did win a medal. In women's moguls, men's moguls and men's aerials we had opportunities that we didn't cash in on. However in saying that, I believe that the mogul team is in a much better position than it was in 1998. In 98 we had 10 podiums with 3 athletes, compared to this year we had 22 podiums by 10 different athletes. The medals weren't necessarily won with the favorites but won with the bench strength, not necessarily our best hopes. Aerials was in a similar situation. Bergy was our #1 medal hope and he didn't win a medal. There was some disappointment with women's aerials, but also one of our best outside hopes, Emily Cook, got injured. At the end of the world cup season we ended up winning world cup overall titles in aerials and moguls. We also ended the women's mogul world cup tour ranked 2, 3, 4 and we had continued success on Nor-Am. If you would like we can discuss women's aerials in depth. It is an obvious concern however there is one highlight. Kate Reed and Jana Lindsey ended up ranked 1st and 2nd in the Nor-Am Grand Prix and the last time that a US woman won the Nor-Am grand prix was 1991 with Nikki Stone.

Brief break in the staff report to allow for the Membership report by Sheryl Fine and Tom Kelly

Fine- I would like to give a brief update where we are and where we're headed. Our staffing is really strong going into the season, both Rhonda and Lois are returning full time and they're doing a great job. This year we added coaches and officials certifications for freestyle. We have been working on non-alpine sports, using our existing database to put the coaches and officials certifications on their membership cards. I get all the updates from Rich so if you have any questions please contact Rich. I wanted to highlight a couple of things; we do accept faxes now for membership forms. It is listed on the top of the form and it makes processing go much faster. Also I wanted to reiterate that we collect dues from 10 divisions and I have hounded you for those dues. The company wants to have the renewal early so I need to get that info ASAP. I want to quickly go over the membership staff responsibilities so you know who does what. Rhonda Caywood is in charge of USSA processing, seasonal staff, refunds, and changes in membership. Lois McQueen is in charge of special events, coaches clinics, videos, etc. She works with coaches Ed, processes schedule agreements, meeting registration and renewing clubs. I manage the mailing list and fulfillment. Hopefully that helps you understand membership better. Any questions?

Eddy- New forms will be available when?

Fine- We are not exactly sure. The board has to approve the new categories and then we can go to print. So hopefully at the earliest next week. We are working to get it done as quickly as possible.

Kenney- Thank you. The processing has come along great and the processing time was excellent this year.

Hayes- We voted in this committee about a new membership last spring? A Rookie membership?

Fine- That will be addressed by Tom.

Kelly- I would like to leave a video that shows highlights from the Olympic Winter Games, please view when you have a minute. I would like to touch on a couple of topics. I wear a couple of different hats at USSA. I wear a PR hat and a membership hat. I started in membership, which has grown tremendously and now manage PR too. For the most part they have been pretty different. We are going to try to bring those two sides closer together. All we have focused on in the PR in the last couple of years was the heroes and the potential Olympic heroes. Now there isn't have as much interest in the Olympics so we would like to put those resources to work on the development side. We would like to work on grassroots awareness of what USSA is and how it's the pipeline to achieve success. We are doing that by selecting markets around the country, traditional markets, and projecting what USSA is. If you want to give input please let me know, we are not concentrating just on freestyle but on USSA as a whole. Another piece of that is more of an economical impact of our events. How much of a challenge do you have getting space to conduct events? We would like to see what the economical impact of our events actually bring. We would like to finalize a template for a division to use to input how much an event actually costs. It will give you as an organizer the tools to know exactly what the event represents.

Stone- I want to introduce myself. I am the athlete alternate on the Athlete Advisory Counsel for the USOC. The USOC has a new CEO and wants PR to focus on four new things for the Games. I was wondering if you have you heard of those programs and will you implement them? They are

- 1- Redefine the Games, it's not just 25 days but it's everyday. Create things in between the Games like the Gladiator Games, other areas of interest.
- 2- The story of the journey. The basketball final four tournament is so popular because everyone knows the journey, how far teams have had to come.
- 3- Create feeder grassroots programs that can create program crossover
- 4- Create out reach programs like Coke did during the Olympics. Programs like this could happen now and not just during the Olympics

Kelly- We work pretty well with USOC but it can be challenging. One advantage that we have in our sport is that it is conducted at the highest level every year. We have world cups, we have World Champs, etc. We can get public interested every year in regards to your first couple of points. I think in the past we have been focused on the top athletes and we need now to focus on the resort community and do work there. It's more challenging to reach the other areas. Inner cities could be advantageous. If they can energize some programs that will help.

Kenney- I see some inconsistencies, I see Marolt focusing on the elite programs and talking about winning medals. I think you need to focus on USSA awareness on grassroots, we don't find that USSA gives us enough of a value on the lower end. What are you doing to help us? What is this business of making the grassroots aware of USSA?

Clark- The goal is to make more people aware media wise and club wise about USSA.

Kelly- The direction of this organization has been to brand US Ski and Snowboard Team but very rarely have we talked about USSA. We did that by design to create excitement for the hometown Olympics. Now we want to shift the focus and want to create great awareness of USSA and that it is the pathway to the Olympics. If my kid is excited about skiing and I have heard of USSA, I have a way to get my kid involved. We want to create that awareness of USSA and those clubs.

Rodman- Do you know that the PR budget is? And how much goes to Freestyle?

Kelly- I would have to make a rough guess that it's \$300,000. We can't break it down by sport. The challenging part is that it's demand driven. If you break it out by time, freestyle is probably 40-50% but we don't quantify it that way.

Stone- I have another issue I'd like to bring up. A lot of athletes that did well at the Olympics were underdogs. In a PR sense it makes the public uncomfortable when an underdog wins. There is a lot of pressure on individual athletes pre-picked by the media. The USOC would like to promote the teams rather than the individuals, if you have a large number to cheer for it could help the athletes improve by having less pressure. Would you look to do this?

Kelly- I disagree with that philosophy; the team is not a focus. Of all the NGB's we do brand the team and do a great job. I think that individuals are the focus and you could look at any number of groups there will always be favorites. We try to be dynamic to that so that we can adjust but you can't force the media to pick up a story. Travis Mayer is a good example, we did promote the team, aggressively, but you have to promote the individual because that's what the public wants.

Stone- Shannon and Travis should have been on the radar before the Games instead of dark horses.

Kelly- We did promote them during the season but sometimes the media just doesn't pick up on them.

Wintersteen- I was involved heavily in the media during the Olympics. I tried to push certain athletes and spread it around but they didn't want to speak to them. After women's moguls everyone was asking if Bahrke silver was shocking? And I said no. The media has a perception as well as the public and it's difficult to change.

Stone- We could promote that more.

Kelly- Yes, but there are also athletes with 5 years of build up, Moseley and Bergy had a five year head start, but as other achieve we are there won't be as recent success.

Clark- We try to promote that but they run with one person, we can try to affect it as much as we can but it's up to the media.

Stone - I agree, my point is that it starts with the ski team, if there is a better way to push the athletes that have done well that would be great. It is other athletes, Hannah had a lot of pressure, she was the only one with real media focus and it could have helped to distribute the pressure.

