

USSA FREESTYLE SPORT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

USSA CONGRESS 2007 - PARK CITY, UT

Northside, Snowpark Lodge – Deer Valley
Friday & Saturday, May 18-19, 2007

Meeting Chair: Andy Wise

- 1) R&T Rep: Andy Hayes
- 2) Judges Rep: Bill McNice
- 3) Coaches Rep: Glenn Eddy
- 4) Development Rep: Chris Haslock
- 5) Membership Rep: Deb Newson
- 6) Membership (DEN, RMD): Lewis Sundquist – proxy Thom Schaefer, Dan Miller – proxy Teresa Campbell.
VOTE ROTATION: Central, Thom Schaefer
- 7) Membership (NOR, FW, INT, PNSA): Mike Papke – absent (Hayes), Kate Duhamel, Caron Keim –absent (Haslock), Pat Deneen (1 vote). VOTE ROTATION: PNSA, Pat Deneen
- 8) FIS rep: Jay Simson
- 9) USSA BOD Athlete Rep: Mariano Ferrario
- 10) Athlete Rep: Michael Macomber - absent
- 11) Athlete Rep: Jen Hudak – proxy Elana Chase
- 12) Athlete Rep: Jenny Haywood – proxy Justin Henceroth
- 13) Ex-Officio: Jeff Lange
- 14) At-Large: Konrad Rotermond
- 15) Head Coach: Jeff Wintersteen
- 16) Program Manager: Emily S. Fisher- absent, Polly-Jo Clark, proxy = 15 votes + chair
1 absent

1. Welcome and call to order

Wise

PJC: Recorded the meeting. She stated that the program was without Emily until August 1 and that Andy Cantor would serve as interim replacement, but he could not take care of everything. She said that any help throughout the meeting would be much appreciated and that Emily and her family were doing well.

USSA Membership Department Report: Sheryl Barnes, Member Services Director

1. Online renewal programming in progress. Hope to launch in the fall.
2. Background Screening
 - Screened over 6,000 coaches and officials
 - Approximately a 10% avoidance factor or about 600 who failed to register
 - Cost to USSA over \$140K
 - Screening to be conducted every three years, but this is subject to change
3. No printed applications - only online.
4. Multi-Sport Youth membership currently being evaluated for launch in the 2008-09 season.

2. FSC Board of Directors Rep Election

Clark

Background/history: The FSC has a USSA board representative and the FSC chair. Operating procedures say the positions do not have to be the same person and the terms are staggered. We are here to elect a representative to the USSA BOD. We have had two people in the position in the past and in the more recent years (since Wise was elected). PJC will facilitate the election.

Simson: Wise has done much great work and the opportunity to have two articulate spokespeople speaking for Freestyle is a good one.

Simson nominated Glenn Eddy and Eddy accepted the nomination.

Rotermund nominated Andy Wise.

PJC: This is the first time in a long, long time that we've had this interest and I'm excited about it. Andy has done a fantastic job. There is a value to having more Freestyle interaction at a higher level of the USSA BOD. We should conduct this via a ballot.

Lange: If each candidate would like to say anything we should take the time to hear them, but first I'd like to share some thoughts on the architecture of the operating procedures. The transition goes back to when Irv Kagan and I were the representatives – the intent of what I put together was that it was a good thing in general for all sports that we have change in leadership roles, not that we lose those people, but that their roles change. Andy was the only one brave enough to step up and so the process as laid out didn't come to pass. This is a great opportunity with multiple candidates.

Eddy commented that he had been on the committee for 20+ years – a very long time and that he was very familiar with the various problems and issues. I have a good sense of what we're working on and I'd like to be able to represent us at the board level. I've served on various committees at various levels for a long time.

Wise commented that he had been the BOD rep for six years, since 2001 and would like to continue. Youth membership – Bob Dart and I have been hounding the BOD for that whole time and finally last December the BOD started listening and started to put the process in motion. New faces can be advantageous at the BOD level, but we would be departing from the current procedure of other sport committees – they are one and the same. When the BOD chair speaks as the rep he's speaking to "the boss", he doesn't have to speak with another person to discuss Freestyle. Keep everything in mind when casting your vote.

Rotermund: Jay brought up having two people visible to bring up issues. I feel the opposite - that it needs to be one voice to bring to the board and brings things forward. It allows this committee to have faith that when it makes decisions it goes straight up, not that Glenn wouldn't – it's great to have the interest. But the chair brings the clout when sitting there, because we are a very small niche sport.

Wintersteen: I understand what you're saying but given that scenario if the chair isn't up for election then basically the chair is always going to be the BOD member or whoever's the BOD representative will always be the chair.

Rotermund: Elections are great - we have someone to run. And it gives us the choice.

Wintersteen: You see my point? Unless I'm mistaken, the chair isn't up for election this year, right? It's a catch 22. Because we're staggered you're saying we will never change because it's always going to be the same person. If we're doing it simply because we need to have the same person have the same voice then it's always going to be the same person.

Lange: That's an architecture point...the intent was transitional. As one person moves throughout the ranks, the next person comes in. The idea with the one-year difference was to have an overlap so there could be some mutual work together for a while to get up to speed. It's difficult to step into the whole thing new. The idea was that there was someone there who has done it before. My thought was, this is entirely up to the election next year, that person moves into a secondary role for a couple years then the transition happens at the other end the same way. Obviously that would not be a good structure if you feel strongly about Konrad's position.

Flash: Or if you feel strongly about Konrad's position, then you know how you're going to vote next year.

Lange: Well, can't get into that scenario, you've got to change something. It's a catch 22 if you strictly follow that structure – one of the two has to change. You end up with a leader for life if you follow it.

Wade: Who gets to vote on it? That group represents all of us over here right? Can we change the structure?

Clark: You are represented by people over here (the FSC at the table).

Beck: What is the term? We still have the opportunity to change it in two years. (BOD position. FSC chair is up next year.)

Wise: Theresa, since Thom is not here, you can vote on this.

Wise asked KXR if he could vote. KXR said you could vote for yourself, yes!

Clark conducts the voting process.

Thank you all for your patience while we worked through this process. We haven't had an actual election with ballots in a very long time, so I appreciate you all bearing with me while we work through it. Congratulations to Glenn Eddy our new representative to the USSA BOD. Thanks to Andy for all your hard work and leadership for the past six or seven years!

And making sure we're doing it all right and it's fair.

The BOD position begins at the annual meeting.

3. Agenda Approval

Wise

There are two new business items that are in your packet that came in after the deadline.

4. Executive Committee Report

Wise

The exec committee continues to meet July and October for the petitions for the US Selection events. In the October call we also had to discuss and decide on the member fee increase that the BOD was discussing in December. It was approved with some reluctance.

We also formed a new judicial committee: Glenn Eddy, Craig Rodman and Travis Mayer.

The closer we get to an event the more phone calls we get. Try to get paperwork in on time. We have a lot to coordinate particularly when the season really gets going and we all travel.

5. USSA Board of Directors Report

Wise

The multi-sport youth membership – at age 12 and under, the athletes should participate in all sports. We want it to be easy for a kid to be able to try other sports and without having to buy another membership. Hopefully this will be in place for 2008-09. In order for a club to meet insurance requirements, some clubs buy the cheapest membership regardless of what sport they are participating in – this will put your insurance at risk and increase liability.

I read an article in the paper, the ski industry is pushing to get halfpipe into the OWG, I don't think it will be 2010. The earliest it will be is 2014. Twin tip skis are on an even pace or outselling alpine skis.

Preston – do we have an estimate of what the industry knows of the population of Freeride skiers?

Wise – no, the skis are being outsold.

Rotermund: Tough thing is to qualify who's participating, determine what is population, etc. The sales of the skis are difficult to qualify - big mountain, carving, twin tips and how they track. We tried to find all the results from all the big events – the numbers in HP and SS are 500-670 USA athletes, including athletes in USSA. It's very difficult because there are quite a few different formats to see who all was participating. Some events are 30-40% foreign.

Clark: Events outside of USSA we cannot always tell you who ALL participated because they list the athletes in finals only. USSA numbers are in the staff report.

Hatch: A lot of people are buying these skis and not competing. Have an opportunity for tremendous growth. Culture isn't to compete or compete right away.

Lange: Don't know that keeping track of the skis sold necessarily means much. Just because alpine skis are sold doesn't mean people are racing. Obviously the shift is moving back - cultural shift going on we should be aware of.

Preston: Look at all those kids in the park - how come they aren't in these events? Gets back to daily membership challenge. Is there some way we can facilitate participation with USSA? \$60 is a hurdle.

Chase: An army of little kids are participating in USASA, cheaper, more local.

Wise: All of that's being looked at in looking at this multi-sport license.

6. Staff Report (see Addendum A)

Clark/Wintersteen

7. FIS Report (see Addendum A)

Clark/Wintersteen/Simson

8. USSA Education

Clark/Wintersteen

Bill Marolt touched on this during the keynote this morning and I didn't realize how much it was going to tie in until a few minutes ago. I want to catch the FSC up. We conducted this education with the USFST athletes and staff after the BOD meetings last year. I want to take it to the next level and get more info to this group of people about who USSA is, how we operate – a better understanding of the company, goals, how things operate in a little bit more detail and how we got where we are. Last year we re-centered the organization focusing on the USSA mission, vision, goals and values.

Now I want to look at how it applies to us – this group, volunteers, clubs, parents, organizers, officials, judges, and coaches. How do we incorporate these into our education curriculum for coaches, judges, officials, and parents? How can we be productive with the information?

FSC – day 2

Wise – We are checking to make sure that one person cannot hold two positions, a person has only one vote. For clarification, one can hold more than one position on the committee, but can only hold one vote during the FSC meetings. (Note: Glenn will be both the coaches' representative and the BOD rep.)

I've been discussing this with Lange. We are contemplating making an operating procedure change with maybe term limits on FSC positions and BOD positions. Also next year the FSC chair is up for election and if anyone plans on running I would appreciate it if they give notice at the same time the agendas are due. We should have an opportunity to take a look at that position and think about it, at least you should have more than 15 minutes to think about who you want to represent you.

9. Subcommittee Reports

DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT TO THE FSC

Chair: Chris Haslock

Freestyle Program Manager (non-voting): Emily Fisher – absent, proxy – Polly-Jo Clark

Athlete Representative: Jen Hudak – absent, proxy – Justin Henceroth

Membership representative: Deb Newson

US Freestyle Ski Team Representative: Todd Schirman

NorAm Committee Representative: Konrad Rotermund

Coaches Representative: Elana Chase

Coaches Representative: Clay Beck

USSA Rule Change Proposals presented from the Development Subcommittee

Proposal Number:	Devo #2
Description:	Adopt FIS rules for ski cross and implement competitions at grassroots
Current Rule:	None
Proposed Change:	Adopt FIS rules for ski cross competitions, include SX on sanction forms and publish rules and procedures in the competition guide.
Discussion/Reason:	<p>This freestyle skiing event is now an Olympic event and we need to help promote it in the USA and get interested skiers involved while offering an opportunity to chase this.</p> <p><u>USSA Note:</u> We did adopt the FIS rules several meetings ago for ski cross. Ski cross is included on the freestyle sanction form. If FIS rules need adjustment for USSA domestic events please propose specific changes.</p>
Pass/Fail	Passed, unanimous. Rules/policies need to be published.

