

**Report of the
NCAA/USOC
JOINT TASK FORCE**


September 1, 2005

Report of the
NCAA/USOC Joint Task Force

September 1, 2005

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	Page 5
The Joint Task Force	Page 11
Methodology	Page 13
Mission Statement	Page 15
Foundational Concepts	Page 17
The Sports that are the Focus of the Task Force's Work	Page 18
Identifying the At-Risk Sports	Page 19
Emerging Sports	Page 23
Understanding the Factors That Contribute to the Loss of Opportunities for Student-Athletes	Page 25
Recommendations	Page 29
Increasing the Resources Available to Support the At-Risk and Emerging Sports	Page 31
Building Awareness and Commitment	Page 35
Altering the Value Proposition Represented by These Sports	Page 38
Identifying Preferred Strategies for Controlling Costs	Page 40
Increasing the Marketability of the At-Risk Sports	Page 41
Aligning the Rules to Support the Mission	Page 43
Setting Goals to Measure Progress	Page 44
Concluding Statement	Page 45



Executive Summary

The mission of the NCAA/USOC Task Force (the “Task Force”) is to develop recommendations for implementation by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (the “NCAA”) and the United States Olympic Committee (the “USOC”) designed to protect and expand the opportunities for American student-athletes and coaches to realize the benefits associated with participation in collegiate athletic programs and sports traditionally included in the program for the Olympic Games.

It is a mission grounded in the view that in well-administered programs, participation in collegiate athletics represents a uniquely valuable educational experience for student-athletes and enriches the quality of campus life generally. As such, there is value in maximizing the opportunity for young people to participate in and benefit from that experience. And there is further value in focusing on those sports that have traditionally been included in the program of the Olympic Games because many of those sports have contributed significantly to the history and success of collegiate sports in America, and the continued existence of some of these sports in collegiate athletic programs is at issue.

In considering ways to protect and expand the opportunity for American student-athletes and coaches to realize the benefits associated with participation in collegiate athletic programs that offer sports traditionally included in the program for the Olympic Games, the Task Force developed the following eight (8) recommendations:

Increasing the Resources Available to Support the At-Risk and Emerging Sports

Recommendation 1

The NCAA and USOC should jointly make an ongoing investment in (while also seeking the investment of others) a new independent charitable foundation for the purpose of fostering the

sponsorship* of Olympic sports by America's colleges and universities. That foundation should be in place and operational early in 2006.

Building Awareness and Commitment

Recommendation 2

Establish a program to encourage the widespread adoption of the following value statement for maintaining broad-based intercollegiate athletic programs in the United States:

[Insert name of organization or institution] believes that participation in intercollegiate athletics represents a uniquely valuable educational experience for student-athletes and enriches the quality of campus life generally. As such, there is great benefit, consistent with the academic mission of American colleges and universities, in ensuring that diverse athletic opportunities are available to students, especially in those sports that connect to the Olympic ideals, inspire young people and attribute to a lifelong commitment to fitness. We are committed to doing all we reasonably can to help ensure that those diverse athletic opportunities continue to exist as part of intercollegiate athletics in America.

Recommendation 3

a) Establish an electronic syndication system to identify and distribute to media outlets (including, in particular, campus newspapers and local papers in college towns) news and features related to the at-risk and emerging sports and the student-athletes and coaches who participate in them.

* While the words "sponsor" or "sponsorship," when used in the context of athletics, often imply a commercial relationship, in this Report the terms are used (as they traditionally are by the NCAA) to refer to a school's inclusion of a sport as part of its athletic program.

b) Create a continuing education program to help coaches become more effective advocates for their programs within the university community. This program, although developed centrally for use across all sports, should be administered through the national governing bodies and/or sport-specific coaches' associations.

c) From among the excellent materials that have already been created by sports like wrestling, swimming and tennis, identify and share best practices for responding to a threatened elimination of a program. This process should result in the production of a standard set of materials that can be easily modified to fit the needs of the individual sports.

Altering the Value Proposition Represented by These Sports

Recommendation 4

Promote models for more effectively utilizing existing at-risk and emerging sport programs to support:

- Sport-specific community outreach,
- The training of elite athletes in Olympic sports,
- Hosting of events (creating a presumption in favor of awarding event to university facilities whenever possible). Those events need not be limited to those involving college athletes. Any event that effectively promotes the sport and/or brings additional revenue to the school is a candidate to be hosted by the college or university.

Identifying Preferred Strategies for Controlling Costs

Recommendation 5

Conduct a survey of the NCAA membership to identify the preferred strategies to be implemented to control the costs associated with operating the at-risk and emerging sports. The survey should be completed and the resulting data available for review by April, 2006.

Increasing the Marketability of the At-Risk Sports

Recommendation 6

a) Consider modification of the NCAA amateurism, participation, and competition rules to increase the likelihood that some of the most accomplished athletes in the at-risk and emerging sports will continue to participate in collegiate athletics.

b) Explore ways to more effectively leverage the event management and marketing resources of the NCAA and national governing bodies ("NGBs") to develop new events and/or market existing events in order to more effectively highlight collegiate competition in at-risk and emerging sports while also bringing additional revenue to those programs.

Aligning the Rules to Support the Mission

Recommendation 7

Work closely with the NCAA's Olympic Liaison Committee to develop a package of legislative proposals designed to protect and expand the opportunities for student-athletes to participate in the at-risk and emerging sports. Among the potential areas of focus for these legislative changes are the following:

- Modification of the sport sponsorship rules to include some modest reward for sponsoring these sports.
- Lessening of restrictions on training time for athletes who have achieved a certain high standard of academic performance.
- Expanding the circumstances under which athletes not currently enrolled in a college or university may practice and/or use university facilities with student-athletes and college coaches.
- Further relaxation of amateurism rules to perhaps:
 - limit consequences of money earned in Olympic sports prior to entering college
 - giving greater deference to funds paid by or through the NGB,
- Facilitate the underwriting of athletic scholarships by third parties including but not limited to the USOC or the NGBs.

Setting Goals to Measure Progress

Recommendation 8

Set numerical goals for maintaining and adding programs in the at-risk sports, issue an annual report of the industry's progress in furtherance of the goals, and offer special recognition of those schools and NGBs who have most effectively contributed to the solution (and those who have not).

The Joint Task Force

On May 11, 2004, the NCAA and the USOC announced the formation of a joint task force ("the Task Force") to examine the decline in sponsorship of Olympic sports by America's colleges and universities.

The NCAA and the USOC each appointed members to the Task Force. The USOC appointed:

- Richard Bender, Executive Director, USA Wrestling
- Herman Frazier, Director of Athletics, University of Hawaii
- Ron Galimore, Senior Director of Men's Programs, USA Gymnastics
- Courtney Johnson, USOC Athletes Advisory Council Member
- William Martin, Director of Athletics, University of Michigan
- Andrew Valmon, Head Track and Field Coach, University of Maryland; USOC Athletes Advisory Council Member
- Jon Vegosen, Chairman of the US Tennis Association Collegiate Committee
- Chuck Wielgus, Executive Director, USA Swimming

The NCAA appointed:

- Andy Geiger, former Director of Athletics, The Ohio State University
- Ian Gray, Vice-Chair, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
- Larry James, Dean of Athletics and Recreational Programs and Services, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Kyle Kallander, Commissioner, Big South Conference; Chair Olympic Sports Liaison Committee
- Cheryl Levick, Director of Athletics, Saint Louis University
- Peter Likins, President, University of Arizona

- Jean Lenti Ponsetto, Director of Athletics, DePaul University

Senior staff of both organizations also participated fully in the Task Force. Those individuals included:

- Jeff Howard, Director, Corporate Communications, USOC
- Tom Jernstedt, Executive Vice President, NCAA
- Kevin Lennon, Vice President for Membership Services, NCAA
- Jim Scherr, Chief Executive and Chief of Sport Performance, USOC
- Jennifer Strawley, Director of Membership Services/Student-Athlete Reinstatement, NCAA
- Judy Sweet, Vice President for Championships, NCAA
- Don Whittle, former Manager, Collegiate and International Programs, USOC

The Task Force was chaired by Jack Swarbrick, an attorney with extensive experience working in both collegiate and Olympic sports. In addition, the Task Force benefited from statistical analysis provided by both the NCAA and the USOC, and administrative support of Mr. Swarbrick's assistant, Rosanne Hunter.

Methodology

1. The Task Force completed its work over the course of 12 months, holding meetings on the following schedule:

July 21, 2004	Chicago
September 22, 2004	Indianapolis
January 5, 2005	Dallas (in association with the NCAA Convention)
April 7, 2005	Colorado Springs
June 17, 2005	Orlando (in association with the NACDA meeting)

2. The Task Force used the following principles to guide its operations:

- a) The Task Force was provided with and based its analysis upon a common base of statistical information assembled by the Chair with the assistance of the NCAA and the USOC.
- b) As reflected in the make-up of the Task Force, the location of its meetings, and the processes it created to communicate with interested parties, the Task Force solicited input broadly.
- c) The Task Force adhered strictly to the charge given to it by the NCAA and USOC. It is worth noting in this regard that the focus of the Task Force did not include a consideration of the merits of Title IX. While the impacts of Title IX were viewed as being relevant to the Task Force's deliberations, consideration of the merits or scope of the law as enforced and proposals for the modification of the law or its enforcement were not.
- d) The Task Force remained focused throughout its process on producing specific and substantive recommendations as part of a final Report to be issued by September 30, 2005. In developing those recommendations, only proposals that enjoyed broad support among the members of the Task Force were given priority.

3. The Task Force divided its work into the following areas of focus:
- Defining the Task Force's mission and foundational concepts
 - Identifying and quantifying the problem
 - Developing recommendations
 - Building implementation strategies



Mission Statement

The mission of the NCAA/USOC Task Force is to develop recommendations for implementation by the NCAA and USOC designed to protect and expand the opportunities for American student-athletes and coaches to realize the benefits associated with participation in collegiate athletic programs in sports traditionally included in the program for the Olympic Games.

Several aspects of this Mission Statement merit additional discussion. The first is the importance the Task Force places on developing recommendations that are designed to do more than merely "stop the bleeding" associated with the elimination of Olympic sport opportunities for student-athletes. The Task Force's long-term goal is to contribute to the creation of an environment that also creates new opportunities through the creation of new programs or the re-establishment of programs that were previously eliminated.

Secondly, the Task Force clearly intends for the primary beneficiaries of its efforts to be American athletes and coaches. After all, the mission of one of the two sponsors of the Task Force, the USOC, is to achieve competitive success in the Olympic Games. Having said that, it is worth noting that the Task Force has not included in this Report any recommendations aimed at limiting the access of foreign athletes to American collegiate sports programs. In stressing the benefits of maintaining diversity in collegiate athletic programs, the Task Force believes that diversity should be encouraged in all its forms. To the extent that pursuit of diversity proves to be at odds with the best interests of the USOC and its national governing bodies, the Task Force believes it is up to those entities, using the tools available to them (e.g. funding mechanisms, selection of coaches to represent the United States, and awarding of events, etc.), to encourage change.

The mission statement of the Task Force also makes clear that the Task Force views the problem of the loss of programs in athletic departments in terms of its impact on both the student and the teacher, or, in the words of the mission statement, the student-athlete and the coach. The unique model that is American intercollegiate athletics not only provides an extraordinary opportunity for more than 360,000 athletes; it also offers a unique training ground for coaches. Collegiate athletic programs around the country and throughout the decades have developed the coaches who have helped to transform young lives through sport in colleges, high schools, local youth programs, and even foreign countries.

Finally, the mission statement refers to "sports traditionally included in the program of the Olympic Games." The Task Force recognizes that the program of sports included in the Olympic Games has been, and increasingly likely will be, subject to change. The focus of the efforts spawned by this Report ought to be mindful of changes to the Olympic program from quadrenium to quadrenium (especially as they relate to the addition of new sports and events). However, consistent with its view that there is value in maximizing the opportunity for young people to participate in and benefit from college athletics, the Task Force believes that a longer time horizon than a single Olympic quadrenium ought to be used when identifying "Olympic sports."

Foundational Concepts

The Task Force reflects a unique partnership between the two leaders of amateur athletics in America. And it reflects the view, shared by the USOC, the NCAA, and their members, that the subject matter of this Task Force is of great significance. That is the case because:

1. In well-administered programs, participation in collegiate athletics represents a uniquely valuable educational experience for student-athletes and enriches the quality of campus life generally. As such, there is value in maximizing the opportunity for young people to participate in, and benefit from, that experience.

2. In protecting and expanding the opportunities for students and educators to participate in intercollegiate athletics, there is further value in focusing on those sports that have traditionally been included in the program for the Olympic Games because: a) many of those sports have contributed significantly to the history and success of collegiate sports in America, and b) the continued existence of some of these sports in collegiate athletic programs is at issue.

3. The presence of collegiate programs in Olympic sports has been a critical factor in America's success in the Olympic Games and international championships. This is the case because those programs: a) effectively underwrite significant facility and program costs that would otherwise be borne by the Olympic sports industry, b) provide a critical arena for coaching development and athlete training and talent identification, and c) provide an indirect but important incentive to children (and their families) to participate in an Olympic sport.

4. There is value in this country's participation in the Olympic Games because that participation provides a unique experience for athletes and coaches, promotes goodwill among countries, and is a unifying force within the United States.

The Sports that are the Focus of the Task Force's Work

From among the sports which both have a championship sponsored by the NCAA and are traditionally included in the Olympic program of sports, there are two subsets of sports which are the focus of this Report. The first includes those sports that have experienced a measurable decline in sponsorship by colleges and universities during the past decade and are perceived as being at risk to experience further decline if some form of intervention does not occur. These are referred to in this Report as the "at-risk sports." The second are those sports that have been identified by the NCAA as "emerging sports" and are traditionally included in the Olympic program of sports.



Identifying the At-Risk Sports

The process of identifying the at-risk sports undertaken by the Task Force began by identifying the 39 sports for which the NCAA conducts a championship. From that list, the Task Force then eliminated the six sports that have not been part of the Olympic program:

Men's:

- Baseball
- Basketball
- Cross country
- Fencing
- ~~Football~~
- ~~Golf~~
- Gymnastics
- Ice Hockey
- ~~Laerosse~~
- Rifle
- Skiing
- Soccer
- Swimming and Diving
- Tennis
- Track & Field – Indoor
- Track & Field – Outdoor
- Volleyball
- Water Polo
- Wrestling

Women's:

- Basketball
- ~~Bowling~~
- Cross country
- Fencing
- Field Hockey
- ~~Golf~~
- Gymnastics
- Ice Hockey
- ~~Laerosse~~
- Rifle
- Rowing
- Skiing
- Soccer
- Softball
- Swimming and Diving
- Tennis
- Track & Field – Indoor
- Track & Field – Outdoor
- Volleyball
- Water Polo

With the remaining sports as the focus of its analysis, the Task Force then developed a methodology for identifying those sports that experienced a meaningful loss of participation opportunities for young people at America's colleges and universities. In conducting this analysis the Task Force elected to focus on the loss of sports sponsorship among D-I schools. This focus was adopted for two reasons. The first was the fact that a review of recent Olympic teams (see for example, Appendix B) confirmed that the vast majority of Olympic athletes and coaches who participated in collegiate sports did so at a D-I school. Secondly, by focusing on a single division

(and focusing on the percentage of sports sponsorship within that division) the Task Force avoided the complexity that would otherwise result from the movement of schools from one division to another during the time span of our analysis. In taking this approach, the Task Force wants to stress that it is not drawing any distinction between the quality or nature of a sports program offered at one classification of college or university versus another. The benefits to a student-athlete or educator-coach derived from participation in a well run sports program are equally valuable and important regardless of the nature of the school providing that experience.