Kelly - I think that with the tools that we had we did a great job with that. It is the reality of sport, the athletes are competing in public, we can manage it but you have to learn how to manage it yourself. At the same time we need to learn from that. Bode wasn't on the radar and he came out of the shoot. At the Olympics there was more attention on Rahlves.

Rodman- It would be great that when someone sees Joe Pack with a silver medal on TV, they could go to the web site and see how to join. I know we pay for TV, can we have web site out there more?

Kelly- There are some cases where we can't put that out there, advertise a web site.

Haslock- If it's a FIS event you can't have the web site inside the field of play.

Kelly- I know we have some contract limits. I want to move on to membership fees. We are proposing a membership increase to the board. Our first challenge is with expenses, this season we saw a 325% increase in insurance, that's about one-half of a million dollars. We weren't expecting that but we could absorb it. We will see yet another increase this year. Insurance is essential to conducting events. The Membership will increase but it's very little compared to cost. Membership fees haven't increase in 5 years, it will increase \$10 on competitor and \$5 on youth this year. This is the only one we've had in 5 years. We want to move forward on the Freestyle Rookie, which will be non-ranked, and a \$45 membership, the same as snowboard. It is never a good thing to increase fees but in reality the service we provide it's a small increase. As we look forward we don't know where insurance is going to go. We are trying to develop a protocol for category changes, our aim is to have a business plan for the changes done by the fall. These are the changes that will go to the board for approval. The coaches membership will also increase to \$100 but there will be no changes in officials memberships.

Kenny- Do you have any idea how much of money generated by membership goes to grassroots?

Kelly- I can't guess on freestyle specifically but as an organization with member fees, head tax, etc, I think 50% goes to members, the deficit company wide from membership fees is one million. Even with the fee increase we won't even come close to overcoming that deficit.

Banghart- I have trouble with a fee increase that is a cost driven issue. I think the big issue is what will the fee increase do to the sport, not how it relates to the cost.

Kelly- We have actually researched that issue. We have never had a fee increase where it dropped our membership. These fees increases haven't been done for 5 years. We do have cost and I don't know where else we can get it.

Banghart- We want to lower membership fees, and this increase could drive people out of our sport. I'm curious about research in other areas and where else this money could come from.

Kelly- We actually did do that in snowboard, the athletes where offered a lower membership category and we did not increase our membership. We have never had an increase in memberships from a lower price membership option.

Banghart- I would like to look at other events, like the Red Bull tour, they put on Big Air events and have smaller fees. We should have been consulted at the grassroots level about what this will do to our membership.

Rotermund- I agree with Tom. The kid who goes to the cheaper event still isn't part of a membership. We need to do a better job of teaching why you would join USSA. Also with bigger Red Bull events there is a major corporation behind the insurance. This company has taken on that responsibility. We are the gateway to the upper level events. You have a large divisional fee, if you want to make it less bring your divisional fees down.

Kenny- There will now be a \$100 coaches membership, what do they get from the membership? I look at my staff and they all get memberships but they don't get anything for it. That membership is of no value to me.

Rotermund- The challenge for the freestyle community is for the new membership to grow numbers and it doesn't relate to having more kids at a cheaper price. The challenge is to give us the value of the membership.

Schoon- I wanted to say that we are all in this together. We are trying to run this program from top to bottom. USSA is taking risks to fund the whole pipeline and doing it at a deficit. If you think coaches membership isn't a good value then let's work on that.

Kenney- We have brought this up for 3 years and get no answers. So yes, I feel like it's a bit of an "us vs. them" but I still don't know what the value is.

Clark- So what do you think is valuable, what should we do?

Deneen- The rookie membership would not be ranked?

Kelly- correct.

Deneen- I think the ranking is very important, I want to sell them the ranking, without that I can't get kids involved. I thought the rookie idea was to get them involved so they can get on the point list.

Beck- I think a good solution is for Big Air and halfpipe is they could be on the points list.

Kelly- I understand your point, the value in a competitor membership and one of the big benefits is being on the points list. This is the core product and now we would be putting it at a lower level. If you have new events, and you are going to have a ranking we could take a look at that.

Sundquist, M- What change in membership numbers have occurred in the last five years?

Kelly- Membership is up and it's strong this past year. We have had a couple year growth trend. Thanks for you comments, if you want to see me off line you are more than welcome to.

Wintersteen- I would like to finish my report. I wanted to talk about moguls, the number of podiums and how that is significant. I think 2-3 years ago we were doing a disservice in that we didn't have the results when had such a strong grassroots program. This year was a big improvement and Lake Placid was awesome. One of the reasons for that success is the strong grassroots and we can harness that. We changed training venues last summer to El Colorado, what I like to call a little slice of Deer Valley in the southern hemisphere, it was awesome. It put us way ahead. I think that was apparent at the Selection events. Usually it's been really tight between top regional athletes and the USST. This year the USST had a big advantage. Also the mogul staff is really gelling. We have one of the best coaches in the world coaching the C team, Diana Williams. I feel very strong about Diana's role, she is a very good role model, she has done great things with the program and produced several of our Olympians. With the aerial program we didn't have the success that we wanted. The schedule was very compressed due to poor weather and planning. Australia was a double contest in poor weather and we also know that the women's program will have a lot of challenges with new athletes. We are starting to get more programs in place, Rich and Lake are doing a great job. In terms of what's on the horizon we are looking to develop more of a relationship with China. The Chinese will be a force to be reckoned with soon. In the past they have shown up to world cups with all different athletes and we never knew what was happening with their program. We have started the lines of communication and know they have 70 women in aerials, they have regional competitions, 4 training sites, there are intermediate steps. Also if we think it's just women, that is foolish, there will be several men too. If we think we can sit back with aerials, that's going to be a big mistake. I would like to touch on my frustration within the freestyle community as a whole. I often hear second or third hand of mutterings within the community and they are never addressed to me

personally. I hear mutterings about the team, the team isn't following rules, team selection, the team doesn't care but if they are not addressed to me then I can't answer any of those questions. One of my absolutes as Head Coach is that this Comp guide is my hymnal, there is nothing that we can do as team in selection or starts that is not in the book. I challenge you to find a rule we have broken. There has to be a sense that there is integrity from the bottom to the top, and we are all in this together. If anyone feels there is a problem and they don't want to talk to me, then find someone who will talk to me. It's not unwelcome and it's something that has to happen. Olympic Winter Games selection criteria was approved here at USSA, approved at the USOC level and it was followed to a T. Bear in mind there was discretion. 2 of 14 spots are up to discretion. The people calling and thinking there were athletes selected that were not in the criteria amazed me. I hope that we can repair that. When it comes to coaches discretion. I have no problem with you questioning coaches discretion. I do have a problem with you not bringing it to me first and then letting it fester. It hurts the team, the athletes and the program as a whole. We will not always agree but I have no problem discussing it with anyone. I think there is a perception that team selection is not a heated debate. We make hard decisions and we know that it's going to be tough politically. I know that it was questionable to choose Travis Mayer to start in Tignes and Steamboat that was not popular. You are not always right but what I would ask from this community is please bring it up and talk about with the coaches.