Proposal Number:	Devo #4
Description:	Have an "open" component at the US Championships for halfpipe.
Current Rule:	Pg 52, #8 The top 30 athletes in halfpipe from the #4 FSP list per gender in addition to the athletes listed in points 1-5 above.
Proposed Change:	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Pg 52, # 8 The top <u>30 15</u>-athletes in halfpipe from the #4 FSP list per gender in addition to the athletes listed in points 1-5 above <u>would be entered into the semi-final.</u></p> <p>Pg 52, # 9 In halfpipe an open group of 30 <u>40</u>-athletes per gender will be <u>allowed entry into a 2 run qualification round.</u></p> <p>Format</p> <p>Pg 53, #3 In halfpipe a semi-final will be added between the qualifications and the finals. The open group of 30 <u>40</u> athletes per gender will have a 2 run qualification round. After the first run the top 5 advance to the semi-final and the top 50% advance to the second qualifying run. From the second qualifying run the top 5 advance to the semi-final. The 30 <u>15</u> FSP qualified athletes <u>would be added to the 10 qualifiers for a 25 athlete semi-final.</u> After the first run the top 5 advance to the final and the top 50% advance to the second semi-final run. From the second semi-final run the top 5 advance to the final. This would culminate in a 2 run final of 10 skiers with the best score of the 2 runs counting.</p> <p>Option 2</p> <p>Pg 52, #8 The top <u>15</u> athletes in halfpipe from the #4 FSP list per gender in addition to the athletes listed in points 1-5 above <u>would be entered into the semi-final.</u></p> <p>Pg 52, #9 In halfpipe an open group of 30 athletes per gender will be <u>allowed entry into a 2 run qualification round.</u></p> <p>Format</p> <p>Pg 53, #3 In halfpipe a semi final will be added between the qualifications and the finals. The open group of 30 athletes per gender will have a 2 run qualification round. After the first run, the top 5 advance to the semi final. From the second qualifying run, the top 5 advance to the semi-final. The 15 FSP qualified athletes <u>would be added to the 10 qualifiers for a 25 athlete semi-final.</u> After the first run the top 5 advance to the final. From the second semi final run the top 5 advance to the final. This would culminate in a 2 run final of 10 skiers with the best score of the 2 runs counting.</p>
Discussion/Reason:	<p>There seems to be a big interest by USSA to have more high caliber skiers to compete at this event to represent a true national champion. Since USSA is currently considered to be a feeder to the "open" circuit rather than the other way around, it would allow for some of the big names to be brought into the fold and help give the event better clout and viability. The US Snowboard Grand Prix used a variation of this and was successful.</p> <p>Option 1 offers 40 open slots and has a maximum of 113 runs.</p> <p>Option 2 offers 30 open slots and has a maximum of 120 runs.</p>
Pass/Fail	Passed: option 1, For: 8, Against: 7, absentions:1

General discussion: The development group was looking for ways to attract the top halfpipe athletes who are currently competing outside of the USSA system to USSA nationals. Several options were discussed and the proposal adjusted as such. Some of this system is getting athletes into the USSA system who are not currently there – they would have to join prior to being in the event, they wouldn't necessarily have been an USSA athlete all season. There was concern that we're using events outside the USSA system - it was clarified that this wasn't doing that. But the point was that these athletes aren't in the system. It is important that we don't forget that the clubs have done a fantastic job creating the pipeline and programs for halfpipe and we shouldn't dismantle that or sell that short.

The message from the USSA management team is that we will use USSA and FIS events to select athletes for Worlds, etc. It needs to be very clear that this is to get big names in, but this will not be in effect in an OWG year or Worlds year and that this will not be permanent.

While it is recognized that one does not go to nationals and get a Worlds start, it is a large part of the process and positioning of an athlete to be able to qualify. We might be compromising our grassroots programs and giving up a lot, several people believe that getting to two USSA/FIS events at some point in the season is not too onerous. Some argue that the halfpipe athletes have opportunities outside of USSA, which is different from moguls and aerials.

Proposal Number:	Devo #7 (proposal from Fisher)
Description:	Alternates to the development group
Current Rule:	After the U.S. Freestyle Ski Team is named in May 2007, the top five men and top five women from the prior year's final FSP in moguls and duals, and the top two men and top two women in aerials will be named to the USSA development group.
Proposed Change:	Add next sentence. <u>An athlete who is named to the development group has until June 1, 2007 to notify the USSA office of their acceptance to the development group naming. Once the USSA office has been notified that an athlete is retiring or the deadline has been reached with no acceptance, the next athlete on the FSP will be added to the development group.</u>
Discussion/Reason:	Without the addition of alternates many times athletes in the devo group have retired and there are fewer athletes with guaranteed NorAm starts.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: unanimous

Points brought forward by concerned parties and discussed by this group.

- Recommendation to staff that the criteria for major events be decided in a more timely fashion for athletes in all freestyle discipline/events to arrive and be prepared to compete.
- Recommendations to judges subcommittee
 - That proctors spend more time on the new school events such as halfpipe and slopestyle. (This came from concerned judges at high-level USSA events.)
 - Head Judges at high-level events need to be more sensitive to moving quickly and be willing to accept help from other parties within the jury or organizing committee to expedite the competition procedures.
- Women's aerials numbers dwindling again? Possible solutions are:
 - Perhaps we need to establish strong subsidized programs like AUS or CAN.
 - Divisions seem to be already moving and they suggested we approach this with; more opportunities (local small events); more incentives (role models, combined events, mountains need to run more traditional weekend); simplifying the venue;

educational material (running simpler venues and how to start small); TV campaign starting small.

- Would like to see ski cross happening at the divisional level.

RULES AND TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT TO THE FSC

Chair: Andy Hayes

PNSA; Pat Deneen
Intermountain; John Zuck for Chris Haslock
Rocky; Matti Wade
Northern; Andy Hayes
FIS Rep; Jay Simson

East; Glenn Eddy for Leon Bodzioch
Central; Thom Schaefer
Far West; Kate Duhamel for Eric Hickman
Head Judge; Bill McNice

1) Declaration of voting members/quorum

2) Rules and Technical subcommittee chairman election. Andy Hayes was the only nomination and was confirmed for two more years.

3) Discussion topics:

A) Dual moguls as a separate sport?

- At USSA level? Will continue on two different points lists and feel that it is an important program for us.
- At NorAm level? The event will follow FIS with only one points list.

B) USSA formats for aerials?

- We currently have only one format, two runs added together.
- (JW) These other formats are for show purposes at the World Cup level and do not seem to make sense for us at this time.

C) Ski Cross?

- Freestyle TD's on jury? Yes, we will try to include Freestyle TD's.
- Inclusion at the US Championships? Probable within two years.

USSA Rule Change Proposals

Proposal Number:	R & T – 2: Passed Unanimously in R&T
Description:	Correct the mogul air judge rule to what we actually use
Current Rule:	<p>6203.1.2 Air Judges</p> <p>Two judges shall independently evaluate the competitors aerial maneuver(s) based upon the criteria as stated in 6204.2. The scores will be averaged for a total air score and truncated to two decimal places.</p> <p>Total air score = 3.75 (max) x 2 jumps = 7.5 (max) per Judge.</p> <p>6203.2.2 Air Judges (same)</p>
Proposed Change:	<p>6203.2.2 Air Judges</p> <p><u>Each judge shall give 0.0 to 2.5 for each of two jumps. For each jump, the judge's score is multiplied by that jump's DD (see 6204.2.1.2). Then the two products are added for that judge's total score.</u></p> <p><u>The two judges' total scores are averaged for a total air score.</u></p> <p><u>6203.2.2 Air Judges</u></p> <p><u>See 6203.2.2</u></p>
Discussion/Reason:	Current rule is the old system changed three years ago.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: unanimous

No discussion.

Proposal Number:	R & T – 3: Passed Unanimously in R&T (from Dick Stone)
Description:	Drop the incorrect FIS mogul repeat rule
Current Rule:	6204.2.2 and 6204.2.3
Proposed Change:	<p><u>6204.2.2 If two jumps are the same, only the greater scoring jump counts.</u></p> <p><u>Two jumps are different if any of the following are true:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>They have a different number of positions (p) or grabs (g)</u> 2) <u>They have a different number of half rotations or half twists (horizontal, offaxis, or inverted)</u> 3) <u>They have a different take-off or landing direction (-)</u> 4) <u>For inverted jumps, they have a different direction of rotation (b,f,s)</u> 5) <u>For non-rotational jumps, they have different upright components, or the components are in a different order</u> 6) <u>An inverted component in one differs by more than a full twist from the corresponding inverted component in the other</u> <p><u>The following are considered equivalent components:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>All grabs</u> b) <u>Spread eagle(S), kosak(K), udnick(Z)</u> c) <u>Back scratcher (B), mule kick(M), iron cross(I)</u> <p><u>Note: Positions (p) are upright components when included with a rotation.</u></p>
Discussion/Reason:	<p>The problems are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current rule is not what we use. 2. The current rule is not understandable. It can be, and has been, endlessly debated as to what it means. Different regions and meets use different rules. 3. The current rule uses terms that are not defined or defined in previous Comp Guides (“types of positions”, “group combination”, “identically performed”). 4. The current rule does not handle inverts. 5. The current rule does not include greater scoring run counts.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: unanimous. Make a note in the beginning of the USSA rulebook that these are USSA rules.

No discussion.

Proposal Number:	R & T – 4: Passed Unanimously in R&T
Description:	Competition Procedure
Current Rule:	3060.2.1 Dual Moguls Dual moguls is a series of one-run duals with the winner advancing to the next round. Ultimately, the last two remaining will ski against each other for first place.
Proposed Change:	Dual moguls is <u>either</u> a series of one-run duals <u>or</u> a <u>single qualification with a dual final</u> , the winner advances to the next round. Ultimately, the last two remaining will ski against each other for first place
Discussion/Reason:	This is the wording of the FIS rule that pertains to competition protocol, dual moguls.
Pass/Fail:	Failed: For – 1, against 14

Hayes: We have several different proposals to re-align format with the FIS. This is one option to a dual moguls format.

Hatch: There's a perception that this saves you runs, but it does not.

Rotermund: There are some operational things that would need to be addressed with the scoring system and what gets sent into USSA.

Henceroth: What are the ramifications across the divisions?

PJC: Make an athletic decision and we'll sort out the changes in Winfree with Dick Stone.

Flash: Against. We're talking about a development tool and it's important that the kids dual and they could go a whole season without dualing.

Proposal Number:	R & T – 6: Passed unanimously R&T
Description:	Appeals
Current Rule:	3050.4 Appeals Refer to the appeals section in this competition guide.
Proposed Change:	Refer to ?
Discussion/Reason:	I believe the appeals section in this competition guide was removed two versions ago; We must have some sort of appeals process and whatever that is needs to be stated here.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: unanimous.
Note:	Emily Fisher found the appeals rule and inserted it in the original agenda on page 17

No discussion.