Having established the sports and schools that would be the focus of its analysis, the Task Force then established a standard for measuring loss of opportunity. The test employed by the Task Force involved three steps.

Step 1. The Task Force required that the sport had experienced the elimination of at least ten (10) D-I programs during the 15-year period 1989 through and including 2004 (the "Period"). The Task Force recognizes that this reflects a very low threshold, but, as will become evident through the application of the other two steps in the process, this first step was designed largely as a method for quickly eliminating from consideration those sports that offered no evidence of a potential loss of opportunity. The application of this step eliminated an additional 12 sports from consideration as follows:

Men's:

- Baseball
- ~~Basketball~~

- Cross country
- Fencing

- Gymnastics
- ~~Ice Hockey~~
- Rifle

- Skiing
- Soccer

- Swimming and Diving
- Tennis
- Track & Field – Indoor
- Track & Field – Outdoor
- Volleyball
- Water Polo
- Wrestling

Women's:

- ~~Basketball~~

- ~~Cross country~~
- Fencing
- Field Hockey

- Gymnastics
- Ice Hockey
- Rifle
- Rowing
- ~~Skiing~~
- ~~Soccer~~
- ~~Softball~~
- Swimming and Diving
- ~~Tennis~~
- Track & Field – Indoor
- Track & Field – Outdoor
- ~~Volleyball~~
- ~~Water Polo~~

Step 2. From the list of remaining sports, the Task Force then applied the second part of the test by analyzing whether the **percentage** of D-I member institutions sponsoring the sport decreased during the Period as measured by the difference between the '03-'04 percentage of D-I institutions sponsoring the sport and the highest percentage sponsorship during the past 15 years. If it had, the third part of the test was applied.

Step 3. A determination was then made as to whether the sport had any one of the following characteristics:

- a) Recent experience suggesting that programs are continuing to be dropped?
- b) A number of current programs (relative to the number of programs in the sport during the Period) that supports the notion that the sport is at risk?
- c) A measurable decrease in squad size?

The analyses embodied in steps two and three of this process are reflected in the information included in this Report as Appendix A. It suggests that the Olympic sports identified below (in order of the total number of programs from fewest to greatest), should be considered at-risk as it relates to the further loss of sponsorship by American colleges and universities.

<u>Sport</u>	<u>Number of Programs</u>	<u>Decline in % Sponsorship</u>
Men's Gymnastics	17	8.1
Men's Water Polo	21	4.9
Men's Fencing	21	3.3
Men's Rifle	22	6.0
Men's Volleyball	23	1.1
Women's Rifle	29	1.6
Women's Gymnastics	64	3.6
Men's Wrestling	86	11.9
Men's Swimming/Diving	143	10.3
Men's Soccer	199	4.2
Men's Indoor Track	246	4.0
Men's Outdoor Track	264	3.7
Men's Tennis	269	10.9
Men's Cross Country	306	3.7

Note: Men's Rowing was eliminated from consideration at the outset because it is not included among the NCAA's 39 Championships. It is worth noting, however, that this Olympic sport also appears to be at risk as a collegiate sport with the percentage of members sponsoring the sport declining from 15% in 1996/97 to 7% in 2002-03. From 1989-90 through 2002-03, 71 D-I programs were dropped.

At first glance, it may strike some as odd that the Task Force has included among its list of at-risk sports some that continue to have very robust levels of sponsorship. Keep in mind, however, that the focus of the Task Force is the loss of opportunity, not the possible extinction of a sport. So, while men's gymnastics and water polo represent the most compelling examples of the at-risk sports because they have both very low levels of sponsorship and high rates of program terminations, men's tennis and swimming and diving – two sports with relatively high levels of sponsorship -- rank second and third (to wrestling) in the rate of program elimination over the past 15 years.

Emerging Sports

The NCAA has identified eight women's sports as "emerging sports." An emerging sport is one recognized by the NCAA that is intended to provide additional athletic opportunities to female student-athletes. NCAA member institutions are allowed to use emerging sports to help meet the NCAA minimum sports-sponsorship requirements and also to meet the NCAA minimum financial aid awards.

The current list of emerging sports (with the number of D-I schools sponsoring those sports listed in parentheses) includes:

Archery (3)	Equestrian (13)	Synchronized Swimming (4)
Badminton (1)	Rugby (1)	Team Handball (0)
Bowling (29)	Squash (8)	

Comparing this list to those sports traditionally included in the Olympic program eliminates bowling, rugby and squash from the scope of this Report. Among the remaining group of five emerging sports, none has yet reached the level of sponsorship to qualify as an NCAA Championship sport. In this sense these sports, although granted special status by the NCAA, might also be considered "at-risk" and so are included within the scope of the Task Force's efforts.

The combination of our analysis of the at-risk sports and the identification of the emerging sports results a final list of 19 sports that the Task Force believes should be the focus of its recommendations as follows:

Women's Sports

Archery	Rifle
Badminton	Synchronized Swimming
Equestrian	Team Handball
Gymnastics	

Men's Sports

Cross Country

Fencing

Gymnastics

Indoor Track

Outdoor Track

Rifle

Soccer

Swimming/Diving

Tennis

Volleyball

Water Polo

Wrestling



Understanding the Factors That Contribute to the Loss of Opportunities for Student-Athletes

In order to effectively fashion ways to help protect the opportunities for student-athletes and coaches to participate in the at-risk and emerging sports, the Task Force spent a significant amount of time identifying and discussing some of the factors that contribute most significantly to the loss of opportunity. Those include the following:

1. Financial constraints

First and foremost among the factors that threaten the ability of a college or university to provide a more diverse athletic experience is the rapidly rising cost of athletics. A series of market factors have combined to create enormous pressure on athletic department budgets. Those include, but are not limited to:

- a) The cost of an athletic scholarship. This is not only one of the largest elements of any athletic department budget, but also it is a cost over which the athletic department has little or no control. An athletic department may, as many have, elect to offer fewer athletic scholarships in a particular sport or eliminate a sport entirely, but it can do nothing to impact the underlying cost of that scholarship, dependent as it is on tuition rates and housing costs.
- b) The rising costs of salaries and employee benefits, compounded by the need to increase personnel assigned to compliance, academic support, and fundraising.
- c) Rapidly increasing costs for insurance and medical care.
- d) A highly competitive environment for personnel and facilities in those "revenue sports" that typically provide much of the funding necessary to operate all other sports.
- e) The important obligation of colleges and universities to add and effectively operate programs that allow schools to provide an equal athletic opportunity to both men and women.

These financial factors are made all the more significant by the separation in many D-I schools of the athletic department budgeting process from the normal school-wide budgeting process, with the

accompanying pressure to establish the financial self-sufficiency of athletics programs. The budget pressure faced by athletic departments across the country and the limited tools available to alleviate that pressure contribute to the creation of an environment where the elimination of entire sports has become commonplace.


2. Market Dynamics - The Cluttered Marketplace


Today, college and university athletic departments operate in an extraordinarily cluttered marketplace. The impacts of this are numerous. On the positive side, the existence of two 24-hour national cable networks devoted to college sports, more than 40 regional sports networks, satellite radio, an endless stream of sports news and special interest programming, and the Internet provide unparalleled levels of exposure. That exposure is occurring, however, in the context of an equally or perhaps even more dramatic growth in other segments of the sports and entertainment marketplace. As a result, the ability to command the attention of what have historically been natural audiences for college sports (students, alumni, and local residents) often becomes more difficult (especially for the non-revenue sports), and the need to both actively promote and explore new streams of revenue becomes greater. Of particular significance as it relates to the work of the Task Force is the fact that this cluttered marketplace can result in a perception of diminished student interest in the at-risk sports when athletic departments consider whether to eliminate a program. (See the 2001 Government Accounting Office Report on "Four Year Colleges' Experience Adding and Discontinuing Teams", GAO-01-297.) This perception can be of critical importance when athletic departments consider ways to reduce expenses.

This dynamic is not unique to college athletics. The same market conditions have created challenges for most of the national governing bodies as they attempt to deal with television and sponsorship markets that tend to place extraordinary value on those few properties that can rise above the clutter and diminished value of almost everything else.

3. Inertia

Especially for the most endangered among the at-risk sports, both the statistical and anecdotal evidence suggests that the elimination of programs tends to encourage the elimination of more programs. As natural rivalries, the critical mass needed to stage a conference championship, or an event of historical significance disappear, it becomes much easier for a school to conclude that the elimination of a sport makes sense. An important corollary to this observation is the fact that among the most endangered of the at-risk sports, the trend toward elimination is likely to continue absent some intervening force. The recommendations that follow are offered in hopes that they can serve as that intervening force.






Recommendations

As reflected by the foregoing analysis, the Task Force believes strongly in the importance of protecting the continued vitality of the at-risk and emerging sports as part of a diverse offering of athletic experiences for students at America's colleges and universities. The Task Force also recognizes, however, that achieving that result is a complex and difficult task. There is no "silver bullet" or single solution available, and the situation at each college and university is unique. Furthermore, all indications are that the conditions that have led schools to drop one or more sports will only become more challenging in the years ahead. The enormous economic pressures shaping decisions about the sponsorship of sports among NCAA member institutions are likely to continue to build well into the future.

The Task Force does not conclude from this, however, that its mission cannot be met. On the contrary, the members of this Task Force have come away from their 12-month immersion into this issue with renewed conviction in the importance of the at-risk sports and emerging sports, and a firmly held belief that meaningful progress can be made to ensure the long-term health of those sports as part of intercollegiate athletics in our country. Those sports add important diversity to a school's athletic offerings, provide valuable educational opportunities consistent with the overall mission of the college or university, and help to support America's success in international sports. In addition, participants in many of these sports develop a life-long commitment to physical fitness that both benefits them and provides an important example for fellow students and young people to follow.

It is also important to note that just as there is no single solution, the Task Force believes that it is not possible for any one entity, working alone, to achieve real progress. Instead, it will require the continued cooperation and shared commitment among the two sponsors of this Task Force – the NCAA and USOC – and their member institutions in the implementation of the recommendations that follow. Progress will not come quickly or easily, but it can and will happen.

It will happen so long as all involved understand that maintaining diverse athletic offerings as part of the American collegiate model requires the same sort of passion, diligence, and commitment that is reflected so effectively in the student-athletes we seek to serve.



Increasing the Resources Available to Support the At-Risk and Emerging Sports

Recommendation 1

The NCAA and USOC should jointly make an ongoing investment in (while also seeking the investment of others) a new independent charitable foundation for the purpose of fostering the sponsorship of Olympic sports by America's colleges and universities. This foundation should be in place and operational early in 2006.


Rationale. This is the first of the Task Force's recommendations because it is the most important, the most urgent, and the most impactful. Ensuring the continued vitality of Olympic sports as part of intercollegiate athletics requires additional resources. If we cannot find ways to increase those resources – the resources necessary to ensure vigilance, provide management, underwrite core functions, and fund innovation – the trend toward the elimination of the at-risk sports will undoubtedly continue.


In 1995, the NCAA and USOC joined together to create the Conference Grant Program. Between 1995 and 1997 this program distributed \$8 million in grants to collegiate conferences to help fund activities related to Olympic sports. Grants were made, for example, to establish a new sport confederation, underwrite conference championships, assist in getting events broadcast, and upgrading club programs to varsity status. This program made a significant contribution to the preservation of Olympic sports as part of the intercollegiate athletic landscape. However, the program had two limitations inherent in its structure which must be addressed in establishing the new entity proposed in this recommendation. The proposed entity must leverage any investment made by the NCAA and USOC to produce significantly greater resources that will be available to aid the at-risk and emerging sports, and it must be established with the expectation that it will play an ongoing role in the preservation of these sports.

Implementation. The model for this program should have the following characteristics:

- Ongoing independent entity with directors appointed by USOC and NCAA. Given the anticipated fund management and fundraising aspect of this entity, the board of directors should be of sufficient size and clout to be able to effectively assist in these matters. One model for consideration would be an eighteen or twenty-one-person board with 1/3 appointed by the USOC, 1/3 by the NCAA and 1/3 independent directors.
- Status as a public charity under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.
- A pro forma that creates a goal for building a corpus of at least \$60 million by the end of year five. (A preliminary version of a pro forma reflecting that goal is included in Appendix C.) Achieving this will require a meaningful multi-year seed investment by the NCAA and USOC, but the independence of the new entity also creates an opportunity to build the corpus through:
 - government earmarks
 - foundation grants
 - charitable gifts
- Unless otherwise required by founders, only the interest on the corpus would be available to fund operations, implement recommendations and make investments in the at-risk sports.
- A “competitive” grant making process in order to encourage the identification of the best ideas.
- Beyond the financial resources it might provide, a critical component of this recommendation is the potential of the new entity to have staff responsible for implementing the strategies needed to advance the mission identified in this Report. This contemplates a small staff and low overhead operation, but it is critical to have people in place who can:

- effectively leverage (not duplicate) and coordinate the efforts of others,
- manage the grant process,
- raise funds, and
- manage the awareness and advocacy functions.





Building Awareness and Commitment

Recommendation 2

Establish a program to encourage the widespread adoption of the following value statement for maintaining broad-based intercollegiate athletic programs in the United States:

[Insert name of organization or institution] believes that participation in intercollegiate athletics represents a uniquely valuable educational experience for student-athletes and enriches the quality of campus life generally. As such, there is great benefit, consistent with the academic mission of American colleges and universities, in ensuring that diverse athletic opportunities are available to students, especially in those sports that connect to the Olympic ideals, inspire young people and attribute to a lifelong commitment to fitness. We are committed to doing all we reasonably can to help ensure that those diverse athletic opportunities continue to exist as part of intercollegiate athletics in America.

Rationale. Any attempt to address the declining sponsorship of the sports identified in this Report must begin with an effort to create greater awareness of the threat and a stronger commitment to address it. Building awareness requires a fundamental change in the tone and tenor of the discussion that surrounds this important issue. The decision on the fate of the at-risk and emerging sports in American colleges and universities lies exclusively with the academic institutions which sponsor those sports as part of their intercollegiate athletic program. As such, the discussion cannot revolve around America's performance in the Olympic Games, the impact of Title IX, or some sense of historical entitlement; it must instead center on the relationship between the sponsorship of these sports and the academic mission of the sponsoring college or university. The Task Force believes that the proposed

value statement effectively makes that connection, focusing as it does on the benefits to the students that result from offering diverse athletic opportunities.