Eddy- At the Coaches meeting I was hoping that you would come and explain the philosophy.

Clark- That actually didn't happen because it was organized at the last minute. We didn't put it together because it was a little bit of a late date and I didn't think we would be ready. I thought it was too late but that is valuable input.

Eddy- I think that kind of thing was intended to take care of this kind of issue.

Wintersteen- I didn't know about the coaches meeting.

Preston- I agree with Glenn that could have been very valuable but going forward as coaches we need to insure that the pipeline is continues. I think coaches Ed is a pillar that we could have that mix going on. It's a very warm and fuzzy environment and we all make friendship and we need to have the national team as part of that. What do you get from your membership? I think you get other people. I think if you could clinic with other people and national team coaches it would be great.

Clark- Now that we have Rich full time that is the intention and we are looking forward to it.

Stone- I want to preface this with although I don't necessarily agree, this but it was brought up with the athletes that if athletes qualify through the criteria then you shouldn't go to discretion.

Wintersteen- That is a philosophical debate about discretion. I want to make it extremely clear that Dybvig and Ramos did not qualify for the Olympic team. Only three people could qualify through the written criteria. We can bring that up but that is a philosophical agreement. Without coaches discretion Pack, Mayer and Bloom would not have gotten starts this year that lead to their success.

Eddy- That was the intention of the coaches meeting, philosophical debates about these issues.

Wintersteen- I was swamped this year and I will make a concession to do that. Coaches discretion is not what gets them on the US Ski team, that criteria is in the Competition Guide. Coaches discretion is the small percentage that has to happen. If you qualify via the book then we can never take that away from an athlete.

Kenny- I think there is a PR value in that, there is a lot of misinformation. The blue book you point to has too much info and we need to look at that.

Wintersteen- My point is that the rumors or muttering may not be coming from people in this room but when the people in this room hear that, we need you to defend the system and get the issue straight by calling Wise or myself.

Kenney- I think there was bad PR at Nationals, whether or not that is your responsibility you get the blame

Wintersteen- I don't run the event and that is a perception that should be changed.

Kenney- Whether it's true or not, it's perception that you do.

Wintersteen- Well then I guess what I'm telling you is that you need to tell them that I don't run Nationals.

Davis- I wanted to say that where I'm hearing the complaints is from the National team members. I think that is where it needs to be addressed and they need to have it explained to them and understand it. I heard a lot discouraging stuff about the team and I heard so much negative from the athletes on the team, that's where the communication needs to happen.

Wintersteen- That is a valid point and I will address it with the team but I also heard it from non-team too. I can tell you what we did about that on the team level. The team has had the Olympic criteria for two years. Last summer we gave all the team members the Olympic Winter Games criteria and last years Canadian aerial results. Each athlete had to use the results and the criteria to pick an Olympic team. If they still have questions they need to communicate with me and tell me that they didn't understand. We can certainly work on that. To some degree it's the athletes' responsibility that they need to communicate with me about that.

Davis- It's just hard to have the athletes bad mouth something that is a goal of mine.

Clark- We can improve it. The exercise in with the Olympic criteria and the Canadian results in Chile was great, they realized a lot of things about the criteria and it worked. We can improve it again for next time. However in the end if your not happy about a decision you will be negative about it.

Davis- I just don't feel like the negativity is at the divisional level.

Rodman- I think some of the confusion was that there was quite a bit of coaches discretion at the beginning of the year. For the Olympics there was a set number of discretion spots but not with regard to starts. It's hard when there are so many discretion spots to world cups. It doesn't say that in start rights.

Hatch- What we have to realize is that coaches discretion is an educated decision by the full time coaches, one will be happy, one won't.

Wise- I think this is a good discussion that could be delayed until Coaches sub-committee which we need to start. I would like Flash and PJ finish.

Wintersteen- I would like to comment on that, please if you have concerns bring them forward or find someone that is comfortable with me to bring them forward. Our budget did get cut this year but that will not create big changes on the outside, it is part of the natural cycle. We still went forward with initiatives, Rich was approved. Another big one was keeping the summer mogul camp in Chile. When we first applied for Chile training camp it was a one time thing, however we now think it's critical to success so it will become part of core budget. In terms of staffing, I'm not sure when we brought you up to date last. Mark Schuett is the new C team air coach. He has lots of talent, he has had success with female athletes and success on Nor-Ams. In other

changes that Mr. Marolt alluded to in sports science, we haven't taken advantage of that but we are looking at defining and implementing. We have re-evaluated contact days with moguls and aerals and we are trying to plan for more snow time for aerals. Questions?

Clark- On a more broad scope in the company all budgets were cut. In all other department no initiatives were approved, athletics was the only department that had initiatives approved. We had two that were approved, Rich and the Chile camp. Rich has been around for a few years but he has always been an initiative. He was approved seasonally for three years, he coordinated Nor-Ams, following that we added him to expand upon that role. Coaches education, judges/officials education, he will be pro-active with that. It's big chunk of work. I have copies of his job description and goals if anyone is interested, it's going well, and we will have much more info available. Last year he wasn't approved at the beginning of the year but he was a late initiative, he was approved in July. It is a big step for us, he will do a better job and will be able to pay attention to things that PJ and Emily can't get done.

Preston- I would like to complement you and ask that he is still there to serve the divisions, he's awesome. I'm so psyched; he has made my job much easier. My one comment is to please keep him in the field. If he moves behind the desk too much it will be a bummer.

Clark- I want to make sure that he gets to divisional meetings and events, making sure he stays out there too.

Newson- I want him to get a vote on Nor-Am committee if possible.

Clark- Yup, if he's not voting he will be there. He will vote on development committee on FSC and at Nor-Am Committee.

Wise- At this time I would like to move into sub-committee meetings.

May 17, 2002, Park City, UT

Attendance: FSC Chairman- Andy Wise

R&T Rep- Andy Hayes

Judges Rep- Bill McNice, absent, Jay Simson proxy

Development rep- Konrad Rotermund

Membership Rep(East)- Glenn Eddy

Membership Rep (CEN, RMD)- Lewis Sundquist, Don Banghart- one vote

Membership Rep (NOT, FW, INT, PNSA)- Mike Papke, Greg Gibeson, Steve Perkins, Pat Deneen- 1 vote

Sr. FIS Rep- Jeff Lange- absent

USSA BOD Athlete Rep- Craig Rodman

Athlete Rep- Mike Friedberg- absent

Athlete Rep- Jessica Davis

At Large- Steve Kenney

Head Coach- Jeffrey Wintersteen

Program Director- Polly-Jo Clark

Others in attendance: Deb Newson, Martin Sundquist, Sheryl Fine, Diana Williams, Matt Gnoza, Clay Beck, Dale Schoon, Rich Hilliman, Mark Poertner, Brian Marcoullier, Dick Stone, Candice White, Kerry Miller, Emily Boyle

Wise- I would like to call the meeting to order and start with the Executive committee report. In the past year with exception of the divisional rule that athletes must attend divisional champs, the only time we met was over start rights. If anyone has any questions I would be happy to entertain them. Next up, two years ago we set up the rotation of the FSC chair being a two year rotation. This spring my position is up for grabs and so is Steve's at-large position. Also for those of you that don't know, Jeff Lange has sent a letter to resign from FIS and Board rep position. We have appointed Jay as FIS rep which is a good idea because at FIS level he is the sub-committee chair at FIS. By virtue of that position he gets info early on, he is well known and we felt it was a good choice. What we have to do now is re-elect me or take nominations for FSC chair.