Proposal Number:	R & T – 7: Passed Unanimously in R&T
Description:	The Competitor Safety Committee
Current Rule:	<p>3034.1.1 All competitions shall have a safety committee formed prior to the start of competition to enforce the safety rules and render all final decisions concerning safety. This committee shall consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One (1) representative from the management (chief of course); • Two (2) athlete representatives. For national level events, these representatives must be from two different divisions. • There will be a separate safety committee named for each event (men and women).
Proposed Change:	<p>3034.1.1 All competitions shall have a safety committee formed prior to the start of competition to enforce the safety rules and render all final decisions advise <u>the jury on matters</u> concerning safety. This committee shall consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One (1) representative from the management (chief of course); • Two (2) athletes' <u>or coaches'</u> representatives. For national level events, these representatives must be from two different divisions. <p>There will be a separate safety committee named for each event (men and women).</p>
Discussion/Reason:	<p>The theory of athlete safety committees is very appropriate. In practicality, when they are appointed at a team captain's meeting, they never have any safety comments to the TD or the chief of course. In fact, they don't even introduce themselves to the TD or chief of course. Recommendation: In 3034, we also discuss coaches as jump shapers – we should have coaches on the safety committee, as they would have more input and be more likely to contribute.</p>
Pass/Fail:	Passed: For – 15, opposed – 1

Wise: Justin, how do you feel about it?

Henceroth: I think it would be fine.

Wise: This would be different from the FIS rule.

Hayes: Really the only place it will show up is JO's. I feel that this should move up to the FIS.

Rotermund: Sometimes you have to go get the athletes. If they were asked, they would participate.

Chase: Can we change the wording to say to go to athletes first?

Hayes: They are always available.

Simson: The intent of the change was to allow for a coaches' representative, not mandate it. If the kids at JO's were younger they may not want to do it, so a coaches' rep is better than no committee.

Proposal Number:	R & T – 9: Passed unanimously in R&T
Description:	Preparation and training on the mogul site
Current Rule:	4202.1.4, 4202.1.5.2 and 4202.1.5.3 All pertaining to the 3-day length of time the mogul course is prepared and available for training.
Proposed Change:	4202.1.4, 4202.1.5.2 to the day length of time the mogul course is prepared and available for training from three days to <u>one day</u> . 4202.1.5.3 The jury may reduce this period if sufficient training is available on one or two days <u>the morning of the event</u> .
Discussion/Reason:	This rule pertains to USSA divisional events and no divisional event organizers are offering three days of official training.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: For – 12, against – 1.
Note:	PJC to get correct wording from Hayes.

Henceroth: I'm against. It looks like you're limiting training to one day and even that one day can be eliminated. It would be nice to have three days as an option.

Hatch: In favor, we don't eliminate one day. It's no longer mandatory. In the small divisions, we're lucky if there's training that day. Reducing to the day of – juries can make that decision now.

Lange: In favor, it's been a pretty soft rule, who decides what is sufficient. Writing the rules to say this is what we prefer vs. a hard/fast rule, this is what must be.

Wise: I can see an organizer saying that all I have to do is prepare it for the day before, they will not do the option, but will do the minimum.

Proposal Number:	R&T – 10 (from Development); Passed Unanimously in R&T
Description:	Judging criteria for slopestyle and halfpipe needs to be uniform throughout the entire country. All USSA regions should be evaluating athletes on the same scale, criteria, total number of points, using the FIS system for halfpipe, and producing results via Winfree that are uniform in display.
Current Rule:	Currently the rule is to follow the FIS format for halfpipe. Currently the system is broken for slopestyle.
Proposed Change:	All USSA regions should be evaluating athletes on the same scale, criteria, total number of points, using the FIS system for halfpipe, and producing results via Winfree that are uniform in display. All the judges should be seated in the same order and listed with labels in the same order on the results sheet at every competition. This follows the same basic framework that is used successfully for moguls. Inform Dick Stone that Winfree needs some tweaking. <u>All divisions will use the 100 point per judge system.</u>
Discussion/Reason:	It is difficult for athletes and coaches to understand the scoring, if the results aren't consistent and the judging is inconsistent. It is hard for an athlete to improve from week to week if they are unsure how to improve. It's hard to compare when regions have different points scales. It also may be affecting the FSP list if some regions are unknowingly using a more compressed scoring system. While other regions are using a looser system. Athletes, coach, parents, and judges all get frustrated and discouraged with the inconsistencies. These small inconsistencies are adding up to a big piece of the puzzle as to why USSA slopestyle and halfpipe events continue to have lower turnout compared to open events.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: unanimously.
Note:	Notify Dick Stone for Winfree changes

Housekeeping rule changes
All passed unanimously in R&T
All passed unanimously in FSC

Proposal Number:	R&T – 12 Housekeeping
Description:	Change 4604.1.
Current Rule:	4604.1 The judges will each evaluate the competitor’s performance based upon the criteria set forth in the USSA judging manual see rule 4156.
Proposed Change:	4604.1 The judges will each evaluate the competitor’s performance based upon the criteria set forth in the USSA judging manual see rule <u>6602</u> .
Discussion/Reason:	4604.1 References an unused rule.

Proposal Number:	R&T – 13 Housekeeping
Description:	Move Slopestyle tiebreakers from 4604.2 to 6603.3
Current Rule:	4604.2 If a tie occurs in an event it shall be broken with a judge by judge comparison of each skiers highest scoring run.
Proposed Change:	6603.3 If a tie occurs in an event, it shall be broken with a <u>judge-by-judge</u> comparison of each <u>skier’s</u> highest scoring run.
Discussion/Reason:	4604.3 Should be in slopestyle scoring procedures. People can’t find it where it is.

Proposal Number:	R&T – 15 Housekeeping
Description:	Correct the mogul repeat rule in the 4200 section
Current Rule:	<p>4206.3 Number of Jumps</p> <p>All mogul courses are two jump courses. Every competitor must perform two different jumps in order to receive maximum points. Only identically performed jumps will be considered repeat jumps with exceptions noted below in rotational maneuvers. “Two different jumps” are defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jumps with different number of positions, • Jumps of different groups for single maneuvers, • Jumps with the same number and types of positions but in a different order, • If two multiple maneuvers are performed they can have the same group combination, but the order must change. <p>Only identically performed jumps will be considered repeated jumps.</p> <p>Exceptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When grabs are performed in rotational maneuvers, all grabs are considered to be the same position. 2. When positions are performed in rotational maneuvers, the location 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 jumps. NOTE: since all grabs are classified as a single maneuver, a 360 with two grabs is a repeat of a 360 with two other grabs or if the grabs are reversed. <p>A competitor who performs only one jump can only receive a maximum of 50% of the total possible aerial score. Jumps in excess of the recommended amount will be disregarded in order of lowest to highest scoring. For example, if a competitor performs three jumps, the judges will disregard the lowest scoring jump. However, a competitor should be careful not to perform jumps in such excess that the judges’ scores for turns are negatively affected.</p> <p>To include new maneuvers to the approved list, a competitor must petition the rules and technical subcommittee. This list will be amended on a seasonal basis only.</p>

Proposed Change:	<p>4206.3 Number of Jumps</p> <p>All mogul courses are two jump courses. Every competitor must perform two different jumps in order to receive maximum points. “Two different jumps” are defined in <u>6204.2.2</u></p> <p>A competitor who performs only one jump can only receive a maximum of 50% of the total possible aerial score. Jumps in excess of the recommended amount will be disregarded in order of lowest to highest score. For example, if a competitor performs three jumps, the judges will disregard the lowest scoring jump. However, a competitor should be careful not to perform jumps in such excess that the judges’ scores for turns are negatively affected.</p> <p>To include new maneuvers to the approved list, a competitor must petition the rules and technical subcommittee. This list will be amended on a seasonal basis only.</p>
Discussion/Reason:	The current mogul repeat rule is in a place that is hard to find. It should be with the other mogul calculations. This would also make it consistent with where the repeat rule is in the FIS handbook.

Proposal Number:	R&T – 16 Housekeeping
Description:	Protest Fee
Current Rule:	3050.1, The reason for the protest along with a \$10.00 protest fee must be given to the jury.
Proposed Change:	3050.1, The reason for the protest along with a \$10.00 <u>\$20.00</u> protest fee must be given to the jury.
Discussion/Reason:	The \$10 fee stated in the rule is inconsistent with the \$20 fee stated on the actual protest form and it seems way more appropriate for a \$20 fee.

Proposal Number:	R&T – 17 Housekeeping
Description:	The Finish Official
Current Rule:	<p>3042.4 The Finish Official</p> <p>The finish official in the mogul event is responsible for checking that all jumps are landed in the course (a jump is landed in the course if the center of the skis (boots) are on the ground before the skier crosses the line). The finish official assists the judges with RNS rulings.</p>

Proposed Change:	<p>3042.5 The Finish Official</p> <p>The finish official in the mogul event is responsible for checking that all jumps are landed in the course (a jump is landed in the course if the center of the skis (boots) are on the ground before the skier crosses the line). <u>In halfpipe the finish line is the last point of take off, this means if you take off and perform a trick on or before the line, the trick and fall will be counted.</u> The finish official assists the judges with RNS rulings.</p>
Discussion/Reason:	<p>Halfpipe rule 6152.1.4 – very end of that long paragraph, “the finish line is the last point of take-off, this means that if you take off and perform a trick on or before the line, the trick and fall will be counted”. This happens to also be the new FIS interpretation; therefore, Rule #3042.4 needs to be modified.</p>

Proposal Number:	R&T – 18 Housekeeping
Description:	Layout of the Dual Mogul Site
Current Rule:	<p>4302.1.3 The dual mogul site should be a constant pitch with one continuous fall line. The slope should not be overly concave or convex, nor should it have distinct changes in pitch.</p> <p>The course must be as evenly covered in moguls as possible. Hard sharp bumps should be smoothed out, deep ruts, ice balls and snow machine tracks should be removed. Bumps that throw the competitor too far into the air should be modified. With respect to air bumps, they should not excessively exceed the height and average shape of the moguls contained in the existing mogul terrain. In addition there should be no removal of moguls or alterations of terrain in the landing area (see 3034.2.3)</p>
Proposed Change:	<p>4302.1.3 The dual mogul site should be a constant pitch with one continuous fall line. The slope should not be overly concave or convex, nor should it have distinct changes in pitch.</p> <p>The course must be as evenly covered in moguls as possible. Hard sharp bumps should be smoothed out, deep ruts, ice balls and snow machine tracks should be removed. Bumps that throw the competitor too far into the air should be modified. With respect to air bumps, they should not excessively exceed the height and average shape of the moguls contained in the existing mogul terrain <u>or be continuous across the course, such as “pro jumps”. Chopping or preparing of the landing area should take place due to safety concerns.</u> In addition there should be no removal of moguls or alterations of terrain in the landing area (see 3034.2.3)</p>
Discussion/Reason:	<p>We adopted this wording for moguls in the spring of 2006 and need to add the wording into dual moguls as well.</p>

Proposal Number:	R&T – 19 Housekeeping
Description:	Competitors' Equipment
Current Rule:	3036.4 Equipment Rules concerning competitors' equipment which are specific to the individual events can be found in section 4008.2 for aerials, 4602.1.5.7 for big air events, and section 4206.1 for moguls in this rule book.
Proposed Change:	3036.4 Equipment Rules concerning competitors' equipment which are specific to the individual events can be found in section 4008.2 for aerials, 4602.1.5.7 <u>4608.2 for big air slopestyle events</u> , <u>4306.1 for dual moguls</u> and section 4206.1 for moguls in this rule book.
Discussion/Reason:	This is a correction in reference to rules about equipment that have changed.