Implementation. In the first instance, this value statement must be adopted by the NCAA and the USOC (through their traditional governance mechanisms). If the two sponsors of this Task Force do not adopt the statement, there is little prospect for others doing so. Assuming adoption by those two entities, an effort must then be made to foster a widespread adoption of the principles throughout the Olympic and collegiate sports families. Beyond adoption by the national governing bodies and NCAA member institutions, every effort should be made to have the statement adopted by important constituent and operating groups within the collegiate and Olympic sports structure (e.g. NGB Council, USOC Athletes Advisory Council, NCAA's Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, Faculty Athletic Representatives Association, Collegiate Commissioners Association, National Association of Collegiate Athletic Directors, National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators, various collegiate coaches associations, etc.) as well as influential independent organizations like the Knight Commission.

Recommendation 3

a) Establish an electronic syndication system to identify and distribute to media outlets (including, in particular, campus newspapers and local papers in college towns) news and features related to the at-risk and emerging sports and the student-athletes and coaches who participate in them.

b) Create a continuing education program to help coaches become more effective advocates for their programs within the university community. This program, although developed centrally for use across all sports, should be

administered through the national governing bodies and/or sport-specific coaches' associations.

c) From among the excellent materials that have already been created by sports like wrestling, swimming and tennis, identify and share best practices for responding to a threatened elimination of a program. This process should result in the production of a standard set of materials that can be easily modified to fit the needs of the individual sports.

Rationale. When a sport faces elimination, those affiliated with the sport and the college or university typically engage in a vigorous campaign to preserve the sport. Sometimes those campaigns succeed; more often they do not. That experience suggests that a more effective advocacy strategy requires:

- a) regular, effective, and targeted communication about the value of these sports to the college or university,
- b) effective training of collegiate coaches to make them better and more engaged advocates for their sports, and
- c) a sharing across sports of best practices for responding to the potential elimination of an at-risk or emerging sport.

Implementation. The implementation strategy identified in Recommendation 1 above is central to these recommendations, but so too is the active role of the impacted national governing bodies in working closely with their sports collegiate coaches. In order to ensure this result, those NGBs are encouraged to have a person on staff who has as a principal job responsibility assisting in the implementation of these recommendations.

Altering the Value Proposition Represented by These Sports

Recommendation 4

Promote models for more effectively utilizing existing at-risk and emerging sport programs to support:

- Sport-specific community outreach,
- The training of elite athletes in Olympic sports,
- Hosting of events (creating a presumption in favor of awarding events to university facilities whenever possible). Those events need not be limited to those involving college athletes. Any event that effectively promotes the sport and/or brings additional revenue to the school is a candidate to be hosted by the college or university.

Rationale. When a college or university administrator is searching for ways to trim expense in his or her athletic budget, the perception of the value contributed by an at-risk or emerging sport becomes of critical importance. It is incumbent on all who care about the future of these sports to attempt to positively impact the value proposition presented by these sports. One way to do this is to use the college or university asset that (relative at least to the sports national governing body) is unique – the sport facility – to produce additional value for the college or university. The specific concepts identified in this recommendation are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive. The key to the recommendation is finding ways to create greater value – whether that value takes the form of service to the community, enhanced exposure for the university, or additional revenue.

In discussing the rationale for this recommendation it is worth emphasizing that in examining some of the best run programs in the at-risk sports, the Task Force typically encountered compelling examples of how a dedicated and creative coach had managed to use his or her sport to advance the university's mission in the community. So, for example, the facility that served as home to the

collegiate program might also offer creative sports programs to members of the community and actively pursue the hosting of non-collegiate events.

Implementation. The implementation strategies are likely to vary significantly by sport. For sports like gymnastics, water polo, volleyball and rifle, the number of D-I schools sponsoring the sport is so low that it would seem possible to develop very specific programs for each school. In other circumstances where the number of sponsoring schools remains high, this effort may revolve around the sharing of best practices. In either case, however, the national governing body has a special responsibility to encourage its collegiate coaches to take the steps necessary to change the value proposition of the sport for the university.



Identifying Preferred Strategies for Controlling Costs

Recommendation 5

Conduct a survey of the NCAA membership to identify the preferred strategies to be implemented to control the costs associated with operating the at-risk and emerging sports. The survey should be completed and the resulting data available for review by April, 2006.

Rationale. Just as it concluded that the creation of new resources is critical to the continued viability of the at-risk and emerging sports, the Task Force believes that the pressure to control costs will continue to have a very significant impact on the operation of college and university athletic departments. Given the relatively small size of the budget for these sports, the Task Force recognizes that achieving meaningful cost containment or savings can be particularly painful. It is for that reason that the Task Force believes that, before pursuing particular strategies, the NCAA membership should be surveyed to determine which forms of savings offer the best hope for achieving meaningful cost containment.

Implementation. Conduct a survey of athletic directors, senior woman administrators, head coaches, and a representative number of athletes at schools that sponsor the at-risk or emerging sports, as well as the executive directors and program directors for the related national governing bodies to determine their view of cost reduction strategies in categories such as:

- Reduced competition,
- Reduced scholarships,
- Cross division competition, and
- Reduced travel.

The survey will be produced, distributed, and compiled by the NCAA's research staff with oversight by the Task Force.

Increasing the Marketability of the At-Risk Sports

Recommendation 6

a) Consider modification of the NCAA amateurism, participation, and competition rules to increase the likelihood that some of the most accomplished athletes in the at-risk and emerging sports will continue to participate in collegiate athletics.

b) Explore ways to more effectively leverage the event management and marketing resources of the NCAA and NGBs to develop new events and/or market existing events in order to more effectively highlight collegiate competition in at-risk and emerging sports while also bringing additional revenue to those programs.

Rationale. With increasing frequency, America's best athletes in the Olympic sports forego the opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics. That is a loss for both the individual athlete and the university. When that decision is based on the unwillingness of an athlete to be bound by the principles of amateurism that are central to the American intercollegiate athletic model, there is nothing to be done. But where an athlete's decision to forego intercollegiate athletic competition is based upon the inability of the NCAA model to accommodate the unique training and competition requirements of an elite athlete, then perhaps a re-examination of the rules that create that conflict is appropriate. In the experience of the members of the Task Force, discussions about the types of rule modifications contemplated by this discussion often run into resistance from coaches who fear that an unfair competitive advantage may result. The Task Force understands well the pressure coaches feel to achieve competitive success and the importance of maintaining a level playing field for intercollegiate competition. At the same time, however, these risks must be evaluated in the context of the greater risk to the very existence of the sport on a college campus or in the overall intercollegiate athletic program.

There are compelling examples of how events in the so-called "non-revenue" sports have achieved extraordinary success. The recent history of the NCAA lacrosse championship is one such case, and many of the sports identified in this Report as being at-risk (e.g. wrestling, women's gymnastics, men's swimming) already stage highly successful collegiate championships. Without exception, however, the opportunity exists to do more. This is especially true because the emergence of CSTV, ESPNU and Fox College Sports creates a significant new demand for collegiate sports programming.

Implementation. The national governing bodies with elite athletes who have foregone the opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics are requested to survey a representative sample of those athletes in order to better understand the nature and relative importance of the factors that contribute to the athlete's decision. That information should then be submitted to the NCAA's Olympic Sport Liaison Committee which will review it and consider what, if any, modifications to the NCAA's rules it might recommend.

Relative to the enhancement of intercollegiate events in the at-risk and emerging sports, the critical first step in effective implementation involves establishing meaningful communication among the event staffs at the NCAA, conferences, and national governing bodies. To accelerate the creation of effective communication, the Task Force recommends that a collegiate sports event summit be convened under the auspices of the foundation created in response to Recommendation 1 above.

Aligning the Rules to Support the Mission

Recommendation 7

Work closely with the NCAA's Olympic Liaison Committee to develop a package of legislative proposals designed to protect and expand the opportunities for student-athletes to participate in the at-risk and emerging sports. Among the potential areas of focus for these legislative changes are the following:

- Modification of the sport sponsorship rules to include some modest reward for sponsoring these sports.
- Lessening of restrictions on training time for athletes who have achieved a certain high standard of academic performance.
- Expanding the circumstances under which athletes not currently enrolled in a college or university may practice and/or use university facilities with student-athletes and college coaches.
- Further relaxation of amateurism rules to perhaps:
 - limit consequences of money earned in Olympic sports prior to entering college
 - giving greater deference to funds paid by or through the NGB,
- Facilitate the underwriting of athletic scholarships by third parties including but not limited to the USOC or the NGBs.

Rationale. Much work already occurs in the area of legislative reform, but the significance of this recommendation lies in the proposal to undertake a comprehensive review of the options in order to produce a full package of proposed legislation. The examples of potential areas of focus identified in the recommendation are intended to be illustrative only. There are, no doubt, other areas of inquiry and specific proposals that merit careful consideration.

Setting Goals to Measure Progress

Recommendation 8

Set numerical goals for maintaining and adding programs in the at-risk sports, issue an annual report of the industry's progress in furtherance of the goals, and offer special recognition of those schools and NGBs who have most effectively contributed to the solution (and those who have not).

Rationale. Athletics is all about pushing oneself to achieve stretch goals. This effort should do no less.

Implementation. The three elements of this recommendation would all be implemented by the charitable foundation identified in Recommendation 1.


Concluding Statement

During the past 15 years, colleges and universities included among the NCAA's Division I membership dropped 594 programs in the sports that are the focus of this Report. The members of the Task Force understand well that none of these decisions were made lightly or easily. Each represented a difficult choice made under a unique set of circumstances and in the context of ever-growing financial pressures. But those circumstances, no matter how compelling, cannot mitigate the very real loss associated with a decision to eliminate a sport from a college or university athletic program. If, for example, we assume an average squad size of 20 athletes, the elimination of 594 programs, means that since 1990, nearly 12,000 student-athletes experienced the loss of an activity that was central to their educational experience – perhaps even the reason they chose to attend the school at which they were a student-athlete. And a much larger number of prospective student-athletes lost the opportunity to ever reap the benefits of participating in the sport they loved at that school. A decision to eliminate a sport also means that coaches who may have been among the institution's best educators may no longer be able to use the school's arena, field, or pool as a place to teach young people. It means that a potentially valuable link to the university's past has been lost. And, it means that the unique (and uniquely valuable) role played by America's colleges and universities in preparing coaches and student-athletes to represent the United States in international competition has been diminished.

It is those very tangible consequences flowing from the elimination of sports that caused the NCAA and USOC to take the unusual step of forming this Task Force for the purpose of examining ways to reverse the trend. Both organizations are to be commended for their willingness to work cooperatively in a search for solutions, and both are (along with their members) encouraged to build upon the momentum they have helped to create by aggressively pursuing the recommendations set forth in this Report. There is no single recommendation that can reverse a trend that has developed

over a quarter of a century. But this Task Force believes that, taken as a whole, the recommendations in the Report can and will make a difference -- a difference that ensures that future generations of student-athletes and coaches will continue to benefit from participation in diverse athletic programs.

APPENDIX A



Women's Fencing

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	8.9	1.5	6.3	2	0	1	11.5	13.3	8.2
1990-91	8.4	1.4	6.2	1	1	3	9.1	6.0	10.3
1991-92	9.4	0.0	5.7	0	0	1	9.8	NA	7.9
1992-93	8.4	0.0	5.0	3	0	4	8.4	NA	9.8
1993-94	8.0	0.8	4.9	0	1	0	10.5	8.0	8.4
1994-95	7.9	0.0	4.5	1	0	0	12.3	NA	0.1
1995-96	8.8	1.0	5.2	0	0	1	11.0	7.0	13.8
1996-97	8.1	0.3	4.3	2	0	4	13.9	8.0	14.3
1997-98	8.1	0.4	4.5	1	0	1	13.0	6.5	11.6
1998-99	8.0	0.3	4.5	0	0	1	13.5	5.0	13.3
1999-00	8.1	0.7	4.0	0	0	1	15.6	9.0	15.0
2000-01	8.1	1.0	4.0	0	0	1	15.7	13.0	13.9
2001-02	8.0	1.0	4.0	0	0	0	13.5	9.7	14.8
2002-03	8.0	1.1	3.8	0	0	1	15.3	8.0	15.1
2003-04	8.0*	1.1	3.5	0	0	1	16.0	11.0	13.7
Total	(1.4)			10					

* Represents 26 teams

Conclusion: Lack of any recent examples of schools dropping the program and growth in squad size indicate that sport probably should not be included in at-risk category.

Women's Field Hockey

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	25.9	10.3	39.0	4	0	3	22.1	22.9	21.4
1990-91	25.7	6.2	39.6	2	0	5	22.6	19.7	21.4
1991-92	24.8	6.0	38.1	0	0	2	21.7	23.2	20.4
1992-93	23.8	9.0	35.0	3	1	7	22.9	24.8	20.8
1993-94	23.6	9.0	35.0	0	0	0	22.2	23.2	20.6
1994-95	23.5	8.4	33.5	0	1	1	22.0	23.0	20.4
1995-96	23.9	7.9	33.6	0	0	0	22.1	23.9	21.4
1996-97	23.1	8.7	33.2	1	0	2	21.5	24.8	21.6
1997-98	23.4	9.6	34.0	1	0	1	22.8	23.3	21.9
1998-99	23.4	8.8	33.4	0	0	0	22.7	24.2	22.6
1999-00	23.4	8.1	33.1	0	0	0	22.4	24.3	21.0
2000-01	23.7	8.5	34.8	1	0	2	22.2	24.1	20.8
2001-02	23.8	9.0	35.3	0	0	1	21.2	24.5	20.3
2002-03	23.5	9.2	35.4	0	0	0	22.1	22.9	20.6
2003-04	23.2*	9.2	35.6	0	0	2	22.3	23.3	20.4
Total	(2.7)			12					

* Represents 76 teams

Conclusion: Recent experience (only three D-I programs dropped in 10 years) does not support inclusion as an At-Risk Sport.