Clark- I would like to open nominations.

Kenney- I nominate Andy Wise for FSC chair.

Simson- Second.

Clark- Any other nominations?

Kenny- I move to close nominations.

Simson- Second.

Wise- I would assume without any other nominations, then I am FSC chair for another two year term. **Motion passes- unanimous.** I would like to open to nominations for the at-large position.

Wintersteen- I would like to nominate Steve Kenny for At-large position.

Simson- Second.

Wise- Any other nominations?

Simson- I move to close nominations, the at large vote goes to not-so-large Steve Kenney.

Wise- **Steve Kenny is elected, motion passes; he is also part of the executive committee.** Jeff Lange would like me to read a letter he wrote regarding his position on the Executive committee and the FSC.

Memo to: Freestyle Sport Committee

From: Jeff Lange

Re: USSA Board Elections

Dear Freestyle Sport Committee;

As many of you are aware, I have had a series of personal and business problems over the past few years that have hindered my ability to participate to the fullest possible extent in the wonderful sport of Freestyle Skiing. While I have held out hope that these problems were temporary, and I continue to maintain optimism that it is still indeed the case, my absence at several meetings has been a concern to many, most of all to myself.

During this difficult period, it has always been of paramount concern to me that I remain an effective voice for our sport. I have actively sought feedback from many in the sport to monitor the situation from perspectives other than my own.

Recent events in other aspects of my involvement in Freestyle Skiing have called to question that effectiveness. And while I have been assured that my integrity remains intact, I have nonetheless come to the conclusion that my representation has not lived up to the standards which I expect of myself. I am therefore withdrawing my stated intent to seek reelection to the USSA Board of Directors.

I have made this decision with reluctance and agony. My greatest concern is that the decision will be perceived as an indication of waning interest in the sport. Nothing could be further from the case. I care for our sport, and put as much thought into it, as I have at any time in my twenty-four years of participation on the national Freestyle Committee. I will eagerly continue to serve the sport in whatever meaningful way that the Freestyle Sport Committee sees fit, including hypothetically the role of Board Representative, were it to be deemed appropriate. But I cannot in good conscience advocate myself for that position under the cloak of incumbency. It is time to take a step back and simply offer my willingness to serve this sport in whatever way its leadership might choose.

Because of the circumstances surrounding this action, I do not feel that it is appropriate for me to participate in the upcoming deliberations and meetings of the Freestyle Sport Committee. While I am keenly aware that this lack of participation plays into the precise reason for my current dilemma, I still feel that it is the only

proper course of action. Regardless of what way, if any, I am fortunate enough to continue to remain involved with Freestyle Skiing, it is supremely important to me to know that I serve by the choice and desire of the sport's leadership, and not by the coercion of self promotion and politics.

I would like to thank you all for your patience, respect and, most importantly, friendship over all these many years. Freestyle is blessed with great people and great leadership. I look forward to witnessing and enjoying the fruition of all your hard work in the coming years.

With greatest appreciation, Jeff

That leaves board position open to be filled today. Two years ago when we started this we wanted to create new leadership so we set up a four year rotation. This would have been the second two years of Jeff's four year commitment to the board. I would like to entertain motions for USSA board rep

Rodman- I would like to nominate Andy Wise for the USSA Board Rep.

Kenney- Second. To give a little bit of history this position originally was held by the same person as the FSC chair and but it doesn't have to be the same person. Two years ago we set up the rotation of leadership from the FSC chair to the USSA Board Rep. The intent was in two years that Andy would take the board position and I am comfortable with giving him that two years early. At the moment this is following what we set up, just two years early.

Rodman- The intent was because the FSC chair is very knowledgeable as to what is going on with the sport and will be a good rep to the board but it doesn't have to be that way.

Rotermund- We didn't have this opportunity to rotate before, doesn't it make more sense that his term is four years so we could have a chairman in training. He has 2 years as FSC chair, 4 years as board rep, it staggers the change. I think the outgoing chairman can carry things through.

Clark- I like that, I agree.

Kenney- This is a good rotation, does anyone else want it?

Wise- Another choice would be Steve, he has sat on it before. I'm throwing that out as an idea.

Kenney- I move to close nominations.

Clark- Second. There is still a natural progression from Chair to board rep but it is still subject to a vote.

Wise- **Without any other nominations I will accept the position of board rep.** One more position I would like to create, not necessarily at this meeting but I think a topic for discussion is for the past board rep should have a position on the FSC.

Kenney- I move that the immediate Past USSA board member be added to the FSC.

Rotermund- Second.

Banghart- I would suggest that this position is ex-officio.

Kenney- Would an amendment be that the ex-officio position is non-voting?

Wise- Jeff is a world of knowledge. I think if he had that position it helps keeps him involved.

Kenney- Jeff has no problem with a non-voting position.

Clark- In general I think that one of the main things is to have some continuity so that knowledge is shared. They can share the knowledge and it makes no difference whether he votes or not.

Simson- I think that if they have that knowledge they should be able to make motions.

Banghart- We would have to add athlete rep that way then.

Wise- We are aware of that. **Is any one opposed? Motion passes unanimously.**
Next I would like to move to the FIS report from Jay Simson.

Simson- FIS report, we are going to meetings in two weeks and these are some of the issues being discussed. I would also like to ask for input from Flash and PJ, also Joe was here. The key things are on the world cup schedule is there now skier cross on the calendar. I'm not sure what USSA is doing about getting athletes there or what kind of events these will be. In moguls the biggest things are rule changes, a proposal to increase the value of speed in comparison to air scores, limitations on aerial maneuvers, possibly just one twister per jump. The agenda is not very clear.

Wintersteen- The twister problem is coming from Robinson. He thinks seeing four twisters is boring. The feel from coaches is that this is coming from the chairman and there is not a lot of support. I would like to comment on the speed issue, more athletes are maxing out the speed so they want to look at the chart and possibly adjust. At a course like Deer Valley the speed plays a bigger role because there is a wider margin. That is my impression from Joe.

Simson- That was part of it and Joe told me that they want speed to increase to 50%. The IOC wanted more objective criteria after what happened in skating.

Wintersteen- One thing that can be frustrating is that unlike at the FSC level at the FIS level the proposals come from the chair and the executive committee. It's hard to get a feel why things like that happen and why they are not proposed until we get there. I'm surprised it's still being talked about because the coaches hate it.

Simson- Joe also mentioned helmets and also athletes would be seeded in moguls. A number of other items, the French want a new mogul DD chart, with a variety of changes including flips. A lot of things will come up there that we haven't seen yet.

Wise- I went over those FIS issues after you guys left yesterday.

Wintersteen- One other thing is the talk of combining moguls and dual moguls to one grand prix. If there are less than three dual mogul world cups then it will be combined with moguls. The combined idea did have support from athletes and coaches in Japan.