Proposal Number:	R&T – 21 Housekeeping
Description:	Layout of the mogul site
Current Rule:	4202.1.3 References the layout of the mogul course and the monitoring of the air bumps
Proposed Change:	4202.1.3 Add after "Chopping or preparing of the landing area should take place due to safety concerns." <u>(see 3034.2.3)</u>
Discussion/Reason:	This references the rule that states; "Two trainers will be appointed at the first team captains' meeting to monitor and advise on the development of air bumps on the mogul course."

Proposal Number:	R&T – 22 Housekeeping
Description:	Dual Mogul RNS
Current Rule:	3058.2 RNS for skiing out-of-course boundaries in any of the events, which includes skiing around control gates, not passing through the finish gate in moguls, or crossing the middle line in a dual moguls course with both feet. If, however, a competitor's run is finished before the finish gate (i.e., loss of ski) the competitor will not be disqualified for not skiing through the finish gate.
Proposed Change:	3058.2 RNS for skiing out-of-course boundaries in any of the events, which includes skiing around control gates, not passing through the finish gate in moguls, or crossing the middle line in a dual moguls course with both feet. If, however, a competitor's run is finished before the finish gate (i.e., loss of ski) the competitor will not be disqualified <u>or receive an RNS</u> for not skiing through the finish gate.
Discussion/Reason:	The current rule implies that the competitor will receive an RNS.

Proposal Number:	R&T – 23 Housekeeping
Description:	Adopt the ruling from moguls 6205 and 6205.1, loss of ski(s) stops, into the halfpipe and slopestyle rules.
Current Rule:	None
Discussion/Reason:	This rule is in place for both moguls and dual moguls and should also be in place for halfpipe and slopestyle.

Housekeeping Rules Withdrawn in R&T Follow

Proposal Number:	R&T – 14 Housekeeping: withdrawn, needs rewording as per R&T – 10
Description:	Cleanup of slopestyle decimal places of 6602
Current Rule:	For example, rule 6602.4 has “2 with 20 points each” and rule 6602.5 has “2x20.0”
Proposed Change:	Add “.0” to all necessary scores.
Discussion/Reason:	There was considerable confusion in 2006 as to places judges should use. 6604 is very clear about decimal points, but 6602 is inconsistent. Note that it should stay as one decimal place (e.g., judge’s score of 4.3), since meets where judges rounded (e.g., judge’s score of 4) had many ties. One meet had 70% of the skiers tied.

Proposal Number:	R&T – 20 Housekeeping: Withdrawn
Description:	The start line.
Current Rule:	3043.1.2 The mogul start will preferably be an open start with a light beam installed approximately 1.5-2.0 meters down, across the hill, parallel to the start line. The starting line and the light beam will be as wide as the control gates on the top of the course. The competitor should plant his/her poles in front of the line and his/her boots should stay behind the line until the start signal is given. The mogul start can also consist of one or more traditional starting gates with the electric timing device attached. The starting gate will be located where the competitor has easy access to his/her skiing line and can quickly reach full speed after leaving the start.

Proposed Change:	<p>3043.1.2</p> <p>The mogul start will preferably be an open start with a light beam installed approximately 1.5-2.0 meters down, across the hill, parallel to the start line. The starting line and the light beam will be as wide as the control gates on the top of the course. The competitor should plant his/her poles in front of the line and his/her boots should stay behind the line until the start signal is given.</p> <p>The mogul start can also consist of one or more traditional starting gates with the electric timing device attached. The starting gate will be located where the competitor has easy access to his/her skiing line and can quickly reach full speed after leaving the start.</p>
Discussion/Reason:	We have not had start lines at competitions nor have we required the skier to have his/her poles in front of the line for ten years. We have also not used traditional starting gates in 20 years.

Withdrawn R&T Proposals Follow

Proposal Number:	R & T – 8: Withdrawn
Description:	Judges Stand
Current Rule:	<p>3041.5 Judges Stand</p> <p>The minimum size of the scaffolding area must be 8 meters by 2 meters. The judges viewing area should be constructed to provide ample room for the appropriate number of officials and to provide room for viewing, storage of equipment and all proper amenities for the operation of the competition.</p>
Proposed Change:	<p>3041.5 Judges Stand</p> <p>The minimum size of the scaffolding area must be 8 <u>5</u> meters by 2 <u>1.5</u> meters. The judges viewing area should be constructed to provide ample room for the appropriate number of officials and to provide room for viewing, storage of equipment and all proper amenities for the operation of the competition.</p>
Discussion/Reason:	We need to be consistent from USSA rules to FIS rules

Proposal Number:	R & T – 11: Withdrawn, this rule was passed in the spring of 2006 and will automatically be adopted.
Description:	General rules for halfpipe
Current Rule:	<p>4152 Halfpipe</p> <p>USSA has adopted the FIS halfpipe judging rules. Check www.ussa.org under Freestyle for current rules.</p>
Proposed Change:	Adopt the FIS rules 4600 through 4613.2 and renumber to 4100 through 4113.2.
Discussion/Reason:	The 4155 section was approved in the spring of 2006, but has not gotten into the comp guide.

Proposals Failed in R&T

Proposal Number:	R & T – 1: Failed unanimously in R&T
Description:	Correct slopestyle deductions for 20 or 40 points
Current Rule:	6604.5 Deductions for falls will be as follows: 3.0 Any complete falls, and complete stops 2.5 – 2.9 Major falls, body contact with snow 1.1 – 2.4 Minor falls, hard touchdown with two hands or more 0.5 – 1.0 Using hand for stability, hand drags 0.1 – 0.4 Unstable body, flat landings, missed airs, speed checks, flailing and sketches.
Proposed Change:	6604.5 Deductions for falls will be as follows: 5 Judge: 6.0 Any complete falls, and complete stops 5.0 – 5.9 Major falls, body contact with snow 2.0 – 4.9 Minor falls, hard touchdown with two hands or more 1.0 – 1.9 Using hand for stability, hand drags 0.1 – 0.9 Unstable body, flat landings, missed airs, speed checks, flailing and sketches. 3 Judge: 12.0 Any complete falls, and complete stops 10.0 – 11.9 Major falls, body contact with snow 4.0 – 9.9 Minor falls, hard touchdown with two hands or more 2.0 – 3.9 Using hand for stability, hand drags 0.1 – 0.4 Unstable body, flat landings, missed airs, speed checks, flailing and sketches.
Discussion/Reason:	There are three different problems with the current rule: 1. The original deductions were designed for 10 points. It should be doubled if each judge is giving 20 points. 2. For three judges, one Show judge giving 40 points and replaces the two judges giving 20 points each. Thus, the deductions for the one judge should double. Otherwise, would get lower deductions with three judges. 3. This also corrects the inconsistency with 6604.4, which says, “can deduct up to 50 % of the points of the run/judge for falls” – which would be impossible under the current rule.

Proposal Number:	R & T – 5: Failed Unanimously in R&T
Description:	Competition Procedure
Current Rule:	4305 Dual Mogul Competition Procedure Either that morning or the previous day. Seeding will be done according to either the most recent USSA points list for dual moguls or the most recent mogul event. All skiers will then be predetermined in the following manner:
Proposed Change:	<p><u>Adopt FIS rules 4305.1 The dual mogul competition can be carried out using two formats. In one format, duals are done from the beginning of the competition and in the other format; duals are done in the finals. In the second format, the qualification for the finals is done with a modified form of Mogul event.</u></p> <p><u>4305.3 Dual final with single qualification</u> A single mogul run will be used to qualify and seed skiers for dual format finals. Final formats can consist of the following number of skiers; 8, 16, 24 or 32 skiers. Only top 4 places will be determined by 'dualing off'.</p> <p><u>4305.3.1 Qualification/Mogul</u> The mogul course will be divided into dual lanes (red/blue) for the Qualification run and the final rounds.</p> <p><u>4305.3.2 The order that the skiers start in shall be according to the start list. Skiers with odd start order (start 1, 3, 5 etc) start on the red course, and the skiers with even start order (2, 4, 6 etc) will start on the blue course.</u></p> <p><u>4305.3.3 Final/Dual Moguls</u> The organizer can propose to the USSA the number of the skiers to have in the Final. The program ought to be around 45 to 75 minutes of skiing.</p> <p><u>4305.3.3.1 The results from the qualifications are used to select skiers for the Finals.</u></p> <p><u>4305.3.3.2 The rankings of 1, 2, 3, 4, shall be determined by duals.</u></p> <p><u>4305.3.3.3 The remaining rankings shall be based upon the results from the qualification according to which round the skiers advance from. Skiers losing rounds in the round of 16, (place 9 to 16) shall be placed from the results from the qualification scores.</u> <u>Skiers losing rounds in the round of 8, (place 5 to 8) shall be placed from the results from the Qualification scores.</u></p> <p><u>4305.3.3.4 Based upon the results of the qualification, the higher ranked skier (better place) can decide to ski in either the blue or the red course. The higher ranked skier must inform the starter/start official of their decision in the start area in a reasonable time before the start round.</u></p>
Discussion/Reason:	The wording in 4305 is outdated and with the new procedures for dual moguls, we need to be following FIS formats.

MEMBERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT TO THE FSC

Chair: Deb Newson

Rocky: Dan Miller – proxy Theresa Campbell

PNSA: Pat Deneen (not present)

Far West: Kate Duhamel

Northern: Mike Papke – proxy Andy Hayes (not present)

Intermountain: Caron Keim – proxy Chris Haslock

Central: Lewis Sundquist – proxy Thom Schaefer (not present)

Meeting called to order with a quorum established.

Proposal Number:	Membership #1A (Amended from original Membership #1)																		
Description:	Create a deadline and registration process for Junior Olympics that would allow the invitation list to be updated efficiently and accurately in order for athletes, coaches and parents to plan for travel for the event and for athletes to be prepared for each event.																		
Current Rule:	#1 Page 51. The quotas for moguls, dual moguls, halfpipe, slopestyle and aerials will be filled by the most recent USSA Freestyle Points list 3.																		
Proposed Change:	<p>The Junior Olympic invitations for all events are chosen from the most recent USSA Freestyle points list #3. <i>The registration procedure for Junior Olympics will be updated every year at the membership subcommittee meeting at the USSA spring congress with the specific dates and with what party will handle registrations.</i></p> <p>For the 2007-2008 competition period the registration and invitation procedure for Junior Olympics will be as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Juniors invitation list will be published on Feb. 22nd, 2008 on www.ussa.org. Updates will also be posted on www.ussa.org. 2. From the initial posting and as invitation lists are updated, invitations <u>MUST</u> be accepted within 48 hours of posting. Invitations <u>that are not accepted</u> will become null and void. <i>For example, invitations posted on Feb. 22nd must be accepted by Feb. 24th at midnight.</i> 3. Once an invitation is accepted (date and time is recorded on invitation web site), the athlete must confirm their registration by registering online or faxing their registration to the registration contact NOT THE EVENT ORGANIZER within 48 hours. Athletes that are unable to register within 48 hours must notify the registration contact. Contact information available online. 4. The invitation updating process will continue online until March 1st at which point the website will freeze with all registration directed to the event organizer when official registration opens. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Event</th> <th>Men</th> <th>Women</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Aerials*</td> <td>50</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Big Air</td> <td>50</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dual Moguls</td> <td>48</td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Halfpipe</td> <td>50</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moguls</td> <td>60</td> <td>60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Aerials Any inverted aerialist who is on the aerials points list and has qualified an inverted jump but does not qualify for this event then that skier is granted a spot to the Junior Olympic aerial event above the current quota.</p>	Event	Men	Women	Aerials*	50	50	Big Air	50	50	Dual Moguls	48	48	Halfpipe	50	50	Moguls	60	60
Event	Men	Women																	
Aerials*	50	50																	
Big Air	50	50																	
Dual Moguls	48	48																	
Halfpipe	50	50																	
Moguls	60	60																	

Discussion/Reason:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The registration contact will provide www.ussa.org with a link to the registration page that will be hosted on the registration contact's site. 2. The time frame of 48 hours has proven to be more than sufficient over the years where this registration process has been tested for over 5 years for similar, if not shorter, invitation time periods. Though everyone has access to the registration page, USSA staff, divisional chairs, coaches, athletes and parents are only eligible to accept invitations. In order to be able to cross check acceptances or declines the parties entering the information will be required to provide an e-mail address at the same time. This new process seems like a hard line to take, and it is easy to think that an athlete may lose their invitation if they miss the deadline. This is where the ability for EVERYONE to see the list online as it is updated is advantageous. This ability protects an athlete's invitation from becoming null and void inadvertently. 3. Confirming the invitation acceptance by providing payment is KEY to this process succeeding. <p>Note: At JO's there is one base registration fee. Athletes should accept all invitations (both valid and alternate) with their initial acceptance. They will be able to see when their alternate status is updated from alternate to qualified.</p>
Pass/Fail:	Passed: For – 15, opposed – 0, abstentions – 1

We looked at Motion #2 in sections. Please see the dissected version following this original version.

