

February NEISA Executive Committee Call Meeting Notes

February 5th, 2021

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Roll Call and Approval of December Minutes**
 - a. Full meeting attendance is available [here](#)
- III. **NEISA Tide Report and By-law Review**
 - a. *Anderson*: Real quick, for our committee updated we've started meeting again including all of our subcommittees. We also have added another advisor to help us with the press stuff.
I'm proposing Bylaws for the March 4th meeting, which includes adding a TIDE representative to the Executive committee. NEISA is proposing this at the annual meeting in February as well. One change we thought is changing the scheduling assistant to the TIDE representative, especially if we're going to automate the scheduling system. A TIDE representative would solidify our goals and make NEISA commit to TIDE on a long-term basis. We also want to update the committee bylaws to establish the committee as an actual committee within NEISA. There's not too much of a big change there. We're also adding an anti-discrimination bylaw to our bylaws as well. MAISA is also adding an anti-discrimination bylaw, but I think ours is a big more complex. I think the big changes we've been talking about are the actions NEISA would take in the ICSA. The grievance form we have in the bylaws is an ICSA form, so everything in the process has to get laid out on the ICSA level. We will be working on that after these go into a vote. There is a grievance form on the ICSA level, but it needs to be updated. We're also talking about changing the Rule 69 action in the 2017 World Sailing Misconduct if you look at Appendix A of the section. In 45.13 it states that previous topics with discriminatory language warrants an action in regard to Rule 69 – we wanted to get rid of that and just go off a case-by-case basis. Additionally, in Section 5 of the venue: NEISA does not permit member teams or conference representatives to hold events at locations with discriminatory policies. I think most schools have this policy, so we'd be looking more at yacht clubs and sailing centers that we would host external events at. Nicole or Jack did I miss anything?
 - i. *Moeder*: No, I think you covered the basics with it.
 - ii. *Valentino*: You've got everything.
 - b. *Anderson*: Greg, what are they doing at the ICSA level?
 - i. *Wilkinson*: The championship committee is bringing that exact same thing that Nationals can only be at venues with an anti-discrimination policy in the books.
 - c. *Kalin*: Is there a particular venue or any place that doesn't do that currently?

- i. *Anderson*: When we were first investigating, the Charleston Offshore Racing Association had... (continued below)
- d. *Pizzo*: Looking at our fall schedule, we have 75 events that are predominantly held at universities, and at sailing centers, they have pretty clear policies as well. A bunch of the other yacht clubs had it, too. Some are harder to find (Larchmont, Niantic), but I imagine we could find that from those members. I don't necessarily know if this is a huge problem in NEISA currently.
- e. *Anderson*: I just threw it into the chat. The CORA had a burgee that looked like a confederate flag so that would warrant discussion.
 - i. *Pizzo*: That's a newish regatta that hasn't always been on our schedule, but that brings up a good point.
 - ii. *Radtko*: This was initially raised when we were hosting at Tulane and not knowing what Southern Yacht Club's policy and history is.
 - iii. *Callahan*: The Sunfish class is hosting Women's North Americans at a venue that used to not allow female members.
- f. *Kalin*: It sounds like everyone is wracking their brain trying to think of venues we frequent with this problem.
 - i. *Anderson*: We've done a lot of research, and some clubs, such as Corinthian, have clearly outlined a policy. Edgewood and a few others all have inclusive policies as well.
- g. *Assad*: So, what's the plan of action from here? I assume everyone on the call is in support? So, we should move forward, and if we end up at a venue that doesn't support this, then we change venues.
 - i. *Anderson*: When we proposed it, people asked how we would handle this. We think venues should just outline this in their bid to host and this policy should be pretty outlined.
 - 1. *Radtko*: Are there specific things that you want these people to include?
 - a. *Anderson*: In either the mission statement or in the bylaws?
 - 2. *Radtko*: So, nothing specific you just want something said there?
 - a. *Moeder*: We need the statement and to have public access to the statement so it can be accessed easily. It should be part of the form, where there is a text about the exact statement to make it as clear as possible for everyone dealing with the bids.
- h. *Kalin*: You're just drafting your bylaws Preston, and you want feedback? We're going to vote on this in March. I know you also wanted feedback on the Rule 69 grievance process and how that would all work?
 - i. *Anderson*: The whole grievance form is on the ICSA level, so we're not creating a new process, but we will be creating a recommendation for the

ICSA executive committee to consider for the grievance form to outline the process a bit more. It's clear how to submit but not what happens after.