Simson- One final comment is that I have been serving as the chair of the Freestyle sub-committee at the FIS so if you want things brought up please let me know.

Wise- The next item is sub-committee reports. First report is Membership.

Eddy- Membership Sub-committee report. The only motion that was passed was to include Telluride in rocky division, pass unanimously. Rest of the meeting was a discussion on the role of the Executive committee and events.

Wise- **I move to include Telluride in the Rocky mountain division.**

Perkins- Second.

Wise- Any discussion? **All in favor- passes unanimously.**

Eddy- The only other action item was the request that rookie membership be scored to the point list. Second action item was to put folio numbers on the points list when it changes.

Kenney- **I move to accept report of the membership sub-committee.**

Clark- Second.

Wise- Any opposed? **Passes unanimously.** Next up is the R&T sub-committee report.

Hayes- R&T went on and on but we got a lot done, I re-wrote the agenda and will hand out now. Minimal discussion is needed. The first motion was the helmet motion. **Move to adopt whatever ruling FIS adopts in regards to wearing helmets. If they do not adopt any rule in regards to helmets then we adopt a rule that all juniors wear helmets during official training and competition.**

Rotermund- Second.

Simson- I am in opposition. The athletes will be in the same competitions where some have to wear helmets and some don't, it's not fair. Athletes born a day apart could have different rules.

Eddy- I am also in opposition for a lot of reasons. We are not saying they don't have to wear one, they can wear one if they want to.

Wintersteen- It seems like it's a very muddy motion. I think it would be prudent to let FIS decide first.

Wise- That's what I think too. I think if we bring it to the board like this they will agree with Jay, they want to see it across the board, not just for juniors. We may need another motion, to adopt what FIS adopts in June. We want kids to be able to train this summer in helmets if necessary.

Wintersteen- I would be more in favor of a conference call after the FIS meetings.

Rotermund- If FIS passes it why do we have to pass it?

Wise- We don't, but we always accepted FIS rules and the Board might look at that and say we should adopt it.

Simson- We try to have our athletes compete and train in the same circumstances as the elite level, at Selections, Nor-Ams, US Champs etc, if FIS passes it and we don't and then if someone gets hurt we will be sued.

Kenney- I think it should be all competitors. The motion as stated is very limiting. We are either going to accept that helmets save lives or they don't.

Wintersteen- We can pass the motion and it will be shot down at the board level or we can wait.

Clark- Call the question.

Wise- **Vote- 11 opposed, 1- abstentions. Motion fails.**

Hayes- The next motion is a recommendation to FIS. It passed unanimously in R&T. **Move to recommend to the FIS to drop one officials license level for every 2 years of inactivity (did not submit any TD reports or attend any clinics.)**

Wise- Any opposition? Abstentions? **Passes unanimously.**

Rotermund- I would like motions 4-6 to be voted on all together.

Rodman- I would like to pull out motion 4.

Hayes- I would like to bring motions 5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6a to the floor for discussion.

Motion 5- to create a new points list for "Big Air" formats using criteria in 4600 and 4400. See coaches motion number 10.

Motion 5.1- Accept the 4600 rule section for "Big Air."

Motion 5.2- Coaches motion 11- to create a National points list for half pipe using criteria 4500.

Motion 5.3- The aerial points list for USSA will consist of the average of the athletes 2 best point scores from the final results list of any sanctioned USSA or FIS Aerial (4000 section) event.

Motion 6a- To suspend a TD's license if the TD report is not received.

Rodman second.

Wise- Call the question, for: 11, against: 0, abstention: 1, **Motion passed.**

Hayes- Next motion we decided to vote on separately, **motion 4- To put upright and inverted aerials on the same points list judges the same.**

Simson- Second.

Davis- Why are we doing that? You can do off axis, etc in Big Air.

Rotermund- There are two different formats of scoring, Big Air has the wow factor, upright is on the DD factor.

Davis- Did we ever address the top 7 on FSP list?

Wintersteen- Yes, you can have a DD minimum in the criteria. One above the line criteria would be being in the top 7, the second would be the DD level.

Hatch- This also allows us to have a competition with upright, inverts and new school or whatever, Big Air you can't have inverts.

Preston- I'm not sure that DD will make a big enough difference, you need to have a big enough distinction between the two.

Wintersteen- In essence you could have an air event that looks exactly like a Big Air event but score it different. Someone in a Big Air event could do the same thing as in an aerial event, it's just scored differently and a DD, and you have to call the jump.

Eddy- All the events will be scored on the same list.

Wise- Call the question, **Motion passes- unanimous**

Hayes- Is there anything you want to pull out separately to discuss? Visual markers for Simson, any others?

Rotermund- Let's vote on the rest.

Wise- 6006.1.1 these numbers are still up in the air, need to be clarify by Dick and Brian.

Hayes- Here are the motions we are discussing.

Motion (Hayes) Move to accept motion 3050.3.6, Delete 4100, 3056.1, 6006.1.1, 6006.26

Motion 3050.3.6- ADD- note: calculation and clerical errors are any scoring errors other than those involving judgment.

DELETE: All of the 4100 section and any other reference to acro.

Motion 3056.1- CHANGE to DSQ for intentional straight back or straight front flip in moguls or dual moguls.

Motion 6006.1.1- CHANGE the base scoring with details from Dick Stone and Brian Lake. ADD straight uprights only to mixed component bonus. CHANGE mute grab to all grabs.

Motion 6006.26- ADD Switch is taking off or landing backwards.

Rodman- Second.

Hayes- Any more discussion? Let's vote on all but 6304.2.3.

Wise- **Passes unanimously.**

Hayes- Let's discuss the next motion. **Move to accept Rule 6304.2.3 ADD: Visual indicators will be allowed in case of failure of timing. Set at 5.85 meters and 11.7 meters.**

Distance of less than 5.85 meters = 3/2 split

Distance of less than 11.7 meters but greater than 5.85= 4/1 split

Distance of greater than 11.7 meters= 5/0 split.

Simson- I oppose for two reason, one it is the same distance for men and women, which could effect the outcome of events, and B, talking about visual effect is to go up on the hill with dye line, it's going to melt into one big long line. Personally I don't want to be on the stand when that happens.

Hatch- As the author of this one, we use same time differential for men and women already, it's a median, between men and women pace set. We were in a bad situation this year and had to deal with it, snowy day and we ran a good event, we made it happen. The other point would be if this doesn't go through the judge should have his own stopwatch.

Simson- I think there are two other issues. One, we shouldn't mandate for all divisions, if you have this rule for all divisions then this will become a crutch.

Hayes- This is not being passed in FIS, just USSA events, just Qualifiers and JO's.

Rotermund- It's a back up system, we could argue about distances, but I think this is dang close to what we should do, we could draw a line on the side and it's a great back up. If all systems of timing fail, you have no back up system; you have to stop the event. Also athletically I don't think it's fair to make athletes re-run if timing fails. In pro rules if you couldn't make a call you go to speed vote of 0, I think there needs to be a back-up system if timing fails.

Wintersteen- The judge isn't looking for time difference from a clock but visually.

Hatch- That is my point, his only job is to judge speed.

Simson- I think the judges stand is not the best place to judge speed.