Proposal Number:	Membership #2 (proposal from Fisher)																		
Description:	Creating a hard line for alternates to Junior Olympics																		
Current Rule:	<p>Quotas and Invitees</p> <p>1. The quota spots for mogul, dual moguls, big air, halfpipe and aerials will be filled by the most recent USSA Freestyle points list, list 3, valid Feb. 24, 2006. For 2006 seniors and juniors will be included in the quotas for aerials and big air. Please check the USSA web site for schedule and event updates.</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="613 1562 1042 1745"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Event</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Men</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Women</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Aerials*</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Big Air</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dual Moguls</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Halfpipe</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moguls</td> <td style="text-align: center;">60</td> <td style="text-align: center;">60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Aerials Any inverted aerialist who is on the aerials points list and has qualified an inverted jump but does not qualify for this event then that skier is granted a spot to the Junior Olympic aerial event above the current quota.</p>	Event	Men	Women	Aerials*	50	50	Big Air	50	50	Dual Moguls	48	48	Halfpipe	50	50	Moguls	60	60
Event	Men	Women																	
Aerials*	50	50																	
Big Air	50	50																	
Dual Moguls	48	48																	
Halfpipe	50	50																	
Moguls	60	60																	

	<p>2. If by virtue of criteria #1 a division does not have three athletes per sex, qualified in a discipline, then the division is guaranteed 3 men and 3 women in each of the events (moguls, dual moguls, aerials, big air and halfpipe). Any spot that remains unused will be lost.</p> <p>3. Each division will conduct combined at its divisional championships. The combined junior champion will be added to Junior Olympics above the current quota. Combined is defined as moguls, aerials and halfpipe. The athlete will compete in each of the three disciplines at Junior Olympics and be added above the current quota.</p>																		
<p>Proposed Change:</p>	<p>Quotas and Invitees</p> <p>1. The quota spots for mogul, dual moguls, big air, halfpipe and aerials will be filled by the most recent USSA Freestyle points list, list 3, valid Feb. 2007. 2 days after List #3 is valid (insert date) an invitation list will be posted on www.ussa.org. Athletes will have 3 days (insert date) to accept or decline their invitation to Junior Olympics. Athletes that do not respond by three days (insert date) will forfeit their invitation to Junior Olympics and alternates will be invited.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="581 814 1042 997"> <thead> <tr> <th>Event</th> <th>Men</th> <th>Women</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Aerials*</td> <td>50</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slopestyle</td> <td>50</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dual Moguls</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Halfpipe</td> <td>50</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moguls</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Aerials Any inverted aerialist who is on the aerials points list and has qualified an inverted jump but does not qualify for this event then that skier is granted a spot to the Junior Olympic aerial event above the current quota.</p> <p>2. Ten athletes per gender in aerials, slopestyle, dual moguls, halfpipe and moguls will be named as alternate to compete in the Junior Olympics. The alternates will be named off the Feb. ?, 2007 FSP list and represent the next 10 names on the FSP list per gender and per discipline. No more than 10 alternates will be entered into the event even if more than 10 decline their spots. Alternates must be placed into the event prior to the time of the draw for the event in which they are named as alternates. All alternates must be registered and paid prior to entry into the event.</p> <p>3. If by virtue of criteria #1 a division does not have three athletes per gender, qualified in a discipline, then the division is guaranteed a maximum of 3 men and 3 women in each of the events (moguls, dual moguls, aerials, big air and halfpipe). Any spot that remains unused will be lost.</p> <p>4. If an athlete qualifies to compete in 3 disciplines at Junior Olympics then they will be considered a combined skier. A combined skier may start in all 5 disciplines and will be added above the quotas in all 5 disciplines. A combined skier is welcome to start in all 5 disciplines but can choose which events to ski. If a combined skier chooses not to ski in a discipline, an alternate is not placed into the event since combined athletes are added above the current quota.</p>	Event	Men	Women	Aerials*	50	50	Slopestyle	50	50	Dual Moguls	75	75	Halfpipe	50	50	Moguls	75	75
Event	Men	Women																	
Aerials*	50	50																	
Slopestyle	50	50																	
Dual Moguls	75	75																	
Halfpipe	50	50																	
Moguls	75	75																	

<p>Discussion/Reason:</p>	<p>As discussed at the FSC meeting last spring, the notification of athletes for Junior Olympics in time for proper travel arrangements, training and registration is nearly impossible. Even with on-line registration and a better notification process the selection criteria is still set up to fail. With the current selection criteria there will still be athletes who get into an event the night before the competition due to athletes who no-show or the time it takes to get responses. Ultimately the open spots, which have been as many as 12 to 15, are being filled with local athletes, younger siblings attending the event or the athletes with the financial ability to get to the event with no notice.</p> <p>Athletically an athlete getting into an event without proper rest due to travel or training is not responsible. The caliber of athlete being entered is not the quality that is expected at Junior Olympics. The philosophy would be to notify athletes and have alternates slotted in as early as possible but ultimately there should be a line which we do not go below. The criterion is still big enough so the organizer could break even.</p> <p>Criteria 1 reasoning- This is very similar to the current criteria only we have expanded the quotas and added alternates.</p> <p>Criteria 2 reasoning- This is the same as US Championships and allows athletes who are far below the line not to have to worry about getting in the last minute. Everyone could plan travel and housing weeks in advance.</p> <p>Criteria 3 reasoning- In the current criteria, allows for smaller divisions to have at least 3 athletes per event, per gender.</p> <p>Criteria 4 reasoning- As discussed at the FSC meeting, athletes who qualify in 3 disciplines would then be considered combined skiers and could ski in all 5 disciplines.</p> <p>This would also encourage junior athletes to compete in at least 3 disciplines if not all five. In the past criteria #3 has added the combined champion from each divisional championships.</p> <p>However this is only adding seven (7) women and seven (7) men and many divisions can not run moguls, aerials and halfpipe at divisional champs so it becomes the division chair's discretion. This criteria would select skiers that are competing at a high level in three disciplines and does not limit it to 1 skier per division.</p>
---------------------------	--

Quotas and Invitees

1. The quota spots for mogul, dual moguls, big air, halfpipe and aerials will be filled by the most recent USSA Freestyle points list, list 3, valid Feb. 2007. Two days after list #3 is valid (insert date) an invitation list will be posted on www.ussa.org. Athletes will have 3 days (insert date) to accept or decline their invitation to Junior Olympics. Athletes who do not respond by three days (insert date) will forfeit their invitation to Junior Olympics and alternates will be invited.

Event	Men	Women
Aerials*	50	50
Slopestyle	50	50
Dual Moguls	75	75
Halfpipe	50	50
Moguls	75	75

*Aerials Any inverted aerialist who is on the aerials points list and has qualified an inverted jump but does not qualify for this event then that skier is granted a spot to the Junior Olympic aerial event above the current quota.

1. The committee felt that, after passing membership motion #1, it would not be necessary for this section. Or do we want to look at the increased quotas for moguls and duals?

(NOTE from PJC: The increase in quotas was based on making a hard line, otherwise there's no need to look at increasing the field sizes in moguls and dual moguls.)

2. Ten athletes per gender in aerials, slopestyle, dual moguls, halfpipe and moguls will be named as alternate to compete in the Junior Olympic. The alternates will be named off the Feb. 2007 FSP list and represent the next 10 names on the FSP list per gender and per discipline. No more than 10 alternates will be entered into the event even if more than 10 decline their spots. Alternates must be placed into the event prior to the time of the draw for the event in which they are named as alternates. All alternates must be registered and paid prior to entry into the event.

2. The committee does not want a hard line for juniors in respect to alternates. Additionally, they feel that with the new registration procedure, the issue that this section addresses will not exist any longer.

See number 3 and 4 points listed below in new separate motions.

Proposal Number:	Membership #2A
Description:	Housekeeping?
Current Rule:	2. (p. 52) If by virtue of criteria #1 a division does not have three athletes per gender, qualified in a discipline, then the division is guaranteed 3 men and 3 women in each of the events (moguls, dual moguls, aerials, big air and halfpipe). Any spot that remains unused will be lost. Motion carries.
Proposed Change:	3. If by virtue of criteria #1 a division does not have three athletes per gender, qualified in a discipline, then the division is guaranteed a maximum of 3 men and 3 women in each of the events (moguls, dual moguls, aerials, slopestyle and halfpipe). Any spot that remains unused will be lost. Motion carries.
Discussion/Reason:	Criteria 3 reasoning- allows for smaller divisions to have at least 3 athletes per event, per gender.
Pass/Fail	Passed: unanimous.

Proposal Number:	Membership #2B
Description:	In order to increase combined participation, this offers additional opportunities for combined skiers.
Current Rule:	No current rule.
Proposed Change:	<p>4. If an athlete qualifies to compete in three disciplines at Junior Olympics then he/she will be considered a combined skier. A combined skier may start in all five disciplines and will be added above the quotas in all five disciplines. A combined skier is welcome to start in all five disciplines but can choose which events to ski. If a combined skier chooses not to ski in a discipline, an alternate is not placed into the event since combined athletes are added above the current quota.</p> <p>Motion carries.</p>

Discussion/Reason:	<p>Criteria 4 reasoning – As discussed at the FSC meeting, athletes who qualify in three disciplines would then be considered combined skiers and could ski in all five disciplines.</p> <p>This would also encourage Junior athletes to compete in at least three disciplines if not all five. In the past criteria #3 has added the combined champion from each divisional championships.</p> <p>However this is only adding seven women and seven men and many divisions can not run moguls, aerials and halfpipe at divisional champs so it becomes the division chair's discretion. This criteria would select skiers who are competing at a high level in three disciplines and does not limit to one skier per division</p>
Pass/Fail:	Passed: unanimous

Proposal Number:	Membership #3
Description:	Change wording in development group selection criteria in order to eliminate foreign skiers from being named to the US development group.
Current Rule:	Page 55 under 2006-2007 Development Program. After the US Freestyle Ski Team has been named in May 2006, the top five men and top five women from the prior year's final FSP in moguls and dual moguls, and the top two men and top women in aerials will be named to the USSA development group.
Proposed Change:	After the US Freestyle Ski Team has been nominated in May 2008, the top five <u>US</u> men and top five <u>US</u> women from the prior year's final FSP in moguls and dual moguls, and the top two <u>US</u> men and top two <u>US</u> women in aerials will be named to the USSA development group.
Discussion/Reason:	This was an oversight when the rule was created. Additionally, the committee wanted to ensure that the additional privilege that has been policy not a rule whereby the top 15 aerialists in each gender receive OTC privileges should also be US athletes, as well.
Pass/Fail:	Passed, unanimous

Discussion Topics/Round table discussion

- 1- Division chairs – sharing organizational ideas and documents – Deb will start e-mail campaign to share files.
- 2- Align the division competition rules so they are the same or similar – though cautioned to be sure divisions maintain rules that apply to them only, this is something the staff showed interest in. Deb will set up a conference call prior to the final comp guide edits to discuss with division chairs.
- 3- Discussion on a group effort to market USSA regional programs via some new types of media – it was agreed that this was something that everyone wanted to participate in – including staff.