- i. *Kalin*: I know there are a couple discussions over email going around – *Preston* I don't know if you want to share the thought process or issues you faced?
 - i. *Anderson*: Like the whole ICSA form?
 - 1. *Kalin*: Yeah
 - ii. *Anderson*: I think the whole question was about the process for the grievance forms. If you file a Rule 69 report do you file a grievance form as well? I think yes?
 - 1. *Assad*: I'm educated about the grievance process, so I could tell people what that looks like. You submit the form and it goes to the Executive Committee. Then usually there's a response from the Executive Committee and they either researched what you wanted them to research, and they give you a response on their action.
 - a. *Radtko*: We're investigating further and will publish more information about grievances happening. Currently, where ICSA TIDE has been with recommendations, there's a few edits within the form with a few places that could be better with more clarity for the public. A majority of people don't know the form exists or what it's for, and especially after, we have a guess of what happens. ICSA TIDE has outlined that, and we know who does it with what training, but we also want to add resources in all of that. NEISA TIDE is saying we need to expand on the form in the future to ensure that process holds up in the future to protecting everyone involved and the situations are handled in a way that's well done. We have looked into it, but we wanted to have the right information before we proceed.
- j. *Pizzo*: Justin since you've submitted these, like I think you should all read the bylaws, because there are scenarios where there's a grievance filed for a sailor that is submitted after a regatta, but how quickly can I sort that out? Like is that sailor eligible to keep sailing the following weekend or not? I think we need to give NEISA leadership where it's not their full job to be nice admin people a very clear structure about how to handle these situations in a timely manner. I say this from a self-preservation standpoint, because I think there needs to be some structure to do this. Justin you can outline some stuff to go through.
 - i. *Assad*: Greg's on the Executive Committee so he can talk more.

1. *Wilkinson*: I'm actually confused about Frank asking if a sailor is eligible to sail the next weekend. I don't think that initiating the grievance process could lead to eligibility committee activity, but it wouldn't happen overnight. There are two ways that I know are available for somebody to be excluded from competition in College Sailing. 1) They would have to follow the Racing Rules of Sailing exactly and 2) they would have to follow ICSA eligibility and procedural rules exactly. The grievance process could trigger eligibility action. What I'm confused about is the idea that on a Sunday somebody files a grievance, and all of a sudden somebody's not sailing the next day or something or the next week? I don't think it operates anywhere near that fast.
 - a. *Radtko*: I don't know that.
2. *Wilkinson*: To be denied entry into a regatta, it has to follow the Racing Rules of Sailing or procedural rules to prevent them from sailing.
 - a. *Kalin*: It sounds like we still have some stuff to figure out with that.
- k. *Anderson*: Jack will talk about the change we made to the other section, but with the actual TIDE bylaws it should be noted that with anti-discrimination, TIDE doesn't have any jurisdiction. This is our recommendations to NEISA, and I think that was something that came up in one of the emails that we've had. I have to hope off so I'm going to have Jack handle the changes we made.
- l. *Valentino*: We had a NEISA TIDE call where we were talking about how do we want to move forward with the fact that membership categories are changing and that the old bylaws that we originally passed during the summer were based on previous privileges and rights that were allocated to different tiers. So, we kneecapped TIDE's ability to be punitive in the interest of building better culture. The original bylaws said that if you don't submit the educational feedback, you're prohibited from competition in the spring, but this was turning some teams off and was less voluntary buy-in and more compliance. So, we changed it so you just need to submit a TIDE rep and let teams naturally buy-in to the program. We're not going to start coming down with the kind of punitive stuff that was in the original bylaws, so that was changed. The only addition after is Section 2 explicitly laying out how TIDE may affect internal team compliance or racing. It's explicit that it's an undergrad run culture change. The last part is saying that if a team is really actively against a healthy culture shift, TIDE reserves the right to reach out to an administrator at the school as an absolute last result.
 - i. *Kalin*: Great
 - ii. *Wilkinson*: Would that not go through NEISA leadership? Would it go straight from a NEISA committee, not exec committee first, straight to an

athletic department without going through the leadership arm of the conference?