Eddy- Why can't the speed judge stand by the finish line?

Preston- You are taking time and turning it into space.

Clark- Call the question.

Wise- For: **3, opposed: 5, abstentions: 3. I have to vote to break the tie and I vote against the motion, motion fails.** My reasoning is that there are so many abstentions which are probably more negative.

Hayes- Let's move to actions of the FIS in the last year, we discussed in entirety at R&T, after discussion all FIS actions were passed. I propose to vote on all of them together. The first two were not included, so everything below 6204.1, **move to accept the following actions of the FIS.**

6204.1- ADD: The competitor shall be judged from the start until the run is completed by crossing the finish line, stopping for more than 10 seconds or losing both skis. Any imbalance or problems inside the course resulting in a fall or touch after the finish line will result in deductions only for those errors which occur before the finish line. The finish line is part of the course. Nothing occurring after the finish line shall affect the judges evaluation of the run.

6204.1.1.1 ADD AFTER SPONTANEITY: Spontaneity is the ability of the competitor to maintain the rhythm of turns prior to the jump, including the initiation for take off.

Maximum raw point allotment 2.5/jump

6204.2.1.2 ADD positions can be performed during the rotation, in the middle of the rotation, or after the rotation. When performed during the rotation of in the middle of a rotation, positions should be symmetrical unless the position itself is not symmetrical (e.g. grabs may not be symmetrical). Timing of maneuvers should also be symmetrical.

6204.2.2 Every competitor must perform two different jumps. Only identical performed jumps will be considered report jumps with the exceptions noted below in rotational maneuvers. "Two different jumps" are defined:

- Jumps with different number of positions.
- Jumps of different groups for single maneuvers.
- Jumps with the same number and types of positions by in a different order.

Exceptions:

1. When grabs are performed in rotation maneuvers, all grabs are considered to be the same position.
2. When positions are performed in rotational maneuvers, the locations in the rotation does not change the jump. A 180-spread-180 is a repeat of a 360 to a spread. If two positions are performed in a 360 or 720, changing the order of the positions changes the jump. NOTE that since all grabs are classified as a single maneuver, a 360 with two grabs is a repeat of a 360 with 2 other grabs or if the garbs are reversed.

6204.2.3 ADD Note grad cannot be performed as a single maneuver. They can only be incorporated with rotational maneuvers. Grabs performed must be identifiable as a grab. Grabs must be held only as long as it takes to present it clearly to the judges.

Note – In order for a new jump to receive a score in a competition, all its component maneuvers must be defined and it must have been assigned a degree of difficulty by the Freestyle Sport Development Subcommittee. The following is the procedure for the qualification process:

1. A CD of the jump must be provided to the Freestyle Sport Development Subcommittee.
2. A written explanation of the jump must accompany the CD. The explanation must include the proper position of the body, arms, legs and head; as well as identify from breaks representing incorrect body position(s).
3. From the time all materials are received, the process to approve and categorize a jump will take approximately 3-6 months and this should be taken into consideration when submitting.
4. The jump/position must be performed in at least one World Cup competition before being performed at either a World Championship or Olympic Winter Games.
5. This qualification procedure applies to all new maneuvers/jumps and variations of existing jumps, grabs

6204.2.4 Last sentence; if a competition lands a jump with at least one ski boot on or before the finish line the jump is counted.

6204.3.2 Delete all wording after; speed calculation (same for 5 or 7 judges in split scoring). ADD: Speed points will be based upon the FIS formula using course distance and pitch.

6304.2.1 In 5 judge format CHANGE overall vote to 3 votes turns, 1 vote air, 1 vote speed
6304.2.1.1 DELETE all working after; tie-breaking 5 judge dual mogul format. ADD: All ties can be broken in the 5 judge dual mogul format. If there is a tie in speed, the overall judge has 4 votes resulting in 19 votes possible. If there is a tie in Air (neither athlete jumps), the overall judge has 4 votes resulting in 19 votes possible. If there is a tie for both speed and air, the overall judge has 3 votes resulting in 13 votes possible.

6305.4.1 DELETE all working after; air judge evaluate jumps based. ADD: on the scoring criteria from single moguls (quality, air and spontaneity), as well as difficulty and variety. Competitors **may repeat jumps** but judges will consider variety in comparing the same two competitors. Variety reflects a different number of maneuvers and different types of maneuvers.

Eliminate 6304.4.2 and 6305.4.2.1

Wintersteen- Second.

Wintersteen- Call the question.

Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.**

Hayes- If you would like any other info about how discussion went, it's in the sub-committee report.

Wintersteen- **Move to accept R&T report.**

Clark- Second.

Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.** Moving on to the Development sub-committee report.

Rotermund- Development sub-committee report. **The first motion is to increase the single mogul quota at Selections taken from US Qualifiers to top 45 men and top 45 women in single moguls.** The motion passed unanimously in committee.

Clark- Second.

Wintersteen- As I see it we have increased the quota for selection events, and now we also want alternates?

Rotermund- We vote separately on those motions.

Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.**

Rotermund- In addition to top 45men and women from Qualifiers, **move to we name an additional 5 alternates per sex in moguls from the US Qualifiers.**

Clark- Second.

Rotermund- Our logic is that our goal is to get 45 men and 45 women in the event from US Qualifiers, by naming 5 alternates we can achieve our goal to fill the quota.

Wintersteen- There were only 43 women at US Qualifiers. How do you pick the alternates?

Rotermund- You don't have alternates from anywhere else.

Clark- So just to make sure, it's the next 5 athletes from US Qualifiers, period, those are your only alternates. If those 5 do not want to attend that's it, we're done, we don't keep going down if the first alternate says no?

Rotermund- Correct.

Simson- If we are increasing the field by 10 why are we adding an additional 5 alternates?

Newson- It's not like you're going down in quality.

Rotermund- Our goal is a full quota. I would argue differently.

Beck- You have athletes that have gone all the way to Qualifiers, and if they are seniors, they need to make a decision about what they are doing with their lives, 5 more alternates is a wise choice.

Rodman- Call the question.

Wise- For: 11, abstention: 1, against: 0, **Motion passes.**

Rotermund- The next motion refers to Qualifiers. **Move that the Qualifiers to US Nationals will be a three day event including men's moguls, women's moguls and dual moguls, and to be held in the same geographical location just prior to the US championships.**

Simson- Second.

Wintersteen- What if there is no bid for an area near US champs? It's hard to get bids already and now we are regulating where bids come from?

Rotermund- That is why we leave it to say "geographical location."

Wintersteen- Nationals is in Bogus, say the only bid for Qualifiers is Sugarloaf, is that the same geographical location? Does that mean it's doesn't happen?

Rotermund- Well it's in the Nationals contract that 10 days before US nationals all events run at the mountain have to be approved.

Simson- So if there is no bid for Qualifiers except from somewhere far away, does that mean we don't have it?

Wintersteen- Then we don't need the rule, the intent is always to have it in the same place anyway and we would ignore it if it doesn't happen.

Preston- The purpose is to have it be a Qualifier to Nationals. It is important to that the intent to have both US champs and Qualifiers in the same place. The second thing is Qualifiers is a revenue event that could help with Nationals funding. I think it would be good appeal for places to bid on both events.

