

**NEISA Executive Committee Conference Call Meeting Notes**  
**May 9, 2018**

Action Items

**1. NEISA Specific Action Items**

- a. Assad, Mollicone and Pizzo to get feedback from NEISA to develop a new in-conference interconference penalty

**2. NEISA Action Items involving the ICSA**

**3. ICSA Action Items**

Motions

1. Motion to suspend the in-conference interconference penalty and for now, apply the standard Scheduling Penalty
  - a. Vote
    - i. Passes, 14 yay, 1 nay

**Next Call: September 12th, 11:00 AM**

***Meeting Notes:***

**I. Call to order**

- A. [Roll Call](#): Justin Assad (Commissioner), Charlie Welsh (President), Peter Lynn (Vice-President), Brian Swingly (Special Projects), Diana Weidenbacker (N. Region Graduate Rep), Mike O'Connor (C. Region Graduate Rep), John Mollicone (S. Region Graduate Rep), Nellie Stidham (N. Region Undergraduate Rep), Ally Schwerdtfeger (C. Region Undergraduate Rep), Brian Nelson (S. Region Undergraduate Rep), Kylie Freitas (At Large), David White (SHU/FF), Caroline Patten (UVM), Zack Leonard (Yale), Amanda Callahan (RWU), Jeffrey Bresnahan (Connecticut College), Quentin Chafee (Brown), Skip Whyte (URI), Mike Kalin (MIT), Ken Legler (Tufts)

**II. Review of April Meeting Minutes**

**III. Commissioner's Report - Justin Assad**

**IV. Discussion of potential date change for Women's Team Race National Invitational**

**Old Business**

**V. 2019 National Championships - Assad**

- A. We have been working really hard on this with the ICSA and have some positive news: Laser Performance is stepping up and continuing to support College Sailing

and are going to stand by their commitment financially even if we use a fleet of boats that is non-LP at the National Championship

1. Really exciting news for NEISA as everyone knows, we have been kind of stuck getting a second fleet of LP boats.
- B. John and I have been primarily working on this. In the past few weeks URI has come online to potentially co-host the event, but we are still getting to the finish line with URI's administration on the exact details but we're pretty excited about this as a realistic solution.
1. I think URI last hosted in 2001 so it'll be good to have them back as a co-host.
  2. All of the details are similar to what we have described on these calls from the beginning, everything out of Sail Newport and pretty well organized.
- C. Budget, Cost of Moving Boats
1. I think the one item we want to talk about is the finances of moving the boats from URI to Sail Newport and potentially the cost of moving Brown's boats to Newport.
  2. I kind of loosely budgeted this at \$2,000 but I have heard some different quotes in the \$1,500-\$2,500 range to get a fleet of boats to Newport and back. That was the target number I had budgeted but as I said in the email I sent to some people yesterday, if we were to add that on to NEISA teams for our Nationals berths, our savings from not having to travel out of conference would still be a significant positive even with making it an additional \$200 fee for each berth that teams qualify for, so up to \$600 if a team qualified for all three.
    - a) This was my thinking on a good way to shake out the finances on that and have a minimal impact on everybody, but I wanted to present it to the group and see if people had input on it. Before we take input, John and Skip am I missing any details?
    - b) Skip: I'm still waiting, John and I haven't had a chance to go over the spreadsheet.
    - c) John: Sorry I've been away the past few days and I don't have my spreadsheet with me with the updated budget but Skip I'll get that to you tomorrow because I'll be in my office tonight. We still have a lot to do on the budget and are going to be asking other teams in NEISA to help with support boats and we want to have some other people and teams involved to help, especially team racing. There's still a lot to do but I think our budget, a lot will depend on how many power boats we can bring in from the outside too, so that'll be important. Like Justin said, I think it's really important that

we'll be able to host this with a fleet of non-LP boats and that URI wants to step up and co-host with us. We're really excited and don't want to do this alone anymore.