1. *Valentino*: That's definitely something we were thinking about. Obviously, there's a lot of overlap between NEISA Executive Committee and TIDE leadership, but it wouldn't be Preston and Izzy drafting a letter, they would be going through leaders. We should probably include that specifically.
- iii. *Wilkinson*: Look at what NCAA conferences would do in this case. Would it go through conference leadership or the DI committee? I'm sure it exists, so if it's possible to match like in other sports so that it carries the proper weight for when it arrives in the athletic department.
- m. *Kalin*: Thank you for that TIDE committee. Did Preston have more to present?
 - i. *Moeder*: I think that was everything on the bylaws front. Frank has been helping us with these bylaws and has made it clear that we want to get this passed and do it right, so we're open to feedback on how this will be the most effective piece of legislature that we can make it. Email Preston, me or Jack, with additional points.
- n. *Kalin*: Thank you. Alright. Greg, I know you wanted to do a reminder to everyone about medical forms going forward for the spring.
 - i. *Wilkinson*: The Executive Committee has circulated a medical guide for all regattas. There will be two documents published 1) details of the medical guide with testing and non-testing protocol and 2) a document of an attestation or signature form that schools will need to file before every competition that schools are playing by the medical rules. The medical rules will be two tests required for every competition, and both tests will need to be PCR. A pre-competition test that is no more than 72 hours prior to the start of the regatta. Everyone will need a negative result in hand before going to the regatta. A post-competition PCR will need to be completed within 1 business day of the event. If there are any positives along the way, especially post-competition, opponents will need to be notified and of their approximate proximity at the event to the positive person (ex. starter, didn't sail, etc.) There will be no boat rotations except at the beginning of day of a two-day event. All meetings are to be not in person, maximum social distancing between teams, masks on land and on the water at all times. There is a question to the medical team if masks can be off during racing, and if we don't have an answer on that now we will soon. I can take questions too.
 1. *Martin*: Who does that attestation form go to, and do schools have to provide results to that same source or just know internally that everyone is negative?

- a. *Wilkinson*: No results are shared unless there is a positive case that notifies the opponents of the school with the positive. In terms of the processing with the forms, we're working on an online solution in some form of electronic signatures that will exist on the ICSA web page. The signatory requirements are going to be relatively high, kind of like the declaration of adherence is where it's going to have the signatories that will need to be from university officials, and basically needs to be a representative of a high-level office.
- o. *Kalin*: I know you have more inside knowledge on what SEISA is asking at the meeting:
 - i. *Wilkinson*: At last year's Annual Meeting we committed to changing the Nationals berth allotment formula for this spring for next year, where it's no longer going to be participation based. In addition to changing the formula, automatic berths to Nationals are only guaranteed to 5 conferences starting after this spring Nationals which are NEISA, MAISA, SAISA, Midwest, Pacific coast. The Northwest conference is folding into the Pacific Coast conference. SEISA has decided to exist on its own and stay a conference despite not having any Nationals berths. There will still be a path to Nationals for SEISA teams based on the proposal coming in, but they will not be able to qualify for Nationals by winning their conference championship like everybody else. But they are now coming back to the Committee asking for their position back. My opinion is they shouldn't get it back.
 - 1. *Bresnahan*: Who will be voting for NEISA on this this weekend?
 - a. *Wilkinson*: Kalin and Preston will be.
 - 2. *Bresnahan*: Even if this doesn't pass, I don't feel that independence should be part of the consideration for ICSA because all that does is adds more stress for the competition committee that's going to be picking these people. Like Tulane should be part of a conference because they potentially could win a conference championship, as opposed to not being part of a conference and now they get thrown in the regular pool so this ends up hurting NEISA teams that would normally qualify. I just don't think independence should be part of the selection process.
 - a. *Wilkinson*: They're going to get support from probably the Midwest, Northwest, and the Pacific Coast. I think it will pass.

- ii. *Assad*: It's worth pointing out that SEISA is still a conference, and they're not technically independent they're just a conference that doesn't have Nationals berths.
 - 1. *Bresnahan*: I feel like that's semantics because how that was presented to NEISA members was that our berths would be based on the 5 conferences, and that there would be a committee to select based on those 5 conferences. My issue is that by becoming an independent, they're hurting NEISA teams to get more teams to Nationals. I think this is a bigger issue for NEISA than you think it is. This is a long conversation and they're just kind of bucking the system here and all these things are loopholes, but this isn't really how this thing was voted on. It was supposed to be 5 districts with 5 automatic berths, and a committee choosing everybody else.
 - a. *Wilkinson*: Everything Jeff said was accurate, and if I could wave my magic wand Tulane shouldn't be in SEISA – they don't look anything like SEISA at all. Anyway, Jeff's right and I think it's going to pass.
- p. *Kalin*: Let's go to scheduling.