Banghart- We need a very clear policy that when you bid on Nationals that you are given both.

Eddy- I think we need it because before we were looking for other places, now we are talking about the same area, it's a different policy.

Wise- Call the question, for: 10, opposed: 1, abstention: 1, **motion passes.**

Rotermund- **Next motion is that the quota for Inverted aerials to US Nationals will be filled from the March FSP list, subject to the minimum DD criteria already listed.** Our general thoughts are that we have the same aerialist go to the same events; we need to utilize the min criteria you can get your athletes there.

Clark- So the Qualifier is for just moguls, and now aerials is different, we can't eliminate any aerialist except with DD.

Rotermund- Yes so there is no elimination of a rule but the field will be cut.

Wintersteen- It effectively does that, they have one less competition when there are already very few competitions.

Eddy- You are assuming that there is.

Preston- It is much more practical now that JO is an open event. There is no need for an aerial Qualifier. It's one less event, but also a lot more money in their pocket. They could jump through that hoop, an extra event is more expense but it's just the same field and it's already decided. Aerialists are not in favor of a Qualifier.

Hatch- If you all are going to start cutting mandatory aerial events then you need to start hosting events, it's very sad. We're not training our athletes to compete.

Rotermund- If I can speak in favor, this is one less inverted aerial event but this group of athletes hates this event the most, we have hurt the event, athletes have made a choice to just not compete. Michael Stevenson already makes that choice. He chose moguls because that path was easiest.

Wise- Call the question, For: 11, abstention: 1, against:0. **Motion passes.**

Rotermund- **Move to add Big Air 4600, half-pipe 4500 to Junior Olympics, in addition to current schedule, aerials 4000, moguls 4200, and dual moguls 4300. The events held would be 4000, 4200, 4300, 4500, 4600 and that 4000, 4500, 4600 are open to all age groups.**

Simson- Second.

Erickson- That would preclude us. We can't have JO's if you have to have an air site and a half pipe.

Wintersteen- Why are we calling it Junior Olympics if half the events are also open to non-juniors?

Davis- We are getting rid of inverts at Qualifiers, that was one less comp but now they can go to Juniors if they wish. It's just to let more athletes do it.

Wintersteen- In essence you're having US champs for halfpipe and Big Air at Junior Olympics, are you breaking out age groups for juniors?

Eddy- Yes.

Erickson- So to bid for juniors do you have to have an A site and a B site? To host juniors you have to have an A aerial site?

Hilliman- No, it was only up to doubles in the last two years.

Rotermund- There are no spec changes we are just adding Big Air and halfpipe.

Simson- I have a question to a USSA person or an organizer, what is the practicality of maintaining and running all of those sites with limited resources?

Eddy- From an organizer perspective we ran a Big Air and aerals on one site last year, the organizer would love to have all those events, it means more dollars.

Rotermund- I feel the same with Bogus.

Wintersteen- Would you consider that since we've only had Big Air created in this meeting and there were only two halfpipes this whole year, would you change it to a recommendation?

Clark- What if we don't get a bid with all the disciplines?

Eddy- If you come to us with no bid after a certain date, but you have bids without them then we can deal with that. It's a policy issue that everyone would have to hear.

Preston- It would be good for everyone to have it, halfpipe could be held somewhere else.

Rotermund- I think the intent is that these are the events you have to run.

Wise- Call the question, for: 8, abstentions: 2, opposed: 1, **motion passes**.

Rotermund- **Motion to have a Junior National champion for the sports of aerals 4000, moguls 4200, dual moguls 4300, Big Air 4500, halfpipe 4600, a National champion Big Air 4500, halfpipe 4600.** That's what we are proposing

Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.**

Rotermund- **The next motion is to for the Junior Olympic quota to be as follows:**

Moguls- 60 men and 60 women

Dual Moguls- 48 men and 48 women

4000 Aerials- 45 men and 45 women

4500 Halfpipe- 45 men and 45 women

4600 Big Air- 45 men and 45 women

Simson- What is the format at Juniors, one day mogul comp with a cut?

Wise- Yes, that's what the quota is now. Any other questions? Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.**

Rotermund- **The next motion is for the half pipe 4500, and Big air 4600 the quotas are 45 men and 45 women and for the 02-03 season the quota will be divided by membership based on the divisions membership as of January 30th, 2003. With a minimum of three men and three women for each division.**

Wintersteen- Second.

Beck- In the past we had a quota similar to this and it didn't work. We have created a points list for both Big Air and halfpipe, let's use them. We want to get this event going fairly and want to get this going, which is great, but I don't want to base it on the divisions but on ability. We want to have a good start, to say to one side of the country that there are thousands of members that want to get involved and then you are closing the door at the top end. It will be extremely difficult to explain to parents and athletes to see in the rulebook that they are in the top 45, but the division only gets three spots, very hard to explain.

Banghart- Did anyone say we can't have the B circuit count, isn't that going to confuse the system?

Simson- I have two items, first with seven divisions and a 45 quota you will be above that and B in response to that in year one you will have an unreliable system, in year one proportional number you can't rank favorably.

Rotermund- I'm close to what Jay said. In theory we have created two new points systems, we don't know what they are going to do, in the first year we should just ask to get it going, get as many athletes as we can get there and have an accurate points list after this event.

Newsome- One way to meet in the middle is to not choose your population from this list but wait to pick until after Dec. 31, of your registered athletes at that time. Once they register we would have a better idea.

Wise- Membership gets the totals all the time.

Hilliman- I don't think that the points list will be great but it's unfair to smaller divisions where it's the most popular. Do it off of halfpipe percentages.

Rotermund- What happens if you have no events due to weather?

Simson- If you do adjust it so you have a minimum base, you could raise the base.

Rodman- I have a question to Clay or another smaller division. Is there a better number, everyone gets 5 per sex? I think we could start that better.

Banghart- I can't speak for east but that's totally unfair, I have 600 athletes, and they have 30 athletes.

Wintersteen- You don't know how many halfpipers you have, you have to run it before we know.

Sundquist- We have halfpipes competitions with 60 people and moguls with 12 skiers.

Sundquist, M- Let's base it off halfpipe numbers. We don't have moguls in mid-west we have a lot of half pipes, we could have 60 kids in our program. You have to do it proportionally.

Rotermund- I would like to suggest that the quotas will be divided proportionally based on the population by Feb 1, 2003. Freestyle competitors, youth and rookie, total competitor membership. That won't work, could be manipulated. We need to get it started and I think this is the best way.

Beck- I agree, I want to keep it simple, we are starting an event, each division gets this number and let it pan out after that. We make that cut right now.

Rotermund- The more I think about utilizing the membership and using the quota, this makes you go out and get members, I like that.

Beck- I will do that but what is the incentive if you only have so many spots to the top events? I'm confused about the upright points list; they would be eligible for Juniors on the points list, 4000 event at Juniors?

Wise- I would like to call the question. For: 9, abstention: 1, opposed: 1, **motion passes.**

Eddy- You forgot one thing. The combined quota at Junior Olympics should be suspended again for the 02-03 season.

Newson- I have an action item as well.

Rotermund- The action item was that the injured athlete clause to what an injured athlete has to do to appeal should be better publicized. Also we need to have a schedule of events and the deadline for entry and appeal deadlines.

Banghart- How do we proposed to take the new aerials, upright, invert, old upright list? Or combined lists?

Eddy- Doesn't matter because it's going off your scores, so there's nothing to do, they are scored.

Clark- **I move to accept the sub-committee report.**

Kenney- Second.

Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.** I think that the discussion you had this morning in Development was very valuable and we need to keep talking about it. Thank you.

Rotermund- I want a whole day to discuss in the fall.

Eddy- There are several items that we need to resolve that we didn't do in R&T. We need to adapt the specs for halfpipe and Big Air.

Motion #1- To recommend the following Big Air course specifications:

- Maximum of 3 jumps on site
- Jump height min. 1m- max 3m
- Distance to knoll min 4m- max 12m
- Landing hill length- min 10m
- Landing hill pitch 30 degree min- 38 degree max
- Takeoff angle minimum must equal land hill pitch.

Motion #2- To recommend the following quarterpipe course specifications:

- Pip height- min 4m
- Take-off angle- min. 1.2 m wide @ 88 degrees last 1m
- Transition- min. 6m
- Base width- min. 6m
- Recommended sloping back deck.
- Optional additional hip take-off

Wise- Any questions? Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously**

Eddy- I have a question about the 4600 rules which we accepted in 5.1 but we haven't written them yet. It's only in outline format. Never mind, I would like to look at the coaches recommendation of motion 16- to request from USSA funds to produce a new school video, a tricktionary, by Blue Lake Productions.

Preston- It's my freeride coach and he could make a complete tricktionary for \$500 very cheap.

Clark- We will look into it and I'll see Preston off line.

Eddy- The next motion is to recommend selection criteria for aerials. Motion 20- to recommend to USSA to field a team in all FIS Freestyle Disciplines (except Skiercross) and to develop criteria to field that team. Halfpipe was the question, we're not asking to fund a team but create criteria to select a team. Create a procedure for athletes who want to enter FIS half-pipes.

Wintersteen- I find it hard to believe that the quota will really be as open as Joe stated so we will need a criteria, but if we don't have any events it's hard to pick a team.

Eddy- They just need to be entered by USSA and we're asking for a criteria to enter.

Wintersteen- Let's think further ahead because I don't think if we have 20 athletes that want to compete that they all will be allowed to compete.

Eddy- Ok, but we need to work on the criteria.

Clark- We will work on it. We will get on it.

Eddy- Once we have a points list it will be easy.

Wintersteen- Right, but we don't so I'm open to comments.

Clark- Move to accept

Rodman- Second.

Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.** Old business- it's all been eliminated or brought up in sub-committee. New business?

Banghart- Would you please explain what happened at US Nationals?

Wise- There was a clerical error that resulted in the wrong athlete being named National Champion, Jeremy Bloom. The two air judges marked their score cards as Jeremy's bottom jump as a mixed quad, which gives it a higher DD which inflated Jeremy's score. That difference had Jeremy winning. This was pointed out later. At the time I was the TD, Konrad was the chief of comp, and because we had scheduling conflicts Bob became a scoring judge. Rich was a turns and line judge.

Rotermund- The problem was that both judges made the same mistake, so when it went into the computer, it wasn't caught there and then it was difficult to check on the score sheet.

Wintersteen- They saw the trick as quad twister but they both put it in the wrong category. We did not find out until 2 hours after awards, it was brought to us by Liz that this could have happened but we didn't have score sheets.

Wise- We were faced with what was on the score sheets and which was what was right? The category or 4 twisters? It was changed when it became evident what was right after that. I watched the TV show and it was obvious. On April 7th the change was made. We could have done it differently but it was unusual circumstances.

Wintersteen- I would like to point out that it was a US team staff that brought it up. Because of other circumstances it was not Liz's position to file a protest. It gets unclear what happens if the judge thinks it was a mixed quad. If the judge says Jeremy did a mixed quad, then it is scored as a mixed quad, you can't protest what a judge sees.

Rotermund- You can't protest the judges score, we had to see the video to be clear.

Wise- You can point the finger at me because it took so long, we had one mistake we didn't want to make a second mistake by correcting the wrong thing until we were sure. We wanted to see the video.

Banghart- I just wanted the facts so I can talk about it.

Eddy- I have one comment; I think the changes on stand were terrible. Nothing could look worse than having a US paid team staff person on the stand judging. And second I would like to

address the issue of the dual mogul quota at US Selections, whether we want to change that or not. Do we want to do something with duals?

Eddy- I move to increase the dual mogul quota from 32 to 48 athletes from US Qualifiers.
(Later rescinded)

Rodman- Call the question

Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.**

Newson- I have one comment to the event organizers, as a photographer of championship events, it would be great to have podiums at all domestic events.

Rotermund- I would like to explain why we went to that, we need to get the cost of TV shots so we can get those guys out but I agree with you.

Beck- I would like clarification on the last thing that was passed? What was just passed?

Eddy- We changed the dual mogul quota to 48.

Beck- How do you come up with only 48? How do you only pick 48 when they are all tied at Qualifiers? This makes no sense.

Newson- It was an after thought; there may have been a better number.

Kenney- I would like to make a motion to reconsider.

Clark- Second

Rotermund- Nerve mind, let's forget that motion.

Wise- Any opposition to removing? Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.**

Lake- I would like to move that the technical specifications for aerial sites change and the single kicker is moved back to 5.5 meters.

Kenney- Why would we make it different from FIS?

Lake- The same thing happened with the double and triple.

Stone- What about young girls trying to learn their first flips? Will that intimidate them? We are already having trouble getting girls involved.

Lake- It is the same philosophy as a double kicker, it's flatter, it's actually easier to flip.

Rodman- The jump is flatter?

Lake- Yes, just a little bit and a lot smoother, it's easier ride, it's a new shape, it makes a slower better kicker. We have built these and they work well.

Hatch- It does a couple of other things, it simulates the single kicker at Lake Placid and the UOP. I can attest that you go a little bit faster but travel down the hill easier, and easier to clear knoll, there is also enough space to have cat in the site, it's easier to maintain the hill.

Wintersteen- Since the aerial coaches understand this issue better I think we should please table until fall and we can better understand it. Especially since there isn't a comfort level on voting on this. **I move to table until the fall.**

Rotermund- Second.

Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.** Any more new business? The fall meetings will be in Park City. There isn't a fall USSA meeting so we will be meeting on our own. I will propose dates and I think we should stick with traditional meeting.

Clark- I would like clarification on what we would like at the fall meetings. A whole day to discuss the development issues Konrad brought up, a full FSC meeting, any other sub-committee that would like to meet, coaches yes, R&T yes, membership- no. Ok would you like coaches in the development meeting and coaches meeting? I would circulate timelines for agendas, and discussion points, and we can have constructive conversations. One thing I would appreciate is if everyone could meet deadlines, it's much easier to distribute all at once. That is also true of posting on the web we need to post all at once.

Simson- **Move to adjourn.**

Rodman- Second. Wise- Any opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.**