- d) Assad: Great, that's what we're looking at. We can save a ton of money with, John what do we think? An additional 4-6 boats from other programs rather than renting those boats from Sail Newport and we can save a significant amount of money. That's where a significant cost is coming from. Is that kind of in the ballpark of what we had in mind?
- (1) John: The expenses are power boats, using their facility, the tents. You know, they set up everything like the tent and have bathrooms and being able to use their space and they get all the permitting for us and everything. It's really nice that it's kind of turn key and we just show up with the boats. Yes, we're going to need to get [phone cut out]
  - (2) Callahan: In the meantime, Roger Williams can contribute 2 power boats.
  - (3) Leonard: Yale can bring one for sure.
  - (4) Assad: Yeah, I figured it'd be easy, Dartmouth will bring a boat or two and we have a lot of people that routinely help out with coach boats so yeah I don't think it'll be too difficult to get a few boats and that'll help us a lot on the budget side of things for sure.
  - (5) Legler: This is Ken, you probably don't want our power boats but we might be able to help out in another way. We have some people that'd be happy to sail URI's boats in a nice Southwest wind from URI to Newport and in a nice Northwest wind from Brown to Newport.
    - (a) General chuckling
- e) Assad: Ok great, we'll leave that up to everybody and figures this out down the road. I want to take a poll from the call and we do have enough people to take a vote but I want to get feedback from everyone first, what do people think about the idea of having an additional fee just to New England teams, like an extra \$200 per berth to help take care of the expense of getting the boats from URI to Newport.
- (1) Welsh: Justin, are you making a motion or just asking for opinions?

- (2) Assad: I'm just asking for opinions, I'm looking for feedback on what people think of it.
- (3) Whyte: Skip here, I'm just doing some mental math and between Women's, Team Racing and Coed, how many berths are we looking at? 24?
- (a) Assad: I counted it at 23 total berths
  - (b) Whyte: It seems like you may be over budgeting this at \$200 per entry based on your estimate.
  - (c) Assad: I did that because I don't have a hard estimate and I ballparked that number because it would also take care of if we needed to pay people to load/unload the boats, that would be factored in and if we used that money to move Brown's boats as well if Brown wanted to do it, one way or the other way by trailer. So those were my calculations on it.
- (4) Whyte: So are we willing to consider a surcharge to this entry fee to do this and the second question is what's the amount?
- (a) Assad: Assuming we're talking about an amount that would be...I guess the amount probably depends, what do people on the call think?
  - (b) Legler: I was wondering if it could be \$100 per event, or in other words \$300 if you qualify for all 3 and \$100 if you only qualify for one.
  - (c) Assad: Yeah, that gets us to \$2,300.
- (5) Assad: The concept of the surcharge, let's try to tackle that first. Does anybody think that's a really bad idea?
- (a) Mike: No, I'm all for it
  - (b) Callahan: Same, I'm fine with it
  - (c) Legler: Justin, it's a great idea
  - (d) Assad: It seems like everybody gets it that we, ultimately for the teams that attend that should save us a significant amount of money because we won't be going to California or South Carolina so that's the target.
- (6) Whyte: Skip back here, with another budget related thing, maybe this goes to John. Brown and URI will be bringing

boats off their docks with cradles to Sail Newport and what are we going to be putting the boats on?

- (a) Assad: I'll need to double check with John on this, but I think they will be going on the docks that are in the rotation basin there at the end of Fort Adams. I think John went into a zone with no service because I don't think he's on the call anymore. But that was what I thought would happen with those, similar to last time.
  - (b) Whyte: Obviously we're not excited about putting our boats on a beach somewhere with no storage.
  - (c) Assad: Right, if they're not being stored on the docks overnight then we'll get 18 dollies there from somewhere. I think that'd be the logical resolution.
- (7) Assad: Any other questions about that?
- (a) Legler: Yes, I have a question and excuse me for joining a little late, I may have missed this already, but is it no longer a need to have both fleets be LP?
    - (i) Assad: Yeah, that's right Ken, I'm not sure if this is a one time thing, but for this year, LP has agreed to stand by their financial commitment even if we use one fleet that is non-LP. That's a really good thing and there's a couple things - they'll still be the title sponsor and we will still need to feature the LP fleet. In team racing, for instance, we will need to use the LP fleet, the whitecap fleet, in the round of 8 and Final Four, but in general the fact that they're willing to do it is really a positive thing.
  - (b) Assad: Alright, so any other thoughts? It sounds like we have general support for the concept of a surcharge if needed for that 2019 National Championship expense for moving boats and we'll try to get some firm numbers on that. I'll also talk to Alden to see what NEISA can contribute towards that as well.