IV. **Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees**

- a. ICSA Meeting Summary – Mike Kalin
- b. Scheduling Coordinator: Schedule/COVID Protocols – Taylor Martin
 - i. *Martin*: The biggest updates are on Spring Nationals qualifiers dates. We had a conference with eligible teams, and if your eligibility status changes, we need to know that on the form ASAP. So, our updates are we are pushing back the first Nationals qualifier to the weekend of the 17th. The big push was to get more sailing in, "regular sailing", before qualifiers. So, the first one is for 4/17, the second one is Sunday 4/18, and that's the same order as before, but Coed and then Team Racing is going to be 4/24, and backup day is 4/25. The original goal was to keep all these one day, and they will still be one day, but based on conversation, travel to and from different sites and different events in one weekend was not going to be an issue. So, moving them to one weekend, different events, different sites, and still no overnights, was a viable option. Those are the new dates, everything else stays the same. Host sites are being determined still. Right now, the basic eligibility is that hosts must be able to host the teams eligible to sail, which is 8 teams, and adhere to ICSA social distancing and COVID protocols. Right now, it looks like Connecticut College and Roger Williams are potentially able to host one or more of those events with CGA, Salve, and URI are unsure whether or not they're going to be able to comply and host that number of teams when these

events happen. So, no host sites have been determined yet, but most of those options are Southern NE, CT and RI. Looking at chat questions, Caroline you need to submit your declaration of adherence by 4/15. Right now, we don't have an official signup process because there is such a small number of teams eligible to compete at the moment, so that's why it's so important to know which teams are available at the moment. If too many teams are eligible, we need to know so that if it becomes an issue where suddenly we have 16 teams eligible, but only 8 spots based on host sites, then we might need to split up into North/South qualifications.

1. *McClintock*: What is the site for confirming that you can sail?
 - a. *Martin*: Declaration of adherence was sent out by email and must be sent to compliance@collegesailing.org
2. *McClintock*: At URI, we're set to sail but they haven't determined if we can sail the New England's. So, these dates and these regattas, are these the only regattas of the spring?
 - a. *Martin*: No, these are just Nationals Qualifiers dates.
 - b. *Pizzo*: There are other events that teams are creating. We thought it was important that Nationals Qualifiers are set up. Two schools were able to host this fall, Conn and CGA, both only had one other team at their venue. If you ask these teams right now, if they were to host in March that's all they'd be able to do. Other regattas are being organized, but at a much smaller scale. It's not going to be a normal thing where we have a normal regatta. Different teams, especially with hosting as a big burden on the host, it's a much less formal process. I know that's not ideal, but there's currently no easy way for us to do this, and I'm happy to discuss offline and we're open to ideas, but we don't have a way to organize these "invite style" regattas. Competition between two schools is a regatta not a scrimmage.
3. *McClintock*: URI is asking me if they need to come up with special protocols, and I said we'll be working on doing something in state, but the school is not good with having people come from out of state. So as well as figuring out compliance and adherence, the school just doesn't know what they're signing off on.
 - a. *Pizzo*: Even with the 8 schools that have indicated they can compete, there is still a lot of uncertainty of what they can do and in what capacity. It's a lot easier for them to sign off on a one-day regatta that's a 30 min drive away vs. a Nationals that is a 6-8 hour drive away.