Action items

1. Design a poster for mass production with a marketing concept to educate and inform the masses about what we do and give them a place to go for information that directs them to the appropriate division. We will look for USSA's help with graphic design and poster production.
2. Create a website to post on the posters that would link to a general info page on each division's web site. (Each division will need to create this general info page.)
3. PJC to check with ussa.org to determine how the merchandise process works where linking our divisional sites to USSA generates commission that could help finance this project.
4. The Prestons will contact the Sawyer Foundation to determine if there is anything that they can do to help.
5. Konrad has offered to educate an individual from each division on how to market their sport and events to the masses on the Internet productively and ethically.

New Business

- **Recommendation to move points list #3's closing date to Feb 19th.** In the 2006-2007 we pushed this date ahead in order to accommodate divisions that had a bad start due to weather. In effect, it worked well, and we would like to continue the later date for list #3 indefinitely. It is great to extend the divisional competition season, as long as the juniors' start date is ten days from the list #3's publish date.
- Recommendation to run ski cross at divisional events: Konrad will be forwarding some education materials in the next couple of weeks.
- Further discussion will ensue via e-mail with the division chairs with respect to how the USSA core values, mission and vision apply at the divisional level.
- In order to facilitate the youth multi-sport membership, divisions are asked to coordinate with the other USSA disciplines in their division in order to coordinate one divisional fee for these youth multi-sport memberships where the fee would ultimately be shared by all parties, in effect, making this membership less expensive and easier to apply for.

Motions Withdrawn

Proposal Number:	Membership #1 (moved from Development). Withdrawn for amendment below.
Description:	Create a deadline for Junior Olympics that would allow us to move to the next in line in time for them to realistically make it to the event and be prepared to compete.
Current Rule:	#1 Page 51. The quotas for moguls, dual moguls, halfpipe, slopestyle and aerials will be filled by the most recent USSA Freestyle Points list 3.
Proposed Change:	The quotas for moguls, dual moguls, halfpipe, slopestyle and aerials will be filled by the most recent USSA Freestyle points list 3. Any athlete who has not accepted his/her spot by communicating a "yes" with the USSA office and confirming with a payment by the deadline 10 days after the list is valid will have relinquished their start to the next skier in line who will have to have already responded with a yes to the USSA office and then confirm with a payment within two days.
Discussion/Reason:	Although things have gotten better I am still addressed with this issue every year and someone is skipped over because they do not have time to arrive prepared to compete in the event just because someone else was too lazy to deal with this in an appropriate time frame.

Proposal Number:	Membership #3 (from Development) Withdrawn
Description:	Education /Advertising Campaign for halfpipe, slopestyle and ski cross
Current Rule:	There is no rule or budget.
Proposed Change:	A small budget dedicated to informing people how to be involved with USSA when USSA/FIS events are scheduled, how to plan ahead to qualify properly, what is required of them as an athlete, the benefits of being involved, if there is prize money at an event, how much, etc. All done in advance, i.e. during the summer.
Discussion/Reason:	I know the information is on ussa.org but, who knows what that is? Just people already in the fold. That's not good enough to get the independent athletes "in the fold". Go to the athletes instead of letting them come to us. There are too many distractions along the way... too many other event organizers are advertising their events. It seems as though even a simple ad or post on Newschoolers.com and Freeskier.com would do the trick. It's a form of recruiting just as we do for aerials. Think outside the box. While this year halfpipe nationals were a much better event than Vermont Open halfpipe, it was not possible for an athlete to simply sign up for nationals. So, instead all those athletes signed up for the Vermont Open or the European Open, or stayed home.

COACHES SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT TO THE FSC

Chair: Glenn Eddy

Far West: Clay Beck

PNSA: Pat Deneen

Judges: Bill McNice

Northern: absent

US Freestyle Ski Team: Todd Schirman/Jeff Wintersteen

Rocky: Matti Wade

R&T: Andy Hayes

Intermountain: John Zuck

Central: Thom Schaefer

Proposal Number:	Coaches #1 (passed in coaches: For – 5, opposed – 0, abstentions – 2)
Current Rule:	3070.3.3
Proposed Change:	Add to 3070.3.3: Athletes must qualify a back layout without position before qualifying other back flips with position (such as back iron cross).
Discussion/Reason:	
Pass/Fail	Passed: For – 13, opposed – 1, abstentions – 2

Proposal Number:	Coaches #2
Current Rule:	None
Proposed Change:	Establish a working group to propose other amendments to qualifying jumps such as a secondary on-snow panel. Panel: Glenn Eddy, Todd Schirman, Matti Wade, Chris Haslock and Nick Preston
Discussion/Reason:	On-going evaluation of the system.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: unanimous. Note: Qualifying procedures are not online (3070.3.3), we need to re-post.

Beck on qualifications submitted to USSA: The divisions need to do a better job following up on the qualifications and paperwork. Since Brian Lake's position has not yet been filled, who is tracking it?

Wintersteen on Coaches Ed: The growth we've had in USSA FS, we have the same admin for more work than ever. It's a priority and we need to continue moving it all forward. It's a lot of work so it can be frustrating, it doesn't happen in a day. We still need to update and revamp aerials. We all share the frustrations.

Coaches clinics status – who's heading that up and what is happening for clinics this year?

Flash will work with Glenn on getting it coordinated.

10. Old Business (none)

Wise

11. New business

Wise

Proposal Number:	New Business #1
Description:	US Selection Events criteria
Current Rule:	<p>U.S. Selection Events</p> <p>Selection events, typically held in December each year, may or may not be FIS NorAm events. They are used to qualify skiers to the C Team of the U.S. Freestyle Ski Team, starts in the U.S. World Cups, starts in NorAm competitions, and select the USSA development group.</p> <p>Selection/Quotas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All USFST A, B and C Team. 2. All athletes who competed in the prior season's U.S. Freestyle Championships. 3. All athletes who are ranked in the top 45 in moguls, top 45 in dual moguls and top 30 in aerials, on the final points list of the previous season that are not qualified via criteria 1 and 2. 4. All athletes who finished in the top 10 in moguls, top eight in dual moguls

	<p>and top 10 in aerials in the prior season Junior Olympics who are not qualified via criteria 1, 2 and 3. No alternates will be taken from Junior Olympics.</p> <p>5. If by virtue of criteria 1, 2, 3 and 4, a division does not have an athlete competing in a discipline in each gender, then that division will be granted a spot in that discipline and that gender to use as it wishes. If the spot remains unused it will then be lost.</p> <p>6. There will be five alternates per gender per discipline. These alternates are to be named off the final FSP list of the previous season and will represent the next five names on the FSP list per gender and per discipline who have not already qualified for the event. Alternates will be placed into the events in the order they are named and will be notified immediately. The alternates will only compete if any of the skiers qualified via criteria 2 and 3 don't accept their spots or get injured.</p> <p>7. International quotas as outlined by USSA and FIS. (If event is sanctioned as a FIS event.)</p> <p>8. Additional athletes may qualify to compete at the US Selection Events in aerials by having a minimum qualification level in traditional aerials to include at least; for women a front flip and a back flip or a front flip plus a front flip with a twist or a back flip plus a back flip with a twist; for the men a single flip and a double flip. Supporting paperwork must be filed in the USSA Freestyle office no later than October 15th in the year of consideration.</p>
<p>Proposed Change:</p>	<p>U.S. Selection Events</p> <p>Selection events, typically held in December each year, may or may not be FIS NorAm events. They are used to qualify skiers to the C Team of the U.S. Freestyle Ski Team, starts in the U.S. World Cups, starts in NorAm competitions, and select the USSA development group. <u>For the 2007 U.S. Selection Events, athletes invited in moguls or dual moguls will be granted starts in both moguls and dual moguls.</u></p> <p>Selection/Quotas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All USFST A, B and C Team. 2. All athletes who competed in the prior season's U.S. Freestyle Championships. 3. All athletes who are ranked in the top 45 in moguls, top 45 in dual moguls and top 30 in aerials, on the final points list of the previous season who are not qualified via criteria 1 and 2. 4. All athletes who finished in the top 10 in moguls, top eight in dual moguls and top 10 in aerials in the prior season Junior Olympics who are not qualified via criteria 1, 2 and 3. No alternates will be taken from Junior Olympics. 5. If by virtue of criteria 1, 2, 3 and 4 a division does not have an athlete competing in a discipline in each gender, then that division will be granted a spot in that discipline and that gender to use as it wishes. If the spot remains unused it will then be lost. 6. There will be five alternates per gender per discipline. These alternates are to be named off the final FSP list of the previous season and will represent the next five names on the FSP list per gender and per discipline who have not already qualified for the event. Alternates will be placed into the events in the order they are named and will be notified immediately. The alternates will only compete if any of the skiers qualified via criteria 2 and 3

	<p>don't accept their spots or get injured.</p> <p>7. International quotas as outlined by USSA and FIS. (If event is sanctioned as a FIS event.)</p> <p>8. Additional athletes may qualify to compete at the US Selection Events in aerials by having a minimum qualification level in traditional aerials to include at least; for women a front flip and a back flip or a front flip plus a front flip with a twist or a back flip plus a back flip with a twist; for the men a single flip and a double flip. Supporting paperwork must be filed in the USSA Freestyle office no later than October 15th in the year of consideration.</p>
Discussion/Reason:	For the 2007-2008 season, the NorAm tour will have one grand prix for moguls, comprised of both moguls and dual moguls. There will not be a separate entry list for moguls and dual moguls.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: unanimous

Proposal Number:	New Business #2
Description:	NorAm Athlete Selection
Current Rule:	<p>Selection</p> <p>USFST athletes will have first priority and the USSA Development Program will fill the balance. The USSA Development Program participants will be determined by adding the place points from both 2006 U.S. Selection Events. The total number of Development Program participants will be determined once the number of USFST C Team spots has been determined.</p> <p>2006-2007 Development Program</p> <p>After the U.S. Freestyle Ski Team is named in May 2006, the top five men and top five women from the prior year's final FSP in moguls and dual moguls, and the top two men and top two women in aerials will be named to the USSA Development group. This will guarantee them starts on the NorAm tour. All development group athletes must participate in the U.S. Selection Events. If a development group athlete is injured and unable to compete in U.S. Selection Events, the athlete must provide medical documentation stating he/she is unable to compete. Once medically cleared to compete, he/she would retain his/her NorAm Start.</p>
Proposed Change:	<p>Selection</p> <p>USFST athletes will have first priority and the USSA development program will fill the balance. <u>For moguls, the USSA development program participants will be determined by adding the place points from all three mogul events (two mogul events and the dual mogul event) from the 2007 U.S. Selection Events. For aerials, the USSA development program participants will be determined by adding the place points from both aerials events from the 2007 U.S. Selection Events.</u> The total number of development program participants will be determined once the number of USFST C Team spots has been determined.</p>

	<p>2006-2007 2007-2008 Development Program</p> <p>After the U.S. Freestyle Ski Team is named in May 2007 2006, the top five men and top five women from the prior year's final FSP in moguls and dual moguls, and the top two men and top two women in aerials will be named to the USSA development group. This will guarantee them starts on the NorAm tour. <u>Any athlete who is named to the devo group in moguls or duals will be guaranteed starts in both mogul and dual mogul NorAm events.</u> All development group athletes must participate in the U.S. Selection Events. If a development group athlete is injured and unable to compete in U.S. Selection Events, the athlete must provide medical documentation stating he/she is unable to compete. Once medically cleared to compete, he/she would retain his/her NorAm Start.</p>
Discussion/Reason:	Currently we name a devo group in both moguls and duals, however, next year there will be one NorAm Standings list for moguls and duals. During the first transition year, athletes from both mogul and dual moguls devo group would get starts in both disciplines. The group would be seven men and eight women due to overlap in moguls and duals.
Pass/Fail:	Passed: For – 6, opposed –5, abstentions – 5

Glenn: Which list do we use fill NorAm spots? Flash: That is not a rule.