## **VI. Suspend In-Conference Interconference Penalty - Assad**

A. I want to have discussion about this first, but I intend to move that we suspend the in-conference interconference penalty and basically, we ran into an issue in this in the fall with BC and the Nickerson and I'll be totally frank, my team ran into an issue with this in the Spring with the Morris Trophy and we scrambled like crazy to get a team that was able to attend, the reason it was hard for us was that we had a number of people that were quite sick that week, and they were ultimately excused by our trainer but it got me thinking and looking at the penalty. Frankly, I think the penalty, for teams that are ranked below 18th or 19th, the penalty has no consequence for these teams because they don't attend these events even when they're open berths available. For the teams that are in play for these events, there aren't a lot of regattas that end up with long wait lists here that have no shows. The only regattas that we have no shows where spots aren't filled are events that don't have a lot of demand anyways so we're trying to support an event and then being penalized for not being able to do that. I think ultimately, I felt like the punishment didn't fit the crime which I think is the case when a team is penalized, it's like an administrative oversight that's the problem and not a deliberate act to ignore. So that's where I'm coming from on why I think the penalty is not very valuable. Some more background, I'm the one that started this penalty back in 2008, I think I proposed it. Back then, the Spring schedule looked quite different and I was coaching UVM then, we were ranked 13th in New England and we couldn't get in to any interconference regattas on a lot of the Spring weekends. We were waitlisted and one particular weekend, Dartmouth was in three interconference regattas and Vermont was in zero and we had to go sail a Southern Series which was won by 48 points or something like that, we purposefully sailed the top team to show how we thought the situation was dumb, so that's why I suggested the penalty back then but ultimately I've kind of come around on it and I think the team that's in that situation this year has that access to the event they want and want to sail so that's my take on it. My idea is we try it with just a normal no-show or late drop penalty for now and if it's not significant enough, we can always re-evaluate at the end of the Fall or at any point. Open to the floor

1. Mike: You said the landscape has changed pretty dramatically in terms of berths available and such, there are probably a handful of different berths at different regattas. I think the penalty doesn't fit the crime.
2. Assad: Does anyone think the penalty is correct and that we're going the right direction with the penalty?
3. Whyte: Not a well formulated thought, can you state what we're doing? Replacing the in-conference interconference no show penalty with the standard no show penalty. Can you explain to me what that is

- a) Assad: The way the current scheduling system works, every team begins with a 12 point penalty cushion and you get penalized per day. A no show penalty is 6 points per day and all of our interconference regattas are 2 days so that would be a 12 point penalty. If you late drop an interconference regatta, that would be 4 points per day so an 8 point penalty. Essentially you have a cushion to use where there's some forgiveness for mistakes but if it continues happening throughout the course of a calendar year then penalties start accruing penalty points and then you get a penalty ranking which ultimately, usually, has a minimal impact on scheduling ranking but it can drop you 1 or 2 scheduling places depending on the year.
- b) Whyte: Obviously sounds like the penalty you're proposing to drop is pretty substantial but the standard penalty is essentially nothing and maybe you replace it, instead of getting rid of it entirely, with a penalty that if you miss an in-conference interconference event you use up all of your points or some other compromised number but it is important that people understand it's an obligation to show up. You know, we host minor events and at a few of our recent events, we had a lot of no shows which was disappointing.
- c) Assad: Skip, I agree 100% on that, I just thought it may be an opportunity to see if without a penalty, if we would still run into issues with teams either late-dropping or no-showing these interconference regattas. I just wasn't sure where we were at on it
- d) Skip: I agree about the penalty, but going to the standard penalty for in-conference interconference events sends the message it could be treated the same way as a Southern Series, that's too small a penalty.
- e) Assad: Ok, yep, I hear that

4. Assad: Anybody else?

#### B. Vote

- 1. Assad: What I'd like to do is call for a vote. **I would like to move that we suspend the in-conference interconference penalty and for now, we apply the standard scheduling penalty.** Can I get a second on that?
  - a) Second
- 2. Assad: So Skip, I think with that we can continue to look at different. I'd like to suspend it now so if we get to the Fall and haven't come up with a solution yet we're still not penalizing teams in this fashion which

everyone seems to agree is too excessive of a penalty. We can kick the can down the road a bit for the summer and decide if it's a straight drop of a scheduling ranking position (moving one position down) or something along those lines if we try to solve this problem down the road. Any more discussion about this? I know we just had a few people come on late, we're discussing suspending the in-conference interconference no show penalty for the time being until we come up with something else so we have some flexibility while we're figuring out the next solution.

- a) Mollicone: Hey, it's John sorry I lost you before, I missed that whole conversation. Does that mean, what does that mean in terms of the no-show penalty with dropping late, the not showing up at all.
    - (1) Assad: So I did just go through that
    - (2) Mollicone: No worries, we can talk about it offline later
    - (3) Assad: it would mimic the penalty for every other regatta in New England and so it would be a pretty minor penalty, sometimes it would have no impact on your scheduling ranking and in some years, we've had teams that are ranked highly drop a position or two if they have no-showed more than one event basically but ultimately it would be very lenient and I agree with Skip in that it would be too lenient of a penalty overall but I think continuing to hold us to the most excessive penalty we have now is not right either. So, I think suspending the current penalty and giving everyone some time to figure it out is the right move
  - b) Leonard: Can I add one thing? I tend to agree that we should reduce this penalty dramatically and here's why. Most weekends, nearly every team in NEISA is in several regattas. Usually, if they're going to drop a regatta, it will be the lower and less desirable ones first. So, by the time someone gets to not being able to show up at an intersectional, if it's not a total mistake, they have some kind of serious problem usually.
    - (1) Assad: Agreed
  - c) Assad: So that's the background on it, any other questions or comments before I call for a vote?
3. Assad: **Let's call for a vote here.** Those of you that are online can vote in the yay/nay column and if you're not online I can enter a vote for you.
- a) Whyte: Is this a scheduling matter that everyone votes in or is it exec comm only?

- (1) Assad: You know, that's a good question, I've been treating it as executive committee only but it sure seems like a scheduling matter. Let's switch over to the scheduling vote page and every team can vote on the scheduling vote page. I think it makes sense to have everyone that's on the call vote. So if you're not by a computer, I can enter a vote for your team.
- (2) Weidenbacker: Justin, this is Diana, so you want us on the scheduling vote page as opposed to the executive committee page?
- (3) Assad: Yes, one vote per team on this, I think it makes sense given it is a scheduling issue.
- (4) Weidenbacker: Therefore, if you vote yay you are in agreement with the proposal?
- (5) Assad: Yes, if you vote yay it's a vote to suspend the interconference penalty. Enter the number 1 as opposed to "Y"
  - (a) Welsh: Can you put yay for me for BU?
    - (i) Assad: Yep, got it
  - (b) Legler: Can you put yay for Tufts?
    - (i) Assad: Yep, got it
  - (c) Leonard: Justin, yay for Yale
    - (i) Assad: Yep, got it

b) Vote

(1) Passes, 14 yay, 1 nay

- c) Assad: Looks like this passes here. It's my fault we don't have a solution yet, I haven't had a chance to work on it yet so Skip I know you and I are on the same page. John and Frank have also been tasked with helping me with this so let's try to work on it this summer and what we think could be good solutions and we can get those out on either the coaches or all NEISA list to get feedback from everybody and potentially implement something right at the beginning of the fall.
  - (1) Whyte: My concern and the reason I voted no is that it would be easy to forget about it and do nothing but we need to come up with some alternative. That's a little different than something that doesn't matter at all.
  - (2) Assad: Agreed, so I'll keep it on my to-do list and send around some discussion this summer and maybe at the

Brooke Gonzalez clinic you and John and I can sit down and try to chat about it and figure out something that makes sense.

## New Business

### **VII. Change to PR 14 - Assad**

- A. Discussing a change to Procedural Rule 13. The Pacific Coast has proposed to change, I don't know what exactly the impetus is behind it, but my guess would be having to buy flights or when I've heard John Vandemore talk about it he's talked about the rules being antiquated.
  1. Pizzo: Justin, I think it's PR14 that they're talking about here with crews and substitutions
  2. Assad: Yeah, it looks like it is PR14 in the proposal it says PR13 which is not correct
  3. Pizzo: So PR13 is Safety: swimming requirements and PFDs and uniforms and 14 is crew substitution
  4. Assad: Yeah, so it should be PR14, it's incorrect
- B. The proposal says College Sailing is mainly sailed at two fleet venues where it is impossible to show up with just three players, by not allowing to switch crews back and forth we are eliminating the amount of sailing a potential heavy air crew could have as well as increasing the travel size of the roster. We have moved on from the days where there was a threat that one crew could sail all of the races, especially at our championships and so the proposal would change it to say: there is no limitation on substitutions within a regatta except that skippers would still be locked into their divisions and it would mimic the unlimited crew changes that already exist in team racing.
  1. Assad: I personally do not see any problem with the rule the way it currently is, but it is a disadvantage for teams that maybe do not have 2 alternate crews, whether they are bigger or smaller crews, but I think in general having the rule gets more people sailing, or that's my thought. What do people think?
  2. Whyte: One reason I like this proposal is that the three division format that MIT uses where you are swapping fleets every set, if you have crews that are better in one boat or another, they can only do one switch. When you only switch at the end of the day, the current rule is much less of a restriction but it's quite restrictive when you're switching fleets with every set.
    - a) Assad: Yep, that makes sense

3. Legler: I think the old rule has served us well for a really long time and I'm a little afraid that in the 2 division dinghy regatta... Let's say that you had a championship with no wind on Saturday and Sunday you're limited to 6 races per division so you could have a crew sail 8 races and the other crew only sail 4 races which doesn't seem to be in the spirit of our rules.
4. Leonard: I am in agreement with Skip. I think that it makes sense to suspend the rule for 3 division, 2 fleet regattas but otherwise I don't think it makes sense.
5. Bresnahan: Yeah, I would agree with the 3 division. Justin, you had said it gets more people but actually it doesn't get more people. I don't care either way but I think the 3 division thing Skip figured out is definitely helping switches.
6. Leonard: With 3 divisions, it's really hard to use heavy crews, like they basically get spent after 4 races and that's not fair and I think that's the place where I agree with it but I agree that it's a slippery slope. We're all in this position when we go into say Nationals and if you manage your team in a way where you put your two best crews in the whole regatta, well it'd be pretty hard to have a team that way. I think suspending this rule in general is a mistake but in this specific situation with 3 divisions, I think it's good.
  - a) Assad: Ok, I could see that Zack, I like that.
7. Whyte: I'd be happy to restate my suggestion and just limit it to 3 division, 2 fleet situations as well.
  - a) Assad: Got it.
8. Assad: It's worth pointing out that the MCSA, the Northwest, SEISA, those three conferences are having single fleet championships so they're definitely not up into the next level that the rule is referencing. I think the majority of regattas happen with single fleets even though there are a significant amount of top level events that have 2 fleets. Big picture is valuable
9. Assad: So, 3 division, 2 fleet regattas, New England would support this but it sounds like below that level, anything else (2 division, 2 fleet, any single fleet regattas) we would not support it. Is this how everyone on the call feels? I don't need to take a vote, I think I have a pretty good feel for where everyone is at. If you don't agree with that or think we are moving in the wrong direction, speak up.
  - a) Matt (MIT): I think that, at least on our team, we have like 40 people and they all want to go sailing and I don't see why we're interested in having crews sailing in multiple divisions and

basically removing that rule creates less opportunities for people on our team to sail if we were to run our team that way. I don't agree with changing the rule, just wanted to throw that out there.

(1) Assad: Thanks

b) Mollicone: I agree with Matt

C. Assad: I'll send a poll out to the coaches and all NEISA lists to try to get some feedback from each team on this because I think a full vote would help direct me on the right way to move forward. On the call, we've had some good discussion I think but I want to make sure I get feedback from everyone. Sounds like we have at least a few people... I see the reasoning with the 3 division, 2 fleet, but I still kind of lean the way that Matt and John lean. If you have several 145-150 pound alternates it's better to use 2 or 3 of them instead of just one.

1. Leonard: I want to switch back on that. As we get more and more negative feedback from our sailors who go to events and either don't sail or sail 2-3 races and then aren't used. The reason I think the 3 division regatta exception is important is because you're virtually guaranteeing that your heavy crews will only sail 4 races if you don't change it. I don't think that's good and I don't think you should have to bring 6 heavy crews so you always have one for 420s. That's stupid.
2. Assad: Ok, I'm not sure I understand why you would need 6, would it only be 3? One per division?
3. Leonard: You'd have to bring one per division for every division
4. Assad: Yes, that could end up being 3 people sitting around if it's a light weekend. I could see that, our sailors don't like that either for sure
5. Peter Bailey: This is Peter Bailey, I'm a graduate and agree with what Zack says and from my experiences when I was in California too. When you're trying to bring people to events it might not make a ton of sense. I mean, their PCCs now are in 3 divisions with 2 fleets so I'd be interested in what they think out there too, not necessarily a bad thing to have less people sail at an event.
6. Whyte: It's also a reality in the 420 situation. Say your skipper is the same size, you need a heavier crew in a 420 than you do in an FJ. You're kind of stuck. In a 2 division situation, when you're switching boats at the end of the day, the switch limitation is not so onerous.
7. Assad: Yeah, this stuff can be very tricky, especially because we can get into very specialized, anecdotal scenarios, each of which has pros and cons. I think for everybody thinking about the big picture and what makes sense for their teams is most important but also the impact on the whole country is relevant as well, I think we've had a good discussion about this.

I get the sense that we're not at a closing point on it so I think the right move for me is to solicit more feedback from the conference and I can send out a survey and get everyone's input which will direct me on how to represent NEISA at the annual meeting.

8. Assad: It sounds like, am I correct in assuming, that nobody on the call thinks it's the right move for 2 division, 2 fleet regattas?
  - a) General agreement
9. Assad: Ok, that's super helpful that we're clear on that and I can talk about that then at the ICSA level. Great, any other business? That takes us to the end of items I had to discuss. Any other items people want to talk about?

## VIII. General Discussion

### A. Vetting for New England Championships

1. Bresnahan: At the winter meeting, we followed the process (as did others) that the Competition Committee had about vetting who is going to host New England Championships and there weren't enough bids so the committee suspended that but are they going to change all the rules that they let out? Right now we should be in a process that regattas should start to be vetted. What's going to happen with that and when are we going to start putting that to action again because we suspended that at the Winter Meeting.
2. Swingly: Yeah, I will take the heat on this one I totally dropped the ball and so we need to get this going again. Seeing as it was my original intention to have this ready and have a vote during this call but it didn't happen so Jeff to answer your question, I will get my committee working on it as soon as possible and Justin, do we have any calls this summer?
  - a) Assad: We could, we don't have any calls during the summer, I was just looking up the schedule and it looks like we already have our September call scheduled. There are some options. We could do a call next week just to vote on these championships if you guys were comfortable doing it that way. We could do it all completely electronically as a phone call may not be needed. I think those are the three options: wait until September, phone call next week, or do it electronically next week
  - b) Leonard: Are we talking about the Championships for next spring?
    - (1) Assad: Yes, Spring 2019
    - (2) Leonard: Why don't we do it next week? We now know the Nationals venue and I think we should do it sooner rather than later.

- c) Singly: We'll work on it and get it out soon.
- d) Assad: If you will just publish that list of potential bids to the NEISA email list everyone will be able to see it there
  - (1) Singly: Sounds good

IX. Meeting Closing

- A. Assad: Our next call is **September 12th at 11am** and we will have a special call next week to tackle New England Championships for 2019.
- B. Thank you everyone for your time, good luck to the teams advancing to ODU and we'll talk to everybody soon
  - 1. Meeting Adjourned