- ii. *Kalin*: Frank you can talk again.
- c. Graduate Secretary Report: By-laws – Frank Pizzo
 - i. *Pizzo*: We had a committee working on bylaw changes to reflect the new classifications in NEISA. The group was myself, Justin Assad, Jack, Jared, and Jeff Dusek, so it was a good, broad spectrum of teams from all different parts of the conference. I sent this in the Slack and we put in changes that reflect the different jargon that's worth reading, and Justin can talk about the quorums. Our voting has been very consistent with what it was beforehand. If you're a fundamental team, there are voting restrictions, if you're a regional team, there are regatta restrictions, but the voting remains the same for everyone, and I think if you're a new school looking to join NEISA, the approval process happens at the Annual Meeting in December, and we allow teams to compete in a couple of events before joining the membership category.
 - ii. *Assad*: It's confusing because we had associate, provisional, and regular members. Associate was where you lived at first and then would hustle along to Provisional and then would have a vote. Fundamental members would have a vote from the beginning. There was significant debate about a grace period of a year or a provisional period of a year, and ultimately, we decided against all that for the simplicity and a way that's manageable and practical. With quorums and voting, we have an ad hoc group and our aim is to do a few things. 1) We want to build a roadmap for Mike and Julia and Frank, and anyone who leads in the conference in the future so if we get to a point of distinction on what a quorum should be for any business, it's all outlined in a PDF and clear who can vote so we're not sifting in the moment. 2) Additionally, we're looking carefully at what quorums should exist so we're able to conduct business. David Thompson has helped us look at the quorum numbers. So that's what we're looking closely at right now and we'll have a product to review by the March meeting. And I'm happy to take feedback.
 - 1. *Anderson*: For membership, is there a committee for the classification?
 - a. *Assad*: For membership, prior to this year, once you're Provisional or Associate or Regular member, the only way to remove yourself was to be inactive for two full years, in which case you're removed or become inactive, or a unanimous vote of the Executive Committee to move you down a membership level. In the end, that follows a different set of guidelines than the one we're going forward, which are based on competitiveness, operational excellence, meeting, scheduling, and fundraising

requirements, etc. We envision a membership committee that is 5 graduate members plus an undergraduate president, and to have 5-year terms aside from the undergraduate president. A lot of people saw our internal guidelines for membership levels that we circulated in November, they would get approved at the Annual Meeting every year in the same way the Performance Ranking Committee has a slate of regattas approved (whenever we make a change to those internal guidelines, we get them approved at the Annual Meeting) and then have membership committee propose a slate of membership levels for approval at the Annual Meeting every year. There are three opportunities for teams if they're unhappy with membership level. If they're unhappy at the end of the Fall competition, and there will be a period to submit to Mike who will forward to the committee. We'll release the initial round of membership levels December 1, and there is a small window for appeals. So, there's really a pretty thorough opportunity for teams. After we've submitted membership, they will then be submitted to the ICSA committee to review so all results will get a nice close look. I think the system worked really well this last year, and I think that's how it will go going forward.

2. *Kalin*: I remember the list was supposed to be published?

a. *Assad*: It's on the website for the winter meeting. I think it's our first year through this, and we're open to feedback on how it can be better. This first year, we thought it could be rocky, but once we're used to it, I think it will be pretty easy going forward.

V. ICSA Winter Meeting Items: SEISA Berth & Nationals Berth Updates – Greg Wilkinson

a. *Kalin*: Greg do you want to talk?

b. *Assad*: I can give a brief overview. What we're envisioning, and we've worked hard on this committee, it's not just about NEISA. We tried to get away from systems that would disadvantage NEISA, so we want systems that help our competitive depth. We haven't tackled team racing yet. For fleet racing, the system is where the top 2 finishers in each championship give ten automatic qualifiers, and from there is an elaborate system to select the next 26 teams. Each committee will have a minimum of 5 voting members, with one non-voting parliamentarian to ensure the rules are being followed. It's a really deliberately outlined process. One good thing is that there is an implementation for a

competitive strength ranking, and we haven't fleshed out all of the details, but it's meant to be able to provide an apples to oranges comparison as a guideline for the selection committee to compare teams that haven't met head-to-head, but not a firm bound. They don't just have to take teams 33-36, they would actually consider a metric (double the number of remaining berths) are the teams that would be considered, and the entire committee can vote to consider another team. I think it will treat NEISA very fairly. On the whole for our conference, it will be a good thing. Coed and Women's will follow that process, Singlehanded and Match Racing will be a bit different. For Singlehandeds, it will be 5 conference champions and 13 open berths. You can skip over finishers at a conference championship to get to other finishers. Only ICSA results will be used. We'll learn all the details tomorrow.

- i. *Mollicone*: For this year, is it straight from conference qualifiers or are there some at-large bids? For 2021 Spring Nationals. There are some at-large berths right, and how will that be figured out?
 1. *Assad*: I don't know the answer to that. I can't recall conversation about that, I think the COVID committee is handling that.
 2. *Kalin*: The formula had to do with the teams that could declare themselves eligible as of April 15. It's one of the reasons why we had to shift everything back. Taylor do you know anything?
 - a. *Martin*: To be eligible, you must have sailed your conference qualifier and the number of berths will be based on the number of teams that sailed the conference qualifier.
- ii. *Mollicone*: So, you can only qualify through the conference championship, not any at-large berths?
 1. *Kalin*: We'll stress to Danielle and Mitch that it would really be nice to know how many berths for each qualifier.
- iii. *Mollicone*: I thought I remember that there would be some at-large berths, and how would that be handled? Just curious how that will work.
 1. *Assad*: The bigger concern is if there will be enough teams to host a Nationals.
- iv. *Bresnahan*: I had a long conversation with Taylor and Matt Lindblad, and Matt brought up good points. Sure, we can have our New England Championships, but if teams come online after that date, how do we handle them? If there are berths available how would that go down? Obviously there should be some consideration. What I brought up is I think there could be a problem hosting Nationals so late in May and early in June if teams are disconnected from their testing centers and being off book from the college. I think John and Matt have a point.

- c. *Assad*: One thing I know I'll have on my plate going forward along with Preston is fueling our committees at the ICSA level to match our 2021 and beyond college sailing committee profile which includes outside stakeholders and club sports coordinators and varsity athletics administrators. I think it's a good opportunity to get some additional voices who have experience in other sports involved with our sport as well as to retain some of the knowledge people of outside stakeholders. Mike and I had a running list of people that would be good last spring, and everyone that has a list of people that would be good candidates. In particular, we have a lot of teams on this call, and if you work with an administrator or director from your school who cares, they could be a good candidate. Reach out to me if you know anyone.

VI. ICSA Winter Meeting Update: Women's Team Race; Recruiting Committee

- a. *Kalin*: We'll hear about this tomorrow

VII. 2020 Singlehanded National Championship Update – Moose McClintock

- a. *Kalin*: Moose I know you've written up something?
 - i. *McClintock*: I'm still waiting to hear back from Mitch on a lot of the stuff in terms of ICSA's support and how many boats will be made available, whether I'm supposed to deal with that and housing. If I'm supposed to find boat dealers – it's all be vague. I just received something from Brad confirming the diversity, but overall, there's questions still about the overall participation of the sailors. Who is supposed to chase down the COVID paperwork, whether there will be testing there, and it's still a bit up in the air? I drafted preliminary SI's to give us a basis to work off of, but Mitch hasn't given me any feedback on what ICSA would like to see for anything.
- b. *Kalin*: Let's put together a meeting next week, John Mollicone knows the in's and out's and he'd be really good. We'll try to put together an agenda to cover these things. I know it's impossible for you to cover the admin for the COVID stuff, so we'll have to come up with some support from NEISA to help you with that. It's too distracting to deal with in the last 3-4 days before the event. In terms of your report for Mitch tomorrow, just put down what you know and we'll try to fill in some gaps.

VIII. Unfinished Business: Survey of NEISA on Overlapping Season Concept

- a. *Kalin*: We're voting "no" for split season because we just don't know what it looks like. We can't just vote on something blindly. MAISA is going to do the same and they just don't want to rush through it. It may be one of those things that passes anyways, so we'll have to figure that out. I hope that represents everyone's view. The obvious answer just never came forward, so the idea would be it doesn't pass. We want to get to a place where enough people are happy about it.

- b. *Bresnahan*: I mean this positively, but we have great committees, but most of these NEISA calls are spent saying “I don’t have time”, or “I need to make this quick” etc. Can we work around the schedules of people that are presenting? For a lot of us not on these committees, it’s just getting jammed down our throat.
 - i. *Kalin*: I had an absolutely mandatory meeting that was switched so we had to change this meeting.
- c. *Bresnahan*: When we’re getting really important and votable information, it’s just that information doesn’t disseminate down to the masses.
 - i. *Pizzo*: We talked about this a little bit; it is pretty challenging to schedule these calls right now. Maybe we should poll the Exec committee, I just fear opening it up to all of NEISA, but I understand what you’re saying, at least the people that are presenting.
- d. *Bresnahan*: At least pre-emails or a pre-document, because I think a lot of times, we get off these calls and there’s a lot of unanswered information.
 - i. *Kalin*: I think the Slack is helping to get a lot of information out there. There is a tremendous amount of change going on right now, and this change is important. Tomorrow’s meeting will be huge.
- e. *Kalin*: Jeff if you get muted tomorrow you need to pass me the info.

IX. **Time of Next Meeting**

- a. March 4th at 11am