Women's Gymnastics

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	23.2	10.8	6.0	3	1	3	13.8	13.9	13.9
1990-91	22.6	9.1	5.3	0	1	2	13.1	12.8	13.4
1991-92	23.2	5.5	4.5	2	3	4	13.0	13.9	13.8
1992-93	22.5	4.5	4.1	3	4	1	13.4	11.7	13.2
1993-94	22.6	4.1	4.0	0	0	0	13.9	10.9	13.4
1994-95	22.2	3.8	3.4	1	0	0	14.1	12.6	13.3
1995-96	22.5	2.8	4.7	0	0	0	14.5	14.1	14.2
1996-97	21.8	2.8	4.0	1	0	3	15.2	12.8	13.4
1997-98	22.1	2.5	4.0	0	1	0	15.2	14.5	16.3
1998-99	21.5	2.4	3.8	1	0	0	16.7	14.8	16.7
1999-00	20.9	2.4	3.8	0	0	0	16.6	14.6	15.4
2000-01	20.9	2.4	3.8	0	0	1	16.1	14.0	14.8
2001-02	20.4	2.4	3.8	1	0	0	16.8	14.0	14.8
2002-03	19.6	2.5	3.5	3	0	1	16.3	14.1	14.9
2003-04	19.6*	2.5	3.5	0	0	0	16.4	14.3	15.5
Total	(3.6)			15					

* Represents 64 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Women's Rifle

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1995-96	2.3	0.3	0.5	0	1	0	10.4	6.0	6.0
1996-97	2.3	0.3	1.0	6	0	6	4.7	4.0	5.8
1997-98	2.6	0.4	0.5	5	2	1	4.6	6.0	3.5
1998-99	10.3	0.3	2.6	2	0	0	4.4	5.0	3.6
1999-00	9.7	0.7	2.4	1	0	0	7.9	7.8	5.0
2000-01	9.7	0.7	2.8	0	0	1	6.8	6.5	5.0
2001-02	10.5	0.7	2.4	2	0	3	5.1	8.0	5.2
2002-03	10.1	0.7	1.9	5	0	2	5.4	7.0	4.8
2003-04	8.9*	0.7	1.9	4	0	2	5.6	2.0	4.8
Total	(1.6)			25					

For the years 1982-83 through 1994-95 women's rifle data were included with men's rifle data.

* Represents 29 teams

Conclusion: Sport should be considered at risk.

Women's Rowing

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	7.2	2.6	4.1	4	2	5	32.0	17.6	18.9
1990-91	2.4	1.0	0.9	4	0	0	29.1	12.0	25.7
1991-92	11.7	2.8	4.5	1	1	6	29.1	19.3	27.4
1992-93	10.1	2.7	4.4	6	1	1	34.4	18.7	27.4
1993-94	13.3	2.9	5.8	2	2	5	36.7	21.4	28.9
1994-95	14.6	3.0	5.8	1	0	3	41.0	18.9	28.9
1995-96	16.7	3.8	7.0	1	1	1	48.9	25.6	27.8
1996-97	17.6	4.5	7.8	0	0	1	55.9	28.7	33.9
1997-98	20.5	5.0	8.6	2	1	1	55.1	27.7	33.8
1998-99	22.8	4.7	8.8	0	0	0	55.4	34.4	32.8
1999-00	23.4	4.4	9.7	1	1	0	53.6	35.3	31.8
2000-01	25.5	4.7	9.9	1	0	0	54.7	37.1	32.0
2001-02	25.6	5.2	10.0	0	0	1	54.0	34.7	28.3
2002-03	25.7	5.7	9.7	0	0	1	58.3	31.7	31.4
2003-04	26.0*	5.7	9.8	0	1	0	58.2	31.1	32.5
Total	23.6			23					

* Represents 85 teams (most ever)

Conclusion: Sport is not at risk.

Women's Swimming and Diving

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	54.3	31.4	55.9	1	0	4	22.1	18.8	17.3
1990-91	51.1	25.8	55.4	5	4	2	22.3	19.6	17.6
1991-92	55.4	23.9	53.5	3	3	7	22.5	19.6	17.5
1992-93	55.0	21.5	52.2	2	7	4	23.0	18.8	18.4
1993-94	53.8	20.8	52.0	2	1	3	23.8	18.7	18.0
1994-95	54.3	20.2	47.9	0	0	0	23.5	16.5	17.6
1995-96	55.6	23.1	51.2	4	1	3	26.5	21.4	20.3
1996-97	54.4	21.8	51.0	3	1	4	24.8	16.9	19.5
1997-98	54.9	23.9	52.4	3	4	5	24.4	18.5	19.5
1998-99	56.1	22.2	51.4	0	0	0	25.1	20.1	19.8
1999-00	56.1	20.5	51.3	0	0	1	25.5	19.5	19.6
2000-01	56.1	22.7	52.7	0	2	3	25.6	19.2	20.4
2001-02	56.8	23.1	53.8	0	1	3	25.3	18.0	19.5
2002-03	56.6	23.4	54.2	2	0	1	25.7	18.3	20.1
2003-04	57.2*	24.5	54.0	0	0	4	25.8	18.2	19.2
Total	6.1			25					

* Represents 187 teams

Conclusion: Sport is not at risk.

Women's Indoor Track

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	71.3	39.2	43.2	3	3	4	23.6	20.0	17.7
1990-91	74.7	41.1	43.3	1	0	4	25.1	19.9	19.5
1991-92	78.2	40.4	43.8	4	1	12	24.2	21.5	19.3
1992-93	78.9	40.4	44.9	5	6	4	25.3	20.1	20.3
1993-94	79.7	37.6	45.4	1	1	0	27.0	20.5	19.7
1994-95	79.1	34.6	43.5	4	1	1	27.9	20.3	20.0
1995-96	81.4	35.5	45.0	3	2	3	27.7	20.3	19.7
1996-97	81.8	32.5	46.2	2	8	4	28.8	21.7	20.8
1997-98	82.8	35.0	47.1	2	7	5	29.8	20.0	21.3
1998-99	84.0	36.0	45.3	1	4	1	32.1	23.1	23.9
1999-00	83.5	33.0	45.4	2	3	4	32.8	23.5	24.0
2000-01	86.9	38.0	47.8	0	3	4	32.6	24.6	24.1
2001-02	88.3	37.2	47.6	0	9	7	32.7	22.4	22.8
2002-03	88.4	38.7	50.2	2	7	2	34.5	23.4	23.6
2003-04	88.4*	38.7	50.9	2	8	2	34.7	26.6	23.4
Total	171			32					

* Represents 289 Teams

Conclusion: Sport is not at risk.

Women's Outdoor Track

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	78.5	58.8	61.3	3	4	2	24.1	21.3	18.7
1990-91	80.7	56.0	61.0	1	6	5	24.5	21.4	19.4
1991-92	82.9	51.8	60.7	2	0	7	24.1	21.5	19.2
1992-93	83.6	52.0	60.9	0	4	4	25.1	20.4	20.2
1993-94	83.7	49.8	60.1	0	1	1	27.1	20.4	19.8
1994-95	84.4	87.5	55.8	0	0	0	28.0	19.8	20.1
1995-96	87.6	50.3	60.2	0	3	5	31.4	21.9	24.8
1996-97	86.6	47.5	60.1	2	6	5	28.8	20.6	21.3
1997-98	88.0	50.3	61.2	2	8	7	29.7	20.4	21.3
1998-99	87.5	47.1	58.8	1	3	0	32.5	23.6	23.4
1999-00	86.0	48.2	57.2	2	1	9	32.3	22.8	23.1
2000-01	89.1	54.2	59.1	1	1	3	32.3	23.2	23.9
2001-02	89.8	54.1	59.0	1	4	7	32.9	21.3	22.2
2002-03	89.6	55.0	60.1	1	3	4	33.9	22.9	23.1
2003-04	89.9*	55.3	58.4	2	2	7	34.7	24.0	22.7
Total	114			18					

* Represents 294 teams

Conclusion: Sport is not at risk.

Baseball

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size			
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	
1989-90	91.5	75.3	81.9	1	0	0		32.9	28.0	25.8
1990-91	91.6	74.6	82.0	1	1	1		33.5	29.9	25.8
1991-92	91.9	77.1	81.9	0	0	0		34.2	29.9	25.1
1992-93	91.9	78.0	82.2	1	0	3		34.0	30.6	25.2
1993-94	91.7	79.2	81.2	0	0	0		34.6	30.2	25.5
1994-95	91.4	74.1	76.4	0	0	0		33.3	29.9	25.3
1995-96	91.8	77.9	79.6	2	0	3		33.3	30.9	26.4
1996-97	89.6	78.2	80.2	2	2	2		33.8	31.3	26.4
1997-98	89.0	80.0	80.4	7	2	1		33.7	31.0	17.0
1998-99	88.5	78.1	79.6	1	1	0		33.0	31.6	27.5
1999-00	88.5	77.8	80.9	1	0	0		32.8	30.8	27.8
2000-01	88.8	78.6	81.1	0	0	0		33.3	30.9	27.8
2001-02	88.3	80.3	82.2	3	1	0		33.1	30.3	28.3
2002-03	87.5	80.5	82.1	1	1	1		33.6	32.6	28.9
2003-04	87.5*	80.5	81.6	1	1	0		34.1	32.0	29.2
Total	(4.4)			21						

* Represents 286 teams

Conclusion: Total number of current teams would appear to suggest that sport is not currently at risk, but other measures suggest that further analysis may be merited.

Men's Cross Country

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	95.6	78.9	76.5	5	3	4	14.6	11.9	13.5
1990-91	96.3	77.5	76.8	1	5	7	14.3	12.2	13.9
1991-92	97.0	75.7	76.1	2	2	13	14.7	11.6	13.2
1992-93	97.3	78.0	75.5	1	3	9	14.7	11.4	13.2
1993-94	96.7	75.1	73.7	0	0	4	15.3	11.6	12.8
1994-95	95.7	70.7	68.3	2	1	4	15.4	10.9	12.5
1995-96	96.7	74.1	75.6	0	3	3	14.8	10.7	13.5
1996-97	94.8	70.6	73.1	5	4	7	14.7	10.6	12.8
1997-98	95.1	73.9	73.0	1	15	18	15.2	11.3	12.9
1998-99	94.6	75.4	73.0	3	2	0	14.2	11.6	13.5
1999-00	94.1	71.0	70.4	2	2	8	14.4	11.3	13.6
2000-01	95.0	78.0	76.8	0	4	12	14.2	11.2	13.1
2001-02	94.1	76.9	78.2	3	7	11	13.9	10.9	12.6
2002-03	94.2	77.3	78.5	0	2	8	14.3	11.6	13.0
2003-04	93.6*	79.4	79.3	4	1	6	14.0	11.4	13.0
Total	(3.7)			29					

* Represents 306 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Fencing

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	9.2	0.5	6.3	1	0	0	24.0	9.0	15.5
1990-91	9.5	0.5	6.2	0	1	2	21.4	11.0	16.5
1991-92	9.7	0.0	6.0	2	2	1	22.9	NA	14.2
1992-93	9.1	0.0	5.8	2	0	6	19.2	NA	15.0
1993-94	8.0	0.0	6.1	0	0	0	19.3	NA	14.0
1994-95	7.6	0.0	5.0	1	0	0	18.5	NA	15.2
1995-96	8.2	0.7	5.0	2	0	1	14.0	11.0	17.9
1996-97	6.8	0.7	3.8	3	0	2	17.2	9.0	18.3
1997-98	6.5	0.7	3.8	2	0	4	17.3	8.5	16.9
1998-99	6.4	0.7	3.6	0	0	1	17.9	10.5	17.8
1999-00	6.5	0.7	3.3	0	1	0	16.2	11.0	16.7
2000-01	6.9	2.4	5.4	0	0	0	17.6	18.0	16.8
2001-02	6.5	1.0	3.3	1	3	9	15.7	12.0	15.7
2002-03	6.4	1.4	3.3	0	0	0	16.6	8.8	16.8
2003-04	6.4*	1.1	3.0	0	1	1	17.0	14.3	16.2
Total	(3.3)			14					

* Represents 21 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Gymnastics

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	13.3	1.0	1.3	1	1	1	15.2	12.0	11.5
1990-91	12.8	0.5	1.2	1	0	0	15.4	14.0	14.5
1991-92	12.1	0.0	1.2	3	1	0	15.4	NA	12.6
1992-93	12.1	0.0	1.2	1	0	0	15.1	NA	11.5
1993-94	11.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0	14.9	NA	NA
1994-95	9.6	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	14.5	NA	NA
1995-96	10.1	0.3	1.7	5	0	1	13.4	7.0	13.3
1996-97	8.1	0.3	0.5	2	0	2	14.2	4.0	14.0
1997-98	7.8	0.4	0.5	7	0	3	15.5	12.0	10.1
1998-99	7.4	0.3	0.5	1	0	0	14.6	11.0	14.0
1999-00	6.5	0.3	0.5	0	0	0	15.6	6.0	14.0
2000-01	6.5	0.3	0.9	2	0	0	15.5	9.0	16.0
2001-02	6.2	0.3	0.5	1	0	2	16.5	9.0	16.5
2002-03	5.2	0.4	0.5	3	0	0	16.2	9.0	14.0
2003-04	5.2*	0.4	0.5	0	0	0	17.0	9.0	14.0
Total	(8.1)			28					

* Represents 17 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Rifle

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1995-96	12.7	1.4	4.0	1	1	1	13.0	7.0	10.0
1996-97	10.4	0.3	2.3	6	1	6	6.6	10.0	9.6
1997-98	9.1	0.4	2.8	9	2	1	7.	7.0	10.8
1998-99	9.0	0.3	2.8	2	0	0	7.5	5.0	10.8
1999-00	7.8	0.7	2.6	4	0	0	10.5	7.8	14.0
2000-01	8.4	0.7	3.8	0	0	1	10.3	6.5	13.0
2001-02	9.6	0.7	2.4	3	0	6	4.9	8.5	5.8
2002-03	8.3	0.7	3.1	7	0	2	5.5	7.5	5.2
2003-04	6.7*	1.1	2.3	5	0	5	5.4	4.3	6.1
Total	(6.0)			53					

For the years 1982-83 through 1994-95 women's rifle data were included with men's rifle data.

* Represents 22 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.



Men's Soccer

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	64.8	50.5	82.2	2	1	1	25.3	24.0	25.0
1990-91	64.9	51.7	82.7	0	0	1	26.7	24.6	25.3
1991-92	65.1	52.3	82.5	0	1	1	26.2	23.5	25.0
1992-93	64.1	52.0	82.8	2	0	0	26.1	23.6	24.9
1993-94	64.5	51.8	83.2	1	1	0	26.0	23.0	24.5
1994-95	64.2	48.7	77.5	0	0	0	26.5	23.8	24.4
1995-96	64.4	53.4	81.1	0	1	0	26.2	24.0	25.2
1996-97	62.2	55.0	82.4	4	0	0	26.0	24.6	24.7
1997-98	61.7	56.4	84.1	4	3	0	26.5	25.1	24.5
1998-99	61.5	56.6	84.6	1	0	1	26.3	25.4	25.0
1999-00	61.1	55.2	83.9	2	0	1	26.5	25.2	25.0
2000-01	61.7	58.0	85.3	1	1	1	27.0	24.5	25.1
2001-02	61.7	58.3	86.5	0	4	0	26.9	24.5	24.8
2002-03	61.8	57.1	87.0	0	2	0	27.4	24.6	25.3
2003-04	60.9*	55.7	86.7	3	5	0	26.6	24.1	25.3
Total	(4.2)			20					

* Represents 199 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Swimming/Diving

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	53.2	26.3	48.9	2	0	5	25.4	21.4	17.2
1990-91	53.7	23.4	48.6	7	2	4	24.7	20.4	18.1
1991-92	54.0	21.1	48.3	3	3	6	24.4	21.2	17.4
1992-93	53.7	20.6	47.5	2	5	4	25.4	20.3	17.6
1993-94	52.8	19.2	46.8	2	0	3	25.9	18.5	16.8
1994-95	52.0	17.1	43.5	0	0	0	24.0	17.1	16.2
1995-96	52.9	20.3	44.5	3	1	3	25.6	20.3	20.7
1996-97	49.2	17.6	42.5	7	4	6	23.7	17.2	16.8
1997-98	48.7	18.2	42.8	7	5	9	23.9	17.5	16.7
1998-99	48.7	17.5	41.9	1	0	0	25.3	18.7	16.4
1999-00	46.4	16.2	41.8	3	1	1	24.4	18.3	16.5
2000-01	46.4	17.6	43.5	2	2	4	24.3	18.2	16.1
2001-02	45.7	19.0	43.8	2	1	3	23.2	16.0	16.2
2002-03	43.7	18.1	44.6	6	2	1	24.1	17.0	16.3
2003-04	43.7*	18.8	44.4	1	1	3	24.4	16.2	15.7
Total	(10.3)			48					

* Represents 143 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Tennis

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	93.2	74.2	81.9	2	5	7	11.0	10.0	11.5
1990-91	92.2	73.2	82.4	1	4	3	11.3	10.3	11.4
1991-92	91.9	72.0	81.6	1	2	4	11.0	10.2	11.0
1992-93	90.9	68.2	82.2	4	11	2	11.0	9.7	10.9
1993-94	91.7	68.6	79.8	0	1	1	10.8	9.5	10.7
1994-95	90.1	64.6	74.3	2	2	1	10.5	9.3	10.8
1995-96	91.8	71.7	78.6	1	3	1	10.4	9.2	10.8
1996-97	88.6	66.8	75.9	6	8	10	10.6	9.4	10.7
1997-98	88.0	66.1	75.8	7	14	14	10.6	8.9	10.4
1998-99	87.8	60.9	74.4	3	4	0	10.4	9.1	10.3
1999-00	86.0	58.9	72.6	5	2	4	10.3	9.0	10.2
2000-01	86.6	61.0	74.7	1	4	2	10.0	9.0	10.3
2001-02	85.8	60.7	74.9	3	5	3	9.9	8.4	10.1
2002-03	83.5	58.5	74.5	7	7	5	9.7	8.8	10.2
2003-04	82.3*	58.9	71.9	3	4	10	9.8	8.7	10.2
Total	(10.9)			46					

* Represents 269 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Indoor Track

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	73.0	40.2	45.1	7	5	3	36.8	27.2	28.5
1990-91	76.0	41.1	44.9	2	1	4	36.8	27.0	27.4
1991-92	79.2	40.8	45.6	5	1	10	35.4	28.3	28.2
1992-93	78.9	42.6	46.5	3	6	2	36.0	27.2	27.5
1993-94	78.4	38.8	46.8	1	3	0	36.7	26.7	27.0
1994-95	76.8	34.6	43.7	5	2	1	36.1	26.7	25.8
1995-96	79.1	35.9	45.0	5	4	5	35.8	27.0	25.5
1996-97	77.2	32.9	44.5	6	8	7	35.6	26.1	27.9
1997-98	77.6	33.9	44.8	6	10	5	36.0	25.9	28.2
1998-99	78.5	33.3	43.1	3	4	1	35.8	30.1	28.6
1999-00	75.4	31.0	43.5	5	3	3	36.3	28.8	30.4
2000-01	78.5	36.3	45.9	0	2	5	35.5	29.4	30.3
2001-02	78.7	35.5	46.2	5	10	6	35.1	27.3	29.4
2002-03	77.1	36.2	47.9	8	7	5	35.6	27.7	29.7
2003-04	75.2*	38.3	48.6	8	3	1	35.9	29.5	29.4
Total	(40)			69					

* Represents 246 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Outdoor Track

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	80.2	61.9	63.2	3	3	3	36.5	28.5	29.4
1990-91	81.4	57.9	63.2	2	6	6	36.9	28.1	28.5
1991-92	83.6	56.0	63.1	2	0	5	35.4	28.9	28.1
1992-93	83.2	55.6	61.2	2	2	3	36.0	28.2	27.4
1993-94	82.7	52.7	60.7	0	2	0	36.6	36.4	27.5
1994-95	82.8	48.7	55.0	1	0	1	35.8	25.5	26.6
1995-96	85.3	52.8	59.0	1	3	3	37.9	28.8	32.3
1996-97	83.1	48.1	57.3	4	7	5	35.9	25.5	28.6
1997-98	84.4	48.6	57.7	4	11	8	36.0	25.5	28.5
1998-99	83.7	48.5	55.0	3	4	0	35.9	28.3	30.3
1999-00	82.2	48.6	54.8	2	1	5	36.1	27.3	29.3
2000-01	84.1	50.8	56.5	1	2	3	35.9	27.1	30.0
2001-02	83.0	51.7	56.4	4	3	6	35.4	26.6	28.8
2002-03	82.6	52.8	57.3	3	3	4	36.0	26.9	29.2
2003-04	80.7*	53.5	56.3	7	2	4	36.6	28.5	28.5
Total	(37)			39					

* Represents 264 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Volleyball

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	7.2	5.7	7.0	0	1	1	16.9	11.7	10.0
1990-91	8.1	4.8	7.4	1	0	0	18.8	12.0	15.5
1991-92	8.1	4.6	7.3	0	0	2	19.1	14.0	13.6
1992-93	8.1	4.5	7.3	1	0	1	17.6	12.6	12.6
1993-94	7.6	4.5	7.8	0	0	1	18.3	13.1	13.8
1994-95	7.3	3.8	7.3	1	0	0	17.9	12.5	12.4
1995-96	7.8	5.5	8.5	2	1	2	17.0	11.4	13.1
1996-97	7.5	5.2	8.3	1	1	2	18.5	13.7	13.1
1997-98	7.1	5.0	8.1	2	0	1	18.6	12.7	11.6
1998-99	7.1	6.1	9.2	0	1	0	18.1	12.0	13.1
1999-00	6.9	5.7	8.5	0	1	1	17.0	13.5	12.2
2000-01	6.9	6.4	8.9	2	1	3	17.8	13.8	12.6
2001-02	6.8	5.9	10.0	1	0	3	17.3	13.4	12.1
2002-03	7.0	5.7	10.6	0	0	0	17.8	14.4	11.7
2003-04	7.0*	5.7	10.0	0	1	3	18.8	15.1	12.5
Total	(1.1)			11					

* Represents 23 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

Men's Water Polo

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	11.3	3.6	4.8	0	0	1	21.6	16.9	18.4
1990-91	10.8	3.3	4.6	2	0	0	23.7	20.1	16.7
1991-92	10.1	2.8	3.6	1	0	2	22.5	18.3	17.7
1992-93	10.1	2.7	3.2	2	1	3	23.0	17.5	16.6
1993-94	9.3	0.0	3.2	1	0	1	23.4	NA	16.9
1994-95	8.3	0.0	3.1	0	0	1	21.3	NA	17.8
1995-96	8.5	1.4	3.5	3	1	1	21.3	14.8	17.8
1996-97	8.1	1.4	3.3	1	0	0	24.4	17.8	16.2
1997-98	8.1	1.8	3.3	0	0	1	25.1	18.8	19.1
1998-99	7.7	1.7	3.3	1	0	0	22.8	20.0	18.6
1999-00	7.2	1.7	3.3	0	0	0	22.2	16.2	16.7
2000-01	7.2	2.0	4.0	1	0	4	23.2	17.8	15.9
2001-02	7.1	3.1	3.8	0	0	1	21.7	15.7	15.7
2002-03	6.4	3.2	3.8	2	0	1	21.9	16.1	15.6
2003-04	6.4*	3.2	3.7	0	0	1	22.8	15.2	15.6
Total	(4.9)			14					

* Represents 21 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.


Men's Wrestling

	% of Total Membership w/Team			Number of Programs Dropped			Average Squad Size		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
1989-90	38.2	22.7	38.7	4	1	2	29.3	24.7	19.3
1990-91	37.5	23.4	37.2	4	1	2	30.1	26.9	20.3
1991-92	36.9	22.0	35.3	1	1	5	29.9	26.0	19.5
1992-93	36.2	19.7	32.9	4	6	6	30.1	25.8	19.5
1993-94	35.5	20.0	31.2	2	0	1	29.2	26.6	18.9
1994-95	34.4	17.5	28.0	0	0	1	30.3	24.3	19.4
1995-96	34.6	17.9	29.6	3	1	4	29.2	26.4	20.2
1996-97	31.6	15.2	26.9	7	4	4	30.9	27.8	21.4
1997-98	31.2	15.7	26.7	4	4	11	29.9	28.4	22.0
1998-99	30.1	14.5	24.9	2	3	2	29.6	27.6	22.4
1999-00	28.0	13.4	24.6	3	2	1	30.1	29.2	23.1
2000-01	28.0	13.9	24.6	1	0	2	30.6	28.7	22.2
2001-02	26.9	14.8	23.9	4	2	2	28.4	25.3	23.6
2002-03	26.0	13.5	23.3	3	3	3	29.1	30.9	23.6
2003-04	26.3*	13.8	22.8	0	0	1	29.7	27.4	23.6
Total	(11.9)			42					

* Represents 86 teams

Conclusion: Sport is at risk.

APPENDIX B



2004 U.S. Olympic Team Roster

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Janet	Dykman	Female	Recurve	Archery	
Jennifer	Nichols	Female	Recurve	Archery	
Stephanie	White-Arnold	Female	Recurve	Archery	
Butch	Johnson	Male	Recurve	Archery	
John	Magera	Male	Recurve	Archery	
Vic	Wunderle	Male	Recurve	Archery	Texas A&M University
Tom	Green	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Sheri	Rhodes	Female	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	
Frank	Thomas	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	
Amy	Acuff	Female	High Jump	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Stephanie	Brown	Female	Discus	Athletics	California Polytechnical Institute
Shelia	Burrell	Female	Heptathlon	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Hazel	Clark	Female	800m	Athletics	University of Florida
LaTasha	Colander	Female	100m, 4x100m Relay	Athletics	University of North Carolina
Crystal	Cox	Female	4x400m Relay	Athletics	University of North Carolina
Shayne	Culpepper	Female	5000m	Athletics	University of Colorado
Lashinda	Demus	Female	400m Hurdles	Athletics	University of South Carolina
Colleen	DeReuck	Female	Marathon	Athletics	University of Port Elizabeth
Gall	Devers	Female	100m, 100m Hurdles	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Stacy	Dragila	Female	Pole Vault	Athletics	Idaho State University
Elva	Dryer	Female	10,000m	Athletics	Western State College
Allyson	Felix	Female	200m	Athletics	Turned Pro
Shalane	Flanagan	Female	5,000m	Athletics	University of North Carolina
Laura	Gertraughty	Female	Shot Put	Athletics	University of North Carolina
Erlin	Gillreath	Female	Hammer Throw	Athletics	University of Florida
Joanna	Hayes	Female	100m Hurdles	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Kristin	Heaston	Female	Shot Put	Athletics	University of Calif. - Berkeley; University of Florida
Monique	Henderson	Female	4x400m Relay	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Monique	Hennagan	Female	400m, 4x400m Relay	Athletics	University of North Carolina
Aretha	Hill	Female	Discus	Athletics	University of Washington
Chaunte	Howard	Female	High Jump	Athletics	Georgia Tech University

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Event	Sport/Title	Team/Institution (in bold)
Tionbe	Hurd	Female	Triple Jump	Athletics	Howard University
Jackie	Jescheling	Female	Hammer Throw	Athletics	Ashland
Sheena	Johnson	Female	400m Hurdles	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Marion	Jones	Female	Long Jump	Athletics	University of North Carolina
Deena	Kastor	Female	Marathon	Athletics	Adams State University
Kimberly	Kreiner	Female	Javelin	Athletics	Kent State University
Muna	Lee	Female	200m	Athletics	Louisiana State University
Tiffany	Lott-Hogan	Female	Heptathlon	Athletics	BYU
Anna	Mahon	Female	Hammer Throw	Athletics	North Eastern University
Jearl	Miles-Clark	Female	800m	Athletics	Alabama A&M University
LaShaunta'e	Moore	Female	4x100m Relay	Athletics	University of Arkansas
Consuella	Moore	Female	200m, 4x100m Relay	Athletics	Penn State University
Melissa	Morrison	Female	100m Hurdles	Athletics	Appalachian State University
Kate	O'Neill	Female	10,000m	Athletics	Yale University
Yuliana	Perez	Female	Triple Jump	Athletics	University of Arizona
Michelle	Perry	Female	Heptathlon	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Jen	Rhines	Female	Marathon	Athletics	Villanova University
Sanya	Richards	Female	400m, 4x400m Relay	Athletics	University of Texas
Rose	Richman	Female	Long Jump	Athletics	Indiana University
Moushaumi	Robinson	Female	4x400m Relay	Athletics	University of Texas
Marla	Runyan	Female	5,000m	Athletics	San Diego State University
Jillian	Schwartz	Female	Pole Vault	Athletics	Duke University
Sellala	Sua	Female	Discus	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Kellie	Suttie	Female	Pole Vault	Athletics	Arkansas State University; Florissant Valley Junior College
Brenda	Taylor	Female	400m Hurdles	Athletics	Harvard University
Nicole	Teter	Female	800m	Athletics	University of Arkansas; Shasta Community College
Carrie	Tollefson	Female	1,500m	Athletics	Villanova University
DeeDee	Trotter	Female	400m	Athletics	University of Tennessee
Grace	Upshaw	Female	Long Jump	Athletics	University of Oregon; University of Calif. - Berkeley
Teresa	Vaill	Female	20km Race Walk	Athletics	SUNY
Tisha	Waller	Female	High Jump	Athletics	University of North Carolina
Angela	Williams	Female	4x100m Relay	Athletics	University of Southern Calif.
Lauryn	Williams	Female	100m, 4x100m Relay	Athletics	University of Miami
Abdihakim	Abdirahman	Male	10,000m	Athletics	University of Arizona; Pima Community College

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Hosts	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Kenia	Bell	Male	Triple Jump	Athletics	Northwestern State University
Bennie	Brazell	Male	400m Hurdles	Athletics	Louisiana State University
Derrick	Brew	Male	400m, 4x400m Relay	Athletics	Louisiana State University; Barton Community College
Tim	Broe	Male	5,000m	Athletics	Did attend College
Dan	Browne	Male	10,000m, Marathon	Athletics	United States Military Academy
John	Capel	Male	4x100m Relay	Athletics	University of Florida
James	Carter	Male	400m Hurdles	Athletics	Hampton University
Curt	Clausen	Male	50km Race Walk	Athletics	Duke University
Bryan	Clay	Male	Decathlon	Athletics	Azusa Pacific University
Shawn	Crawford	Male	100m, 200m, 4x100m Relay	Athletics	Clemson University
Alan	Culpogger	Male	Marathon	Athletics	University of Colorado
Walter	Davis	Male	Triple Jump, Long Jump	Athletics	Louisiana State University; Barton County Community College
Philip	Dunn	Male	50km Race Walk	Athletics	Carleton University
Kevin	Eastler	Male	20km Race Walk	Athletics	University of Wisconsin
Anthony	Famiglietti	Male	3,000m Steeplechase	Athletics	University of Tennessee; Appalachian State
Robert	Gary	Male	3,000m Steeplechase	Athletics	Ohio State University
Justin	Gallin	Male	100m, 200m, 4x100m Relay	Athletics	University of Tennessee
John	Godina	Male	Shot Put	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Maurice	Greene	Male	100m, 4x100m Relay	Athletics	Junior College
Breaux	Greer	Male	Javelin	Athletics	Northeast Louisiana University
Charlie	Gruber	Male	1,500m	Athletics	Attended College
Tora	Harris	Male	High Jump	Athletics	Princeton University
Otis	Harris, Jr.	Male	400m, 4x400m Relay	Athletics	South Carolina
Matt	Hemingway	Male	High Jump	Athletics	University of Arkansas
Reese	Hoffa	Male	Shot Put	Athletics	University of Georgia
Allen	Johnson	Male	110m Hurdles	Athletics	University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
Jonathan	Johnson	Male	800m	Athletics	Texas Tech University
Meb	Kefezighi	Male	Marathon	Athletics	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Alfred (A.G.)	Kruger	Male	Hammer Throw	Athletics	Attended College
Daniel	Lincoln	Male	3,000m Steeplechase	Athletics	University of Arkansas
Melvin	Lister, III	Male	Triple Jump	Athletics	University of Arkansas
Tim	Mack	Male	Pole Vault	Athletics	University of Tennessee; Malone University
Casey	Malone	Male	Discus	Athletics	Colorado State University
Derek	Miles	Male	Pole Vault	Athletics	University of South Dakota



First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Coby	Miller	Male	4x100m Relay	Athletics	Auburn University, Meridian Community College
John	Moffitt	Male	Long Jump	Athletics	Louisiana State University
Adam	Nelson	Male	Shot Put	Athletics	Dartmouth College
Jamie	Nieto	Male	High Jump	Athletics	Eastern Michigan University, Sacramento City College
John	Nunn	Male	20km Race Walk	Athletics	University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Tom	Pappas	Male	Decathlon	Athletics	University of Tennessee; Lane Community College
James	Parker	Male	Hammer Throw	Athletics	Utah State University
Darvis	Patton	Male	4x100m Relay	Athletics	Texas Christian University, Garden City Community College
Derrick	Peterson	Male	800m	Athletics	University of Missouri
Dwight	Phillips	Male	Long Jump	Athletics	Arizona State University
Jonathon	Riley	Male	5,000m	Athletics	Stanford University
Dathan	Ritzenhein	Male	10,000m	Athletics	University of Colorado
Khadevis	Robinson	Male	800m	Athletics	Texas Christian University
Grant	Robison	Male	1,500m	Athletics	Stanford University
Andrew	Rock	Male	4x400m Relay	Athletics	University of Wisconsin - LaCrosse
Jarred	Rome	Male	Discus	Athletics	Boise State University
Duane	Ross	Male	110m Hurdles	Athletics	Clemson University
Tim	Seaman	Male	20km Race Walk	Athletics	University of Wisconsin - Parkside
Toby	Stevenson	Male	Pole Vault	Athletics	Stanford University
Angelo	Taylor	Male	400m Hurdles	Athletics	Georgia Tech University
Paul	Terek	Male	Decathlon	Athletics	Michigan State University
Terrence	Trammell	Male	110m Hurdles	Athletics	University of South Carolina
Ian	Waltz	Male	Discus	Athletics	Boston University
Jeremy	Wariner	Male	400m, 4x400m Relay	Athletics	Baylor University
Alan	Webb	Male	1,500m	Athletics	University of Michigan
Bernard	Williams	Male	200m	Athletics	University of Florida
Darold	Williamson, II	Male	4x400m Relay	Athletics	Baylor University
Kelly	Willie	Male	4x400m Relay	Athletics	Louisiana State University
Michael	Cain	Male	Women's Team Administrator	Women's Team Administrator	
Mike	Conley	Male	Men's Team Leader	Men's Team Leader	
Charlie	Craig	Male	Men's Team Manager	Men's Team Manager	
Stephanie	Hightower	Female	Women's Team Manager	Women's Team Manager	
Sue	Humphrey	Female	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	University of Texas

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Noise	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Curtus	Frye	Male	Women's Sprint/Hurdles Coach	Women's Sprint/Hurdles Coach	University of South Carolina
Craig	Poole	Male	Women's Jumps/Middle Events Coach	Women's Jumps/Middle Events Coach	
Jeri	Daniels	Female	Women's Throws/Multi-Event Coach	Women's Throws/Multi-Event Coach	Penn State University
Beth	Alford-Sullivan	Female	Women's Middle Distance Coach	Women's Middle Distance Coach	Penn State University
Julia	Emmons	Female	Women's Endurance Events Coach	Women's Endurance Events Coach	University of North Carolina
George	Williams	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	St. Augustine
Orin	Richburg	Male	Men's Sprint/Hurdles Coach	Men's Sprint/Hurdles Coach	University of Washington
Ralph	Lindeman	Male	Men's Jumps/Multi-Event Coach	Men's Jumps/Multi-Event Coach	Air Force
Criss	Somerlot	Male	Men's Throws/Multi-Event Coach	Men's Throws/Multi-Event Coach	
Vin	Lananna	Male	Men's Middle Distance Coach	Men's Middle Distance Coach	
Bob	Larsen	Male	Men's Endurance Events Coach	Men's Endurance Events Coach	
Brooks	Johnson	Male	Men's Relay Coach	Men's Relay Coach	
Howard	Bach	Male	Men's Doubles	Badminton	California State University-Fullerton
Kevin	Han	Male	Men's Doubles	Badminton	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs
Ignatius	Rusil	Male	Team Leader/Head Coach	Team Leader/Head Coach	
Sue	Bird	Female	Guard	Basketball	Seattle Storm/University of Connecticut
Swin	Cash	Female	Forward	Basketball	Detroit Shock/University of Connecticut
Tamika	Catchings	Female	Forward	Basketball	Indiana Fever/University of Tennessee
Yolanda	Griffith	Female	Forward/Center	Basketball	Sacramento Monarchs/Florida Atlantic University
Shannon	Johnson	Female	Guard	Basketball	San Antonio Silver Stars/University of South Carolina
Lisa	Leslie	Female	Center	Basketball	Los Angeles Sparks/University of Southern Calif.
Ruth	Riley	Female	Center	Basketball	University of Notre Dame/Detroit Shock
Katie	Smith	Female	Guard	Basketball	Minnesota Lynx/The Ohio State University
Dawn	Staley	Female	Guard	Basketball	Charlotte Sting/University of Virginia/Women's Head Coach - Temple University
Sheryl	Swoopes	Female	Forward	Basketball	Houston Comets/Texas Tech University
Diana	Taurasi	Female	Guard/Forward	Basketball	Phoenix Mercury/University of Connecticut
Tina	Thompson	Female	Forward	Basketball	Houston Comets/University of Southern Calif.
Carmelo	Anthony	Male	Forward	Basketball	Denver Nuggets/Syracuse University

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Carlos	Boozer	Male	Forward/Center	Basketball	Cleveland Cavaliers/Duke University
Tim	Duncan	Male	Center	Basketball	San Antonio Spurs/Wake Forest University
Allen	Iverson	Male	Guard	Basketball	Philadelphia 76ers/Georgetown University
LeBron	James	Male	Guard	Basketball	Cleveland Cavaliers/St. Vincent-St. Mary High School
Richard	Jefferson	Male	Forward	Basketball	New Jersey Nets/University of Arizona
Stephon	Marbury	Male	Guard	Basketball	New York Knicks/Georgia Tech University
Shawn	Marion	Male	Forward	Basketball	Phoenix Suns/University of Nevada-Las Vegas
Lamar	Odum	Male	Forward	Basketball	Miami Heat/University of Rhode Island
Emeka	Okafor	Male	Forward/Center	Basketball	Charlotte Bobcats/University of Connecticut
Amare	Stoudemire	Male	Forward	Basketball	Phoenix Suns/Cypress Creek High School (Fla.)
Dwayne	Wade	Male	Guard	Basketball	Miami Heat/Marquette University
Carol	Callan	Female	Women's Team Leader	Women's Team Leader	Women's Team Leader
Sean	Ford	Male	Men's Team Leader	Men's Team Leader	Men's Team Leader
Van	Chancellor	Male	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach
Anne	Donovan	Female	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Assistant Coach
Gail	Goestenkois	Female	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Assistant Coach
Larry	Brown	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach
Gregg	Popovich	Male	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach
Oliver	Purnell	Male	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach
Rock	Allen	Male	Light Welterweight	Boxing	Concrete Jungle
Andre	Dirrell	Male	Middleweight	Boxing	Police Athletic League
Vicente	Escobedo	Male	Lightweight	Boxing	Woodland Boxing Club
Jason	Estrada	Male	Super Heavyweight	Boxing	Manfredo's Gym
Vanes	Martirosyan	Male	Welterweight	Boxing	Verougo Hills High School
Fon	Siler	Male	Flyweight	Boxing	Milville Golden Gloves
Devin	Vargas	Male	Heavyweight	Boxing	Grass City Boxing
Andre	Ward	Male	Light Heavyweight	Boxing	Hard Hitters
Rau/Shee	Warren	Male	Light Flyweight	Boxing	Milville Golden Gloves
Sandy	Martinez-Pino	Female	Team Leader	Team Leader	Team Leader
Basheer	Abdullah	Male	Head Coach	Head Coach	Head Coach
Anthony	Bradley	Male	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Joe	Zanders	Male	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach
Kathy	Colln	Female	Sprint/Women's Kayak/K-2, K-4	Canoe/Kayak	University of Washington
Rebecca	Giddens	Female	Slalom/Women's Kayak/K-1	Canoe/Kayak	Georgia State University
Carrle	Johnson	Female	Sprint/Women's Kayak/K-1, K-4	Canoe/Kayak	University of Calif. - San Diego
Marie	Milalis	Female	Sprint/Women's Kayak/K-4	Canoe/Kayak	University of San Diego
Lauren	Spalding	Female	Sprint/Women's Kayak/K-2, K-4	Canoe/Kayak	
Andy	Bussey	Male	Sprint/Men's Kayak/K-2	Canoe/Kayak	
Chris	Ennis, Jr.	Male	Slalom/Men's Canoe C-1	Canoe/Kayak	
Brett	Heyl	Male	Slalom/Men's Kayak K-1	Canoe/Kayak	
Joe	Jacobi	Male	Slalom/Men's Canoe C-2	Canoe/Kayak	
Nate	Johnson	Male	Sprint/Men's Canoe/C-2 500m, C-2 1000m	Canoe/Kayak	
Benjie	Lewis	Male	Sprint/Men's Kayak/K-2 500m	Canoe/Kayak	
Jordan	Malloch	Male	Sprint/Men's Canoe/C-2 500m, C-2 1000m	Canoe/Kayak	
Scott	Parsons	Male	Slalom/Men's Kayak K-1	Canoe/Kayak	
Jeff	Smoke	Male	Sprint/Men's Kayak/K-2, 1000m	Canoe/Kayak	
Matt	Taylor	Male	Slalom/Men's Canoe C-2	Canoe/Kayak	
Bartosz	Wolski	Male	Sprint/Men's Kayak/K-2 500m	Canoe/Kayak	
Rami	Zur	Male	Sprint/Men's Kayak/K-1 500m, K-1 1000m	Canoe/Kayak	Southwestern College
Mark	Parrish	Male	Sprint Team Leader	Sprint Team Leader	
Bill	Endicott	Male	Slalom Team Leader	Slalom Team Leader	
Jerzy	Dziadkowiec	Male	Sprint Head Coach	Sprint Head Coach	
Silvan	Poberaj	Male	Slalom Head Coach	Slalom Head Coach	
Kristin	Armstrong	Female	Women's Road	Cycling	
Dede	Barry	Female	Women's Road	Cycling	University of Colorado
Mary	McConneloug	Female	Women's Mountain Bike	Cycling	
Erin	Mirabella	Female	Women's Track/Individual Pursuit	Cycling	
Jennie	Reed	Female	Women's Track/Sprint, 500m Time Trial	Cycling	Gregg's Trek/Volkswagon Racing Team
Christine	Thorburn	Female	Women's Road	Cycling	Stanford/Grinnell College/Webcor Builders
Adam	Duvendeck	Male	Men's Track/Team Sprint	Cycling	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs
Tyler	Hamilton	Male	Men's Road	Cycling	University of Colorado - Boulder/Phonak
George	Hincaple	Male	Men's Road	Cycling	
Jeremy	Horgan-Kobelski	Male	Men's Mountain Bike	Cycling	University of Colorado - Boulder

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Bobby	Julich	Male	Men's Road	Cycling	CSC
Levi	Leipheimer	Male	Men's Road	Cycling	
Gideon	Massie	Male	Men's Track/Team Sprint	Cycling	
Jason	McCartney	Male	Men's Road	Cycling	
Marty	Nothstein	Male	Men's Track/Keirin	Cycling	
Colby	Pearce	Male	Men's Track/Points Race	Cycling	University of Colorado - Boulder
Christian	Stahl	Male	Men's Track/Team Sprint	Cycling	
Todd	Wells	Male	Men's Mountain Bike	Cycling	University of Arizona
Steve	Johnson	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Jliri	Malinus	Male	Team Administrator	Team Administrator	
Andrzej	Bek	Male	Track Head Coach	Track Head Coach	
Desmond	Dickie	Male	Track Assistant Coach	Track Assistant Coach	
Bernard	Kocis, Jr.	Male	Track/Mountain Bike Mechanic	Track/Mountain Bike Mechanic	
Keeneth	Whelpdale	Male	Track/Road Bike Mechanic	Track/Road Bike Mechanic	
Cassandra	Cardinell	Female	Synchronized Platform	Diving	Indiana University
Sara	Hildebrand	Female	Synchronized Platform	Diving	Indiana University
Rachelle	Kunkel	Female	3m	Diving	Brigham Young University
Kimiko	Soldati	Female	3m	Diving	Indiana University
Laura	Wilkinson	Female	Platform	Diving	University of Texas
Troy	Dumais	Male	3m, 3m Synchronized	Diving	University of Texas
Justin	Dumais	Male	3m Synchronized	Diving	University of Texas
Caesar	Garcia	Male	Platform	Diving	Auburn University
Kyle	Prandi	Male	Platform, Synchronized Platform	Diving	University of Miami
Mark	Ruiz	Male	Synchronized Platform	Diving	
Justin	Wilcock	Male	3m	Diving	Brigham Young University
Richard	Kimball	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Ken	Armstrong	Male	Head Coach	Head Coach	
Debbie	McDonald	Female	Dressage/Brentina	Equestrian	
Beezie	Patton Madden	Female	Show Jumping/Authentic	Equestrian	
Julie	Richards	Female	Eventing/Jacob Two Two	Equestrian	
Kim	Severson	Female	Eventing/Winsome Adante	Equestrian	
Amy	Tryon	Female	Eventing/	Equestrian	
Lisa	Wilcox	Female	Dressage/Relevant 5	Equestrian	

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Darren	Chiacchia	Male	Eventing/Windfall 2 - Trakehner Stallion	Equestrian	
Robert	Dover	Male	Dressage/FBW Kennedy	Equestrian	
Chris	Keppler	Male	Show Jumping/Royal Kaliber	Equestrian	
Guenter	Seidel	Male	Dressage/Aragon	Equestrian	
McLain	Ward	Male	Show Jumping/Sapphire	Equestrian	
John	Williams	Male	Eventing/Carrick	Equestrian	
Peter	Wyde	Male	Show Jumping/Fein Cera	Equestrian	
Marilyn	Adams	Female	Dressage Team Leader	Dressage Team Leader	
Sally	Ike	Female	Show Jumping Team Leader	Show Jumping Team Leader	
Jim	Wolf	Male	Eventing Team Leader	Eventing Team Leader	
Klaus	Balkenhol	Male	Dressage Head Coach	Dressage Head Coach	
Frank	Chapot	Male	Show Jumping Head Coach	Show Jumping Head Coach	
Mark	Phillips	Male	Eventing Head Coach	Eventing Head Coach	
Sada	Jacobson	Female	Women's Saber	Fencing	Yale University
Emily	Jacobson	Female	Women's Sabre	Fencing	Columbia University
Kaimara	James	Female	Women's Epee	Fencing	Princeton University
Erinn	Smart	Female	Women's Foil	Fencing	Columbia University
Marie	Zagunis	Female	Women's Sabre	Fencing	University of Notre Dame
Jed	Dupree	Male	Men's Foil	Fencing	Columbia University
Dan	Kellher	Male	Men's Foil	Fencing	Columbia University
Seth	Kelsey	Male	Men's Epee	Fencing	U.S. Air Force Academy
Ivan	Lee	Male	Men's Sabre	Fencing	St. John's University
Cody	Mattern	Male	Men's Epee	Fencing	
Jason	Rogers	Male	Men's Sabre	Fencing	The Ohio State University
Keeth	Smart	Male	Men's Saber	Fencing	St. John's University
Soren	Thompson	Male	Men's Epee	Fencing	Princeton University
Jon	Tiomkin	Male	Men's Foil	Fencing	St. John's University
Robert	Largman	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Arkady	Burdan	Male	Coach	Coach	
Yury	Gelman	Male	Coach	Coach	
Jeff	Bukantz	Male	Team Captain	Team Captain	

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Weight	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Mohini	Bhardwaj	Female	Women's Artistic	Gymnastics	UCLA
Anna	Hatch	Female	Women's Artistic	Gymnastics	
Terin	Humphrey	Female	Women's Artistic	Gymnastics	University of Alabama
Courtney	Kupels	Female	Women's Artistic	Gymnastics	Turned Pro
Courtney	McCool	Female	Women's Artistic	Gymnastics	Lee's Summit North High School
Jennifer	Parilla	Female	Trampoline and Tumbling	Gymnastics	Orange Coast College
Carly	Patterson	Female	Women's Artistic	Gymnastics	Spring Creek Academy
Mary	Sanders	Female	Rhythmic	Gymnastics	York Mills Collegiate Institute
Jason	Gatson	Male	Men's Artistic	Gymnastics	
Morgan	Hamm	Male	Men's Artistic	Gymnastics	University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
Paul	Hamm	Male	Men's Artistic	Gymnastics	University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
Brett	McClure	Male	Men's Artistic	Gymnastics	
Blaire	Wilson	Male	Men's Artistic	Gymnastics	Ohio State University
Guard	Young	Male	Men's Artistic	Gymnastics	Brigham Young University
Kathy	Kelly	Female	Women's Team Leader	Women's Team Leader	
Ron	Brant	Male	Men's Team Leader	Men's Team Leader	
Jan	Exner	Female	Rhythmic Team Leader	Rhythmic Team Leader	
Ann	Simms	Female	Trampoline Team Leader	Trampoline Team Leader	
Kelli	Hill	Female	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	
Kevin	Mazeika	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	
Mimi	Masieva	Female	Rhythmic Head Coach	Rhythmic Head Coach	
Lionel	Rangel	Male	Trampoline Head Coach	Trampoline Head Coach	
Nicole	Kubes	Female	78 kg	Judo	
Charlee	Minkin	Female	52 kg	Judo	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs
Ronda	Rousey	Female	63 kg	Judo	
Cellia	Schutz	Female	70 kg	Judo	
Ellen	Wilson	Female	57 kg	Judo	
Martin	Boonzaayer	Male	100 plus kg	Judo	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs
Rhadi	Ferguson	Male	100 kg	Judo	Arizona State/Western Michigan University
Rick	Hawn	Male	81 kg	Judo	Howard University
Brian	Olson	Male	90 kg	Judo	University of Colorado - Boulder

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Alexander	Ottiano	Male	66 kg	Judo	Brown University
Jimmy	Pedro	Male	73kg	Judo	Brown University
Taraje	Williams-Murray	Male	60 kg	Judo	
Leonard	Wessell, III	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Eddie	Liddle	Male	Head Coach	Head Coach	
Brett	Barron	Male	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	
Anita	Allen	Female	Modern Pentathlon	Modern Pentathlon	U.S. Military Academy
Mary Beth	Iagorashvili	Female	Modern Pentathlon	Modern Pentathlon	Marquette University
Vaho	Iagorashvili	Male	Modern Pentathlon	Modern Pentathlon	Institute for Physical Culture and Sport
Chad	Senior	Male	Modern Pentathlon	Modern Pentathlon	George Washington University
Steve	Richards	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Viktor	Svatenko	Male	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	
Janusz	Peciak	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	
Stacey	Borgman	Female	Lightweight Double Sculls	Rowing	Columbia University
Allison	Cox	Female	Eights	Rowing	University of San Diego
Caryn	Davies	Female	Eights	Rowing	Harvard University
Jennifer	Devine	Female	Single Sculls	Rowing	University of Washington
Megan	Dirkmaat	Female	Eights	Rowing	University of Calif. - Berkeley
Hilary	Gehman	Female	Quadruple Sculls	Rowing	Colby College
Michelle	Guerette	Female	Quadruple Sculls	Rowing	Harvard University
Danika	Harris-Holbrook	Female	Quadruple Sculls	Rowing	Princeton University
Kate	Johnson	Female	Eights	Rowing	University of Michigan
Sarah	Jones	Female	Pairs	Rowing	University of Massachusetts
Laurel	Korholz	Female	Eights	Rowing	University of Calif. - Berkeley
Kate	MacKenzie	Female	Pairs	Rowing	University of Michigan
Sam	Magee	Female	Eights	Rowing	Stanford University
Anna	Mickelson	Female	Eights	Rowing	University of Washington
Lianne	Nelson	Female	Eights	Rowing	Princeton University
Kelly	Salchow	Female	Quadruple Sculls	Rowing	University of Cincinnati/Rhode Island School of Design
Lisa	Schlenker	Female	Lightweight Double Sculls	Rowing	Portland State University
Mary	Whipple	Female	Eights	Rowing	University of Washington
Aquil	Abdullah	Male	Double Sculls	Rowing	George Washington
Chris	Ahrens	Male	Eights	Rowing	Princeton University

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Wyatt	Allen	Male	Eights	Rowing	University of Virginia
Dan	Beery	Male	Eights	Rowing	University of Tennessee - Chattanooga
Pete	Cipollone	Male	Eights	Rowing	University of Calif. - Berkeley
Matt	Deakin	Male	Eights	Rowing	University of Washington
J. Sloan	DuRoss	Male	Quadruple Sculls	Rowing	Brown University
Joseph	Hansen	Male	Eights	Rowing	Oregon State University
Ben	Holbrook	Male	Quadruple Sculls	Rowing	Brown University
Beau	Hoopman	Male	Eights	Rowing	University of Wisconsin
Garrett	Klugh	Male	Fours	Rowing	San Diego State
Wolf	Moser	Male	Fours	Rowing	Harvard University
Henry	Nuzum	Male	Double Sculls	Rowing	Harvard University
Jason	Read	Male	Eights	Rowing	Temple University
Greg	Ruckman	Male	Lightweight Double Sculls	Rowing	Harvard University
Artour	Sansonov	Male	Pairs	Rowing	Harvard University
Jamie	Schroeder	Male	Fours	Rowing	Stanford University
Kent	Smack	Male	Quadruple Sculls	Rowing	Rutgers University/Hobart College
Matt	Smith	Male	Lightweight Fours	Rowing	University of Wisconsin/U.S. Army
Paul	Teti	Male	Lightweight Fours	Rowing	Princeton University
Pat	Todd	Male	Lightweight Fours	Rowing	Harvard University
Steve	Tucker	Male	Lightweight Double Sculls	Rowing	MIT
Bryan	Volpenhein	Male	Eights	Rowing	Ohio State University
Luke	Walton	Male	Pairs	Rowing	University of Calif. - Berkeley
Steve	Warner	Male	Lightweight Fours	Rowing	University of Michigan
Mike	Wherley	Male	Fours	Rowing	University of Minnesota
Brett	Wilkinson	Male	Quadruple Sculls	Rowing	Bucknell University
Glenn	Merry	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Matt	Imes	Male	Team Administrator	Team Administrator	
Mike	Teti	Male	Coach	Coach	
Tom	Terhaar	Male	Coach	Coach	
Kris	Korzeniewski	Male	Coach	Coach	
Mike	Irwin	Male	Boat Handler	Boat Handler	
Charles	Butt	Male	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	
Christine	Wilson	Female	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	
Lanee	Butler-Beashel	Female	Women's Mistral	Sailing	University of Calif. - Irvine

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Carol	Cronin	Female	Yngling/Skipper	Sailing	Connecticut College
Mary Ellen "Meg"	Gaillard	Female	Europe	Sailing	Connecticut College
Nancy	Haberland	Female	Yngling/Crew	Sailing	Miami University (Ohio)
Isabelle	Kinsolving	Female	Women's 470/Crew	Sailing	Yale University
Katie	McDowell	Female	Women's 470/Skipper	Sailing	Brown University
Liz	Merrifield Filter	Female	Yngling/Crew	Sailing	Tulane
Kevin	Burnham	Male	Men's 470/Crew	Sailing	University of Miami
Paul	Cayard	Male	Star/Skipper	Sailing	San Francisco State University
Paul	Foerster	Male	Men's 470/Skipper	Sailing	University of Texas
Kevin	Hall	Male	Fltn	Sailing	Brown University
John	Lovell, III	Male	Tornado/Skipper	Sailing	College of Charleston
Mark	Mendelblatt	Male	Laser	Sailing	Tufts University
Charlie	Ogletree	Male	Tornado/Crew	Sailing	Old Dominion University
Pete	Spaulding	Male	49er/Crew	Sailing	Boston College
Phil	Trinter	Male	Star/Crew	Sailing	Indiana University
Tim	Wadlow	Male	49er/Skipper	Sailing	Boston University
Peter	Wells	Male	Men's Mistral	Sailing	University of Calif. - Irvine
Fred	Hagedorn	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	Tufts University/Northwestern University
Gary	Bodie, III	Male	Head Coach	Head Coach	California Institute of Technology
Sarah	Blakeslee	Female	Three-position Rifle	Shooting	N/A
Elizabeth	Callahan	Female	Air Pistol, 25m Pistol	Shooting	N/A
Emily	Caruso	Female	Air Rifle	Shooting	Norwich University
Morgan	Hicks	Female	Three-position Rifle	Shooting	
Hattie	Johnson	Female	10m Rifle	Shooting	
Collyn	Loper	Female	Trap	Shooting	N/A
Kim	Rhode	Female	Double Trap, Skeet	Shooting	Calif. Polytechnic University
Connie	Schiller Smotek	Female	Skeet	Shooting	
Rebecca	Snyder	Female	Air Pistol, 25m Pistol	Shooting	
Michael	Antl	Male	Three-position Rifle, Prone Rifle	Shooting	West Virginia University
Lance	Bade	Male	Trap	Shooting	
Shawn	Dulichery	Male	Skeet	Shooting	
Glenn	Eller	Male	Double Trap	Shooting	
Matt	Emmons	Male	Air Rifle, Three-Position Rifle, Prone Rifle	Shooting	University of Alaska - Fairbanks

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Event Title	Team/University/High School
Bret	Erickson	Male	Trap, Double Trap	Shooting	
Todd	Graves	Male	Skeet	Shooting	
Koby	Holland	Male	Running Target	Shooting	
Jason	Parker	Male	Air Rifle	Shooting	Xavier University
Adam	Saathoff	Male	10 meter 30 + 30 running target	Shooting	Arizona State University
Daryl	Szarenski	Male	10m Air, 50m Pistol	Shooting	Tennessee Tech University; Roger Williams University
Jason	Turner	Male	10m Air, 50m Pistol	Shooting	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs
Wanda	Jewell	Female	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Lloyd	Woodhouse	Male	Shotgun Head Coach	Shotgun Head Coach	
Erich	Bujiung	Male	Pistol Head Coach	Pistol Head Coach	
Sergey	Luzov	Male	Running Target Head Coach	Running Target Head Coach	
David	Johnson	Male	Rifle Head Coach	Rifle Head Coach	
Shannon	Boxx	Female	Midfielder	Soccer (Football)	University of Notre Dame
Brandi	Chastain	Female	Defender	Soccer (Football)	Santa Clara University
Joy	Fawcett	Female	Defender	Soccer (Football)	University of Calif. - Berkeley
Julie	Foudy	Female	Midfielder	Soccer (Football)	Stanford University
Mia	Hamm	Female	Forward	Soccer (Football)	University of North Carolina
Angela	Hucles	Female	Midfielder	Soccer (Football)	University of Virginia
Kristine	Lilly	Female	Midfielder	Soccer (Football)	University of North Carolina
Kristen	Luckenbill	Female	Goalkeeper	Soccer (Football)	Dartmouth College
Kate	Markgraf	Female	Defender	Soccer (Football)	University of Notre Dame
Heather	Mitts	Female	Defender	Soccer (Football)	University of Florida
Heather	O'Reilly	Female	Forward	Soccer (Football)	University of North Carolina
Cindy	Parlow	Female	Forward	Soccer (Football)	University of North Carolina
Christie	Rampone	Female	Defender	Soccer (Football)	Monmouth University
Cat	Reddick	Female	Defender	Soccer (Football)	University of North Carolina
Briana	Scurry	Female	Goalkeeper	Soccer (Football)	University of Massachusetts
Lindsay	Tarpley	Female	Midfielder	Soccer (Football)	University of North Carolina
Aly	Wagner	Female	Midfielder	Soccer (Football)	Santa Clara University
Mary	Wambach	Female	Forward	Soccer (Football)	University of Florida
Nils	Krumlins	Female	Team Leader	Team Leader	
April	Heinrichs	Female	Head Coach	Head Coach	
Tracey	Leone	Female	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Booze	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Phil	Wheddon	Male	Goalie Coach	Goalie Coach	
Laura	Berg	Female	Outfield	Softball	Fresno State University
Crystl	Bustos	Female	Infield	Softball	Palm Beach Community College
Lisa	Fernandez	Female	Pitcher	Softball	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Jennie	Finch	Female	Pitcher	Softball	University of Arizona
Amanda	Freed	Female	Utility	Softball	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Lori	Harrigan	Female	Pitcher	Softball	University of Nevada - Las Vegas
Lovjeanne	Jung	Female	Second Base	Softball	University of Arizona
Kelly	Kretschman	Female	Outfield	Softball	University of Alabama
Jessica	Mendoza	Female	Outfield	Softball	Stanford University
Talria	Mims Flowers	Female	Utility	Softball	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Stacey	Nuveman	Female	Catcher	Softball	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Leah	O'Brien-Arnico	Female	Outfield	Softball	University of Arizona
Catherine "Cat"	Osterman	Female	Pitcher	Softball	University of Texas
Jenny	Topping	Female	Catcher	Softball	Calif. State University - Fullerton
Natasha	Watley	Female	Short Stop	Softball	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Paula	McCormick	Female	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Mike	Candrea	Male	Head Coach	Head Coach	University of Arizona
Ken	Eriksen	Male	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	
John	Rittman	Male	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	
Amanda	Beard	Female	100m Breaststroke, 200m Breaststroke, 200m Individual Medley	Swimming	University of Arizona
Lindsay	Benko	Female	200m Freestyle	Swimming	University of Southern Calif.
Caroline	Bruce	Female	200m Breaststroke	Swimming	Stanford University
Kristen	Caverly	Female	200m Backstroke	Swimming	Stanford University
Haley	Cope	Female	100m Backstroke	Swimming	University of Calif.-Berkeley
Maritza	Correia	Female	4x100m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Georgia
Natalie	Coughlin	Female	100m Freestyle, 100m Backstroke	Swimming	University of Calif.-Berkeley
Margaret	Hoelzer	Female	200m Backstroke	Swimming	Auburn University
Katie	Hoff	Female	200m Individual Medley, 400m Individual Medley	Swimming	High school
Rhi	Jeffrey	Female	4x200m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Southern California
Kara Lynn	Joyce	Female	50m Freestyle, 100m Freestyle	Swimming	University of Georgia
Kalyn	Keller	Female	400m Freestyle, 800m Freestyle	Swimming	University of Southern California
Dana	Kirk	Female	200m Butterfly	Swimming	Stanford University

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Tara	Kirk	Female	100m Breaststroke	Swimming	Stanford University
Rachel	Komisarz	Female	100m Butterfly	Swimming	University of Kentucky
Colleen	Lanne	Female	4x100m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Texas
Diana	Munz	Female	800m Freestyle	Swimming	Turned Pro
Carly	Piper	Female	4x200m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Wisconsin
Kaitlin	Sandeno	Female	400m Freestyle, 200m Butterfly, 400m Individual Medley	Swimming	University of Southern Calif.
Jenny	Thompson	Female	50m Freestyle, 100m Butterfly	Swimming	Stanford University
Dana	Vollmer	Female	200m Freestyle	Swimming	High school
Amanda	Weir	Female	4x100m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Georgia
Ian	Crocker	Male	100m Butterfly, 100m Freestyle	Swimming	University of Texas
Nate	Dusing	Male	4x100m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Texas
Mark	Gangloff	Male	100m Breaststroke	Swimming	Auburn University
Scott	Goldblatt	Male	4x200m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Texas
Gary	Hall	Male	50m Freestyle	Swimming	University of Arizona
Brendan	Hansen	Male	100m Breaststroke, 200m Breaststroke	Swimming	University of Texas
Bryce	Hunt	Male	200m Backstroke	Swimming	Auburn University
Larsen	Jensen	Male	400m Freestyle, 1500m Freestyle	Swimming	University of Southern Calif.
Klete	Keller	Male	200m Freestyle, 400m Freestyle	Swimming	University of Southern Calif.
Dan	Ketchum	Male	4x200m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Michigan
Lenny	Krayzeiburg	Male	100m Backstroke	Swimming	University of Southern Calif.
Jason	Lezak	Male	50m Freestyle, 100m Freestyle	Swimming	University of Calif. - Santa Barbara
Ryan	Lochte	Male	200m Individual Medley	Swimming	University of Florida
Tom	Malchow	Male	200m Butterfly	Swimming	University of Michigan
Aaron	Peterson	Male	100m Backstroke, 200m Backstroke	Swimming	University of Texas
Michael	Phelps, III	Male	200m Freestyle, 100m Butterfly, 200m Butterfly, 200m Individual Medley, 400m Individual Medley	Swimming	Turned Pro
Scott	Usher	Male	200m Breaststroke	Swimming	University of Wyoming
Peter	Vanderkaay	Male	4x200m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Michigan
Erik	Vendt	Male	1500m Freestyle, 400m Individual Medley	Swimming	University of Southern Calif.
Neil	Walker	Male	4x100m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Texas
Gabe	Woodward	Male	4x100m Freestyle Relay	Swimming	University of Southern Calif.
Joke	Schubert	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	University of Southern Calif.
Jackie	Bak-Yost	Female	Assistant Team Leader	Asst Team Leader	

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Horse	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Michael	Lawrence	Male	Assistant Team Leader	Assistant Team Leader	
Mark	Schubert	Male	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	
Eddie	Reese	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	University of Texas
Richard	Quick	Male	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Assistant Coach	Stanford University
Francis	Busch	Male	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Assistant Coach	University of Arizona
Teresa	McKeever	Female	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Assistant Coach	University of California - Berkeley
Jon	Urbanchek	Male	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach	University of Michigan
David	Salo	Male	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach	Club
Robert	Bowman	Male	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach	University of Michigan
Allison	Bartosik	Female	Team, Duet	Synchronized Swimming	
Tammy	Crow	Female	Team	Synchronized Swimming	University of Calif. - Berkeley
Erin	Dobratz	Female	Team	Synchronized Swimming	Stanford University
Becky	Jasontek	Female	Team	Synchronized Swimming	Ohio State University
Anna	Kozlova	Female	Team, Duet	Synchronized Swimming	Academy of Physical Education (Russia)
Sara	Lowe	Female	Team	Synchronized Swimming	
Lauren	McFall	Female	Team	Synchronized Swimming	
Stephanie	Nesbitt	Female	Team	Synchronized Swimming	
Kendra	Zanotto	Female	Team	Synchronized Swimming	
Linai	Vaz DeNegri	Female	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Chris	Carver	Female	Head Coach	Head Coach	
Linda	Witter	Female	Assistant Coach	Assistant Coach	
Tawny	Banh	Female	Singles & Doubles	Table Tennis	Calif. State University
Gao	Jun	Female	Singles & Doubles	Table Tennis	Eastern China University of Science & Technology
Whitney	Ping	Female	Doubles	Table Tennis	
Jasna	Reed	Female	Singles & Doubles	Table Tennis	
Mark	Hazinski	Male	Doubles	Table Tennis	Oakland University
Ililja	Lupulesku	Male	Singles & Doubles	Table Tennis	

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Weight	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Khoa	Nguyen	Male	Singles	Table Tennis	
Bob	Fox	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Teodor	Gheorghhe	Male	Head Coach	Head Coach	
Nia	Abdallah	Female	Olympic Featherweight (49-57kg)	Taekwondo	N/A
Steven	Lopez	Male	Olympic Welterweight (69-80kg)	Taekwondo	N/A
Jean	Lopez	Male	Team Leader/Head Coach	Team Leader/Head Coach	
Martina	Navratilova	Female	Doubles	Tennis	
Lisa	Raymond	Female	Doubles	Tennis	University of Florida
Chanda	Rubin	Female	Singles	Tennis	
Serena	Williams	Female	Singles, Doubles	Tennis	Art Institute of Florida
Bob	Bryan	Male	Doubles	Tennis	Stanford University
Mike	Bryan	Male	Doubles	Tennis	Stanford University
Taylor	Dent	Male	Singles	Tennis	
Mardy	Fish	Male	Singles, Doubles	Tennis	
Andy	Roddick	Male	Singles, Doubles	Tennis	
Vinny	Spadea	Male	Singles	Tennis	
Jeff	Ryan	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Zina	Garrison	Female	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	
Patrick	McEnroe	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	
Susan	Bartholomew-Williams	Female	Triathlon	Triathlon	University of Alabama
Barb	Lindquist	Female	Triathlon	Triathlon	Stanford University
Sheila	Taormina	Female	Triathlon	Triathlon	University of Georgia
Hunter	Kemper	Male	Triathlon	Triathlon	Wake Forest University
Victor	Plata	Male	Triathlon	Triathlon	Calif. Polytechnic University
Andy	Potts	Male	Triathlon	Triathlon	University of Michigan
Libby	Burrell	Female	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Gale Ann	Bernhardt	Female	Head Coach	Head Coach	
Al	Lau	Male	Team Leader - Beach	Team Leader - Beach	
Tom	Pingel	Male	Women's Team Leader - Indoor	Women's Team Leader - Indoor	
Al	Monaco, Jr.	Male	Men's Team Leader - Indoor	Men's Team Leader - Indoor	
Toshi	Yoshida	Male	Women's Coach	Women's Coach	
Kevin	Hamby	Male	Women's Coach	Women's Coach	

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Episode	Sport/Title	Team/University/Institution
Robyn	Romansky	Female	Women's Coach	Women's Coach	
Doug	Beal	Male	Men's Coach	Men's Coach	
Carl	McGown	Male	Men's Coach	Men's Coach	
Hugh	McCutcheon	Male	Men's Coach	Men's Coach	
Misty	May	Female	Right Side	Volleyball-Beach	Long Beach State University
Holly	McPeak	Female	Right Side	Volleyball-Beach	UCLA
Kerri	Walsh	Female	Left Side	Volleyball-Beach	Stanford University
Elaine	Youngs	Female	Left Side	Volleyball-Beach	UCLA
Dain	Blanton	Male	Right Side	Volleyball-Beach	Pepperdine University
Dax	Holdren	Male	Right Side	Volleyball-Beach	University of Calif.-Santa Barbara
Stein	Metzger	Male	Left Side	Volleyball-Beach	UCLA
Jeff	Nygaard	Male	Left Side	Volleyball-Beach	UCLA
Robyn	Ah Mow-Santos	Female	Setter	Volleyball-Indoor	University of Hawaii
Elisabeth "Wiz"	Bachman	Female	Middle Blocker	Volleyball-Indoor	UCLA
Lindsey	Berg	Female	Setter	Volleyball-Indoor	University of Minnesota
Heather	Bown	Female	Middle Blocker	Volleyball-Indoor	University of Hawaii
Tara	Cross-Battle	Female	Outside Hitter	Volleyball-Indoor	Long Beach State University
Tayyiba	Haneef	Female	Opposite	Volleyball-Indoor	Long Beach State University
Nancy	Metcalf	Female	Opposite	Volleyball-Indoor	University of Nebraska
Ogonna	Nnamani	Female	Outside Hitter	Volleyball-Indoor	Stanford University
Keba	Phipps	Female	Outside Hitter	Volleyball-Indoor	
Danielle	Scott	Female	Middle Blocker	Volleyball-Indoor	Long Beach State University
Stacy	Sykora	Female	Libero	Volleyball-Indoor	Texas A&M University
Logan	Tom	Female	Outside Hitter	Volleyball-Indoor	Stanford University
Lily	Ball	Male	Setter	Volleyball-Indoor	University of Indiana-Purdue Fort Wayne
Kevin	Barnett	Male	Outside Hitter	Volleyball-Indoor	Pepperdine University
Brook	Billings	Male	Opposite	Volleyball-Indoor	University of Southern Calif.
Phil	Eatherton	Male	Middle Blocker	Volleyball-Indoor	Ball State University
Gabe	Gardner	Male	Outside Hitter	Volleyball-Indoor	Stanford University
Tom	Hoff	Male	Middle Blocker	Volleyball-Indoor	Long Beach State University
Ryan	Miller	Male	Middle Blocker	Volleyball-Indoor	Brigham Young University
Reid	Priddy	Male	Outside Hitter	Volleyball-Indoor	Loyola Marymount University
Riley	Salmon	Male	Outside Hitter	Volleyball-Indoor	Pierce College
Clay	Stanley	Male	Opposite	Volleyball-Indoor	University of Hawaii

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Noise	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Erik	Sullivan	Male	Libero	Volleyball-Indoor	UCLA
Donald	Suxho	Male	Setter	Volleyball-Indoor	University of Southern Calif.
Robin	Beauregard	Female	Center Back	Water Polo	Stanford University
Margie	Dingeldeln	Female	Driver	Water Polo	Stanford University
Ellen	Estes	Female	Center	Water Polo	Stanford University
Jacqueline	Frank	Female	Goalkeeper	Water Polo	Stanford University
Natalie	Golda	Female	Center Back	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Erica	Lorenz	Female	Driver	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Berkeley
Heather	Moody	Female	Center Forward/Captain	Water Polo	San Diego State University
Thalia	Munro	Female	Center Back	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Nicolle	Payne	Female	Goalkeeper	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Berkeley
Heather	Petri	Female	Driver	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Kelly	Rulon	Female	Driver	Water Polo	Stanford University
Amber	Stachowski	Female	Center Back	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Irvine
Brenda	Villa	Female	Driver	Water Polo	Stanford University
Omar	Amr	Male	Driver	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Irvine
Tony	Azevedo	Male	Driver	Water Polo	Stanford University
Ryan	Bailey	Male	Offense	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Irvine
Layne	Beaubien	Male	Defense	Water Polo	Stanford University
Brandon	Brooks	Male	Goalkeeper	Water Polo	Stanford University
Genal	Kerr	Male	Goalkeeper	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Dan	Klatt	Male	Driver/Defense	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Irvine
Brett	Ormsby	Male	Driver	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Irvine
Jeff	Powers	Male	Offense/Defense	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Chris	Segesman	Male	Driver/Defense	Water Polo	University of Calif. - Irvine
Jesse	Smith	Male	Driver/Defense	Water Polo	Calif. State University - Long Beach
Wolf	Wigo	Male	Driver	Water Polo	Pepperdine University
Adam	Wright	Male	Driver	Water Polo	Stanford University
Michelle	Pickering-Baker	Female	Women's Team Leader	Women's Team Leader	University of Calif. - Los Angeