**Minutes of SWJRA League Meeting**

**October 2, 2005**

**Belmont, CA**

1. **Election of Stewards: Nomination of stewards for terms up (Monica and Zohar)**
   1. **Nominations for Monica Hilcu and Rich Tzeng received and seconded.**
   2. **Nominations for Zohar Abramovitz and Wayne Rickert received and seconded.**
   3. ***Results: Monica 29, Rich 10; Zohar 26, Wayne 13.***
2. **Stewards’ Motion: Do we want to go to a 3 day regatta format?**
   1. **Discussion regarding relative pros and cons of increasing regatta capacity vs. expense and logistical difficulties.**
   2. ***Results: In favor – 10; Opposed – 23. Motion is settled. The regatta will not go to a 3 day format.***
3. **Motion by SI to develop a plan to zone the park for boat storage.**
   1. **Discussion led to a withdrawl of the motion by the SI coach.**
   2. ***Stewards are charged with developing a plan that will better use the space available for boat storage.***
4. **Motion by LBJC to seed some events based on a time trial to be held early Saturday or Friday evening. Motion is seconded.**
   1. **Proposal is to run a head race style time trial for over-subscribed events.**
   2. **Discussion suggested support for developing a system of defining rankings beyond 1-6 (petite finals or time trials).**
   3. **Suggestion to run a “pilot program” in one or two events.**
   4. ***Results: In favor – 3; Opposed – Acclamation. Proposal is rejected.***
5. **Stewards Discussion regarding the progression system. For over-subscribed events, does the region want to go to a heats-reps-finals, heats-semis-finals format?**
   1. **Discussion was largely a conversation clarifying the difference between a repechage and a semi-final.**
   2. ***Results: Region decided to retain the heats-reps-finals progression as agreed upon in 2004.***
6. **Stewards Discussion regarding the inclusion of Petite Finals. For which events and under what circumstances does the region want to include petite finals?**
   1. **Varsity 8: In favor – 30; Opposed - 5; Abstain – 2**
   2. **JV 8: In favor – 7; Opposed -10; Abstain 6**
   3. **3V8: In favor – 1; Opposed – Acclamation**
   4. **Novice 8A: In favor – 38; Opposed – 0; Abstain – 2**
   5. **Novice 8B: In favor – 15; Opposed – 8; Abstain – 10**
   6. **Open 4x: In favor – 6; Opposed – 7; Abstain – 15**
7. **Motion to prioritize the V8 as the first to receive a petite final, time permitting.**
   1. **Results: In favor – 26; Opposed – 15.*Stewards empowered to insert petite finals, time permitting, in the following events in this order: Varsity 8; Novice 8; Novice 8B.***
8. **Stewards Discussion regarding whether the stewards should be empowered to eliminate events in order to accommodate a petite final.**
   1. ***Results: Unanimous decision by region not to eliminate any events.***
9. **Motion by MRA to enforce participation in petite finals.**
   1. **Discussion about how to incentivize teams to appear for their petite final. Ideas include assigning value to petite finals, taking away points from teams who don’t show up, eliminating athletes from offending crews from later events.**
   2. ***Results: In favor – Acclamation; Opposed – 1.***
10. **Motion by MRA to exclude non-SW regional programs from the SWRJC regatta.**
    1. ***Results: In favor – 39; Opposed – 0; Abstain – 1.***
11. **Motion by Pacific to institute a “red shirt” rule that limits athletes from changing teams.**
    1. **Discussion dealt with the ethical concerns of athlete poaching, the enforceability of any rule that was established, some of the gray areas involved in what would be considered extenuating circumstances,**
    2. ***Results: In favor – 4; Opposed – 30; Abstain – 0. Motion does not pass.***
12. **Motion by Berkeley to institute a policy that limits athletes from changing teams without first getting a waiver from the coach of their original program. Failure to do so would result in that athlete being restricted from competition at SWRJC. If that athlete does participate, his/her boat will be disqualified from the regatta.**
    1. ***Results: In favor – 8; Opposed – 13; Abstain – 15. Motion does not pass.***
13. **Motion by Stanford to institute a policy that requires the coach of program A to contact the coach of program B in the event that an athlete from program B wants to transfer to program A. This communication must take place prior to the athlete in question begins rowing for program A.**
    1. ***Results: In favor – 30; Opposed – 2; Abstain – 3. Motion passes.***
14. **Steward Monica agrees to take on the responsibility of investigating what would be involved in establishing the SWJRA as an official league.**
15. **Motion by Paul Wilkins to use a computerized seeding system over the course of the season.**
    1. ***Region agreed to try out the system.***
16. **Motion by Oakland Strokes to adopt the USRowing rules relating to lightweights.**
    1. ***Results: In favor – 19; Opposed – 5; Abstain – 3. Motion passes.***
17. **Clarification of the Varsity/JV rule as it pertains to cox’ns. Rule 4a will be amended to have the words “when possible” struck out, thereby extending the Varsity/JV rule to cox’ns in the same manner that it applies to rowers. A clause will be added to 4a that states that the Stewards will listen to petitions in extenuating circumstances.**
18. **Stewards motion to strictly enforce the late entry policies.**