PJC: It's what we've been doing, albeit the rule or criteria does not exist. We need to decide on this motion and we need to address which points list we use and the procedure to fill NorAm spots in a new/separate motion.

Rotermund: It will create a longer list overall and we may not need to go to the points list to fill NorAm starts.

Preston: Against it – I don't like to ask a mogul athlete to ski three days at such a high level – it's a large burden. We don't ask athletes to do this anywhere else and have never asked them before. On NorAms are we saying that we're still going to fill the quotas for MO/DM?

Skinner: We ask younger athletes to compete more at JO's. We'll see a higher level and more committed athlete moving up the ladder. Work harder in the pre-season.

Newson: Using one list to fill the NA is a great idea. Agree with Skinner – make sure athletes are doing both. Selections are very nerve-wracking, do or die – but this is what they deal with at the World Cup. Could we consider using a drop out of the 3.

K: The creation of having 2 MO and 1 DM for Selections was choosing the Team from Selections. Do we need to have 2 MO and 2 DM at Selections to choose a Team start? Maybe we have 1 MO and 1 DM, make one list.

Flash: No (1/1) because the OWG is a MO event and Selections is very successful and we don't want to change it. We're asking the athletes to do A LOT. I agree with Nick. Eliminate DM or have the DM event and go to NorAm fill from the DM list from Selections.

Henceroth: I like what Flash was saying – Team selection off MO/MO, but NorAm off a combination of the MO/MO/DM.

K: Could end up with a significant amount of no-showing. Could end up with 80 MO and then the next day just have that group (16) compete again....

Flash: Those people that “don’t matter” are pretty relevant. They fill up a lot of spots.

Schwartz: very high ranked skiers...athletes going for Team spots are going all out and risk missing a NorAm spot (excluding the devo group). I think we need a rule to catch the top 16.

Hatch: would like to see what a DM would do, but do not want to go against USFST.

Flash: C Team selection criteria is set and is not changing.

K: concerned about what adding a drop would do to the event.

Flash: Team, World Cup starts, NorAm starts, etc.

Henceroth: doesn’t think it’s too much of a burden but has never been in the spot of going for a Team spot. It is really working as it is set now.

PJC: discussed at length and vote, come up with another solution. We need a solution to how we select our NorAm starts.

Schwartz: Suggest to the chair that we question the abstentions. Confusion?

Simson: No compelling need to change, but the motion did have merit.

Can’t really start calling abstentions now – haven’t all day.

Hatch: More new business – R&T #1 in report from today. Concern brought to Hatch at JO’s. Discussion ensued regarding the ability to bring new business onto the agenda NOW. Agendas were set and approved. Cannot add now.

Henceroth: A question on a motion approved earlier to address development group and foreign athletes for next year. Can we address it formally this year?

Flash: I don’t like changing rules retro-actively because we don’t like what the outcome was.

Lange: I agree, but I think we need an exception or to find a way to address it this year, maybe via an appeal to the FSC executive committee?

PJC: That is something I would be comfortable with. If the athlete/s and coaches concerned can get something to us that would be great.

Newson: I have a motion to address a procedure for filling NorAm spots that we discussed earlier. This is what we have been doing, we need a rule in place for it.

Motion: The US entries in the 2007-08 NorAm Tour, the event will be filled from US Selection points list generated from the total place points earned from the two moguls and place points from the dual moguls event. The remaining quota spots will be filled by using the most recent FSP list for each discipline.

For example, a mogul NorAm start:

- 1) US Selections list (place points from MO/DM), if we haven’t reached our quota, then,
- 2) Most recent points list for each discipline, moguls FSP for moguls, dual moguls FSP for dual moguls.

Newson/Henceroth: passed, unanimous

Wise: a couple of final items: Do we need a fall meeting? (Feedback was no.)

Any updates for ski cross, PJC will send info via the web and emails.

Thanks to all the chairs for providing in their information. Please continue. FSC chair is up for vote in the spring. Anyone interested in running must submit their nomination when the agendas are due. Would like to have a panel of prospective people who want to run so the voting members can have the time to review. It is my intention to run again next year.

Henceroth: NorAm changing to a single grand prix, does it change US Team selection? It eliminates a path.

PJC: We are adjusting it.

Newson: Report back to everyone. Division chair did come to ask for advice and received recommendations and advice from the membership committee.

Hatch: The jury has the power to deal with unsportsmanlike behavior as it's happening.

Wise: Thank you for that report.

12. Adjournment

Wise

Motion to Adjourn: Newson/Hatch.

ADDENDUM A

USSA Freestyle Staff Report
May 14, 2007

Introduction (PJC)

Another year on the books in Freestyle and there was a lot of activity at all levels. Our membership continues to increase, not just the number of competitors, but in all categories. Most notably our youth category (12 and under) increased by over 150 kids! Also, of our 2311 competitors (FC, FR, FY), 956 are juniors. As we continue to grow we are challenged with ensuring that our programming lines up with the demands of our numbers of athletes, coaches and officials involved. An on-going inventory of what we're doing at various levels and in different areas of the country is necessary.

The FIS World Championships were held in Madonna di Campiglio, Italy and we had plenty of USSA representation: Bill McNice was a judge and Andy Hayes was the technical delegate. The FIS Junior World Championships were held in Airolo, Switzerland. We fielded a team of 25 athletes plus coaches and staff. In addition Don Ramirez was a judge and Andy Wise was the TD. These assignments are not automatically awarded to us by the FIS – candidates must meet FIS and USSA criteria, are nominated by USSA and then approved by the FIS. Similar to the athletes – they must qualify! Huge congratulations to all the athletes for a job well done at both events.

We are looking forward to another year in the world of Freestyle and have a lot of work to do, the addition of ski cross to the OWG and a detailed plan for halfpipe to name just two. I am confident that we will have great programs up and down the pipeline with all participants (athletes, coaches, judges, TD's and officials).

The information in this report is a snapshot of some of the key areas in Freestyle. As you know, there are a lot of moving parts to the whole program and if there's something you have an interest in knowing more about please let me know and we'll do our best to get you the information.

Member Data (PJC)

1993-94 = 1800	2004-05 = 2606
2002-03 = 2413	2005-06 = 2794
2003-04 = 2555	2006-07 = 3047

Details of 2005-2006	Details of 2006-07
Competitor = -9 athletes	+ 16
Coach/Official = +6	+3
Official = +16	-14
Rookie = +23	+97
Youth = +138	+159

Halfpipe

JO's field size	
2002-03: 20 women, 60 men	2003-04: 24 women, 60 men
2004-05: 25 women, 65 men	2005-06: 22 Women, 61 Men
2006-07: 25 women, 56 men	
Nationals field size	
2005-06: 13 women, 15 men	2006-07: 13 women, 18 men

Discipline	Points List Spring 2003	Points List Spring 2004	Points List Spring 2005	Points List Spring 2006	Points List Spring 2007
AE – women	29	31	43	32	24
AE – men	104	106	109	77	79
SS – women	42	52	38	28	30
SS – men	213	247	179	176	213
HP – women	22	34	36	38	35
HP – men	99	145	154	146	121
MO – women	191	194	159	152	145
MO – men	528	458	303	304	250
DM – women	94	126	129	117	135
DM – men	240	283	234	235	228

2007-2008 Development GROUP

The following group of athletes are the 2007-2008 USSA development group. They are guaranteed starts for NorAms in the 07-08 season, pending new business motion #2, mogul and dual mogul athletes would qualify for both mogul and dual moguls starts. They must participate in U.S. Selection Events to retain their start rights.

Men's Moguls
1- Joe Discoe
2- Jimmy Discoe
3- Jeremy Cota
4- Cody Tempel
5- Nate Johnson

Women's Moguls
1- Ani Haas
2- Kristen Sweeney
3- Whitney Henceroth
4- Caterina Mader
5- Jordan Poyfair

Men's Dual Moguls
1- Jimmy Discoe
2- Joseph Discoe
3- Jay Panther
4- Cooper Golding
5- Jeremy Cota

Women's Dual Moguls
1- Whitney Henceroth
2- Kristen Sweeney
3- Sophia Schwartz
4- Mikaela Matthews
5- Olivia Akerley

Men's Aerials
1- Matt Flesher
2- GW Creighton

Women's Aerials
1- Allison Lee
2- Sabrina Guerin- AUS

New Information!

We are starting to build out this program and beginning this year these athletes will be invited to train with the national team during specified times. For moguls, this means being invited to come to two camps this prep period and for aerials it means training at the UOP during each camp (in both cases at their own expense). In addition while training with the national team in Park City, it means access to the USSA training center WITH organized moguls or aerials sessions.

This is a start. There is a lot more we will be doing, and we are working on an organized plan so that each new project or piece we add is effective and productive.

We're very excited to be offering this opportunity to these athletes. They will receive a letter from me officially inviting them and outlining the expectations. I will also set up meetings for the group to continue the education process.

US Selections Update

Dates and location have still not been confirmed, but we are looking at two options:

December 15-23 or so OR December 6-16 or so, in either Utah or Colorado.

We will sanction the event as a FIS normal event as we have in the past (except last year). We must follow FIS rules – one which creates confusion is the FIS minimum age. See FIS report for more info.

Please note that we will need to look at qualification/selection criteria for this event because the FIS considers moguls and dual moguls the same discipline, just as is on the FIS World Cup. Both moguls and dual moguls events will be on the same NorAm Standings. Please see new business motion #1 and #2 to address U.S. Selections beginning this year and the development group starts at NorAms.

Junior Olympics

The Junior Olympics are a two-year bid, 2008 is the second year of the rotation and are set for Steamboat Springs, CO. The event is set for March 3-9, 2007.

US Championships

Killington was the second year of a two-year contract. USSA is in the process of receiving bids from sites and hopes to have it done as soon as possible

USSA Points List 2007- 2008

Proposed Freestyle Points List Dates for 2007-2008

Period	Close	Valid
Fall List	Nov. 13	Nov. 16
1 Mar 27- Dec. 21	Dec. 21	Dec. 28
2 Dec. 22- Jan. 22	Jan. 22	Jan. 25
3 Jan. 23- Feb 12	Feb. 12	Feb. 15
4 Feb. 13- Mar. 4	Mar. 4	Mar. 7
5 Mar. 5- Mar. 31	Mar. 31	Apr. 3

Please take a good look at the closing and valid dates of the 2007-2008 points list. Once they are approved at this meeting they are set for the season.

Petition to Start -The petition to start form is now available on the USSA member web site. Please go to [www.ussa.org / freestyle / competitions](http://www.ussa.org/freestyle/competitions) (scroll down! on the right).

Deadline for US Selections:	Response from FS Exec Committee by:
July 1, 2007	July 20, 2007
October 1, 2007	October 20, 2007

2007- 2008 Competition Guide

Each summer the comp guide is edited from how it was printed the year before. Anyone wishing to get a jump start on it can use the 2006-2007 comp guide, however changes must be noted when the original is sent to you, please don't just send the new text, note how it has changed from the previous year. Jeff Weinman, Competition Services Assistant Director, will be sending out the divisional sections. After that Emily Fisher will be coordinating the comp guide editing. Contact info for Jeff Weinman is jweinman@ussa.org.

TIMELINE:

June 15, 2007- division chairs receive the comp guide for editing
 July 9, 2007- All division sections due to Emily at USSA, noting changes
 July 23, 2007- Final draft of division sections sent back to division chairs for final edits
 August 6, 2007- All final edits to Emily, no more changes! All division sections must be complete at this time or the comp guide will remain the same as 2006-2007 version.

NorAm (PJC)

NorAm Schedule Update - PJC is still working with US sites and the Canadian Freestyle Ski Association on the calendar. (Emily ALMOST had it done, but had to leave to have a baby. Now it's back in my hands, so I'm trying to keep up with all her good work!!)

2005-06 Participation

Events/Sites	Numbers on NorAm Standings	Nations
AE: 6 events @ 2 sites	22 men; 16 women	CAN, USA
MO: 6 events @ 5 sites	59 men; 51 women	CAN, USA, JPN, SWE
DM: 4 events @ 4 sites	52 men; 51 women	CAN, USA, JPN
HP: 4 events @ 3 sites	48 men; 18 women	CAN, USA, JPN, NZL

2006-07 Participation

Events/Sites	Numbers on NorAm Standings	Nations
AE: 5 events @ 2 sites	27 men; 14 women	CAN, USA, AUS, ARG
MO: 4 events @ 4 sites	41 men; 41 women	CAN, USA, JPN
DM: 4 events @ 4 sites	45 men; 42 women	CAN, USA, JPN
HP: 3 events @ 2 sites	24 men, 12 women	CAN, USA

2006-07 Review - It seems that we made progress with the calendar in that we were able to host more multi-discipline events in a better timeframe. We continue to be challenged to find sites to host such a diverse group of disciplines to site (mo/dm/ae/hp/sx). The Canadians were on the calendar for aerial events and the bad weather that plagued the east caused the cancellation of one of them and the necessity to move moguls.

The level of competition is improving so much that we now have the additional challenge of finding courses that are on par with the athletes' abilities. While many, if not all come in at spec, we're being asked to look for better courses or to find ways to address it within current courses.

Unfortunately there was some misinterpretation of the rules with respect to entry fees and we are looking at ways to address this. It is difficult to make rules that balance flexibility so that we can accommodate different situations and yet balance that with following the intent. It may be a matter of better education of our organizers.

As we reported last spring we received approval on an initiative to help fund the US portion of the NorAm Tour. We were able to get organizers some help financially and awarded prize money at each US event. While neither of these items was a large dollar amount, we believed it helped the organizer and the athletes.

NorAm Standings - The US took five of the eight titles on the NorAm Tour. In moguls 1-2 with both the men and women, dual moguls women 1-2 and dual moguls men 1-2-3. Aerials men 1-2 and women were were 2nd.

Critical Issues/Moving Forward

- FIS implementation of universal rules for all Continental Cups (NorAms, Europa Cups, Australia/New Zealand Cups, etc)
- Finances for both the athletes and the organizers
- Education of the organizers: rules, policies, etc.
- Monitor moguls and dual moguls total events (8 in 2006-07)
- Aerials events need to be at more venues: while we are very fortunate to have a venue like the Utah Olympic Park, but we need to get these athletes to train and compete on other venues to better deal with the variations that come with different courses

Next Meeting: we are in the process of setting up the next conference call of the NorAm Committee.

NorAm Committee Members

Polly-Jo Clark, Chair, USSA
Andy Wise, USSA
Konrad Rotermund, USSA
Matt Gnoza, USSA
Brian Lake, USSA

John Pomeroy, CFSA
Wayne Hinkel, CFSA
Jay Vaughan, CFSA
Michel Hamelin, CFSA

Junior World Review (PJC)

Airolo, Switzerland, March 14-20, 2007

Junior Worlds Team

- Moguls: Kayla Snyderman, McKenzy Golding, Ani Haas, Kristen Sweeney
Jay Bowman-Kirigin, Byron Wilson, Joe Discoe, Jimmy Discoe
- Dual Moguls: Kayla Snyderman, McKenzy Golding, Kristen Sweeney, Whitney Henceroth
Jay Bowman-Kirigin, Bryon Wilson, Jimmy Discoe, Jeremy Cota
- Aerials: Allison Lee, Sami Palmer, Rachel Hatch, Jillian Kazley
Dylan Ferguson, GW Creighton, Matt Flesher, Matt Depeters
- Halfpipe: Sophia Schwartz, Kim Sharp, Alicia Cavanaugh, Jessie Sharp
David Wise, Ross Falcone, Billy Mann

Results

- Moguls: 2nd Snyderman
1st Wilson, 2nd Bowman-Kirigin, 3rd Joe Discoe, 4th Jimmy Discoe
- Aerials 2nd Ferguson
- Halfpipe 1st Kim Sharp, 2nd Sophia Schwartz

Overall this event was great. It was so much fun for me to finally get to this event. The athletes were fantastic – not just on the hill, but off as well. It's a large group to manage, many of whom have not traveled overseas prior to this, so it's a great education for them – not just in terms of being a part of a true international field, but dealing with all aspects: changing money, different cultures and languages, roommates you just meet, electrical/power and food you might not know. It is a very high-level competition with many athletes they will see as their careers continue.

It was critical to have the support of the club coaches who went – with so many athletes we needed the van drivers and extra help in general. Each Jr Worlds will be different and in this case we're living 20k away from the venue, there are a lot more logistics involved. It was also neat to see how the all the coaches (national team and club) worked together for the athletes as a whole and when the athletes saw this they all supported each other as well. In fact, as one example - the aerialists came to the hill early on their comp day to see the moguls event and the mogul skiers came back that night to watch aerials. I think athletes made lifelong friendships that they might not have otherwise, another good outcome of this event.

I learned many things since I experienced this event first hand:

- I must make it a priority on my calendar (PJC).
- I need to put a process in place for the selection of club coaches for each discipline (MO/AE/HP/SX).
- A USSA doctor should be one of the staff attending.
- Since this is a pay-to-play program we must do everything we can to keep the costs down for the athletes. In this instance the lodging included three meals a day and the cost was very reasonable. I don't think we could have found cheaper on our own – we are a large group that's difficult to house!
- We should post basic Jr Worlds info and international travel tips on the Freestyle site of www.ussa.org year-round. While there are changes each year based upon the event, some

things are pretty standard. If we sort that out and post it, athletes, clubs and parents can be better informed at a much earlier date. Once we have event specific info we ADD that info to the same spot on the web.

- If possible stay an extra day for touring.
- Find out what activities the organizing committee has arranged for the athletes. If inappropriate or lacking, arrange our own.

2007-08 Jr Worlds

Information just received from the FIS – they have received two bids for the 2008 Jr Worlds: Japan with MO/DM only and Airolo again – with all disciplines. We will keep you updated!

FIS Report (PJC)

The FIS meetings are May 22-27, 2007 in Portoroz, Slovenia. Jay Simson, Jeff Wintersteen and PJ Clark will attend for USSA Freestyle.

- Ski cross has officially been added to the OWG in Freestyle. This will affect our quotas: maximum field size, maximum team size and potentially maximum starts per gender per discipline. We also will need to know what the details for minimum qualification.
- Last spring USSA Freestyle made a proposal to reduce the minimum age to compete in FIS Freestyle events. It was tabled for further discussion in the fall. Many of our counterparts did not understand the ramifications of this FIS rule. We continued to educate others on it and it was discussed again at the fall meeting, where it was approved starting the 2007-08 season with some modifications, it was then approved by the FIS Council in November and is to be implemented this year.
 - o FIS Rule 3046.1

The Council approved a change of the minimum age for moguls, aerials and halfpipe from 15 to 14 years old for participation in international FIS-level events only, including FIS Junior World Ski Championships, starting in the 2007-08 season.

In order to participate in FIS World Cup and (senior) World Championships, the minimum age will be 15 years on the 1st of January of the year in which the event takes place (as per the other FIS disciplines).

- Judges and Technical Delegate Selection
 - o USSA will be putting a selection process in place to evaluate eligible candidates. Selection will be based on feedback from past selection processes and any new requirements from the FIS.
 - o USSA nominations are due to the FIS by August 2007 for the 2009 World Championships and by August 2008 for the 2010 OWG.
- Mogul Air Bump Standards: review
- Procedure for measurement in MO/AE
- Youth and Children Committee for Freestyle and Snowboard

US Team Staff Report (Jeff “Flash” Wintersteen, Head Coach)

Aerials:

Aerial program from the elite team standpoint will not have many changes from a program and project standpoint. We are still using the centralized system we have employed in the past. The only minor addition is a Lake Placid ramp camp. We feel this is a nice way to jump-start the summer. Lake Placid OTC will get the entire team together and the less crowded Lake Placid facility means a lot of early season fundamentals.

There will be some staffing changes as Brian Lake has left us after a number of years of service. We wish Brian well and appreciate his contribution to the team for a number of years. Obviously we will be looking to replace Brian at the C Team level. We are also still working to establish the development program in Lake Placid this summer with a full time staff person. We are currently in final discussions with a couple applicants and look forward to having this position filled shortly.

Moguls:

Moguls remains largely unchanged from program level except for the addition of some on-snow prep funding for Zermatt and Hood camps, which were not part of the previous core budget. In addition we have had some dramatic staff changes in late fall. Scott Rawles is the new Head Mogul Coach and assisting him will be Lasse Fahlen (from Norwegian Team), Todd Schirman (formerly Head Coach of PC Freestyle) and Garth Hager (Steamboat Springs Winter Sports Club). Rawles did a great job in his first abbreviated season and I looked forward to his input over the long term.

A significant staffing philosophy change is important to note as all the coaches will work at different levels of the program, from Selections to World Cup. We will no longer have a “World Cup” coach. We have also invited development group athletes with their coaches to key projects this fall and look forward to continuing this relationship with those athletes and coaches.

We look forward to a great season and beyond to 2010. Don't hesitate to contact me with any questions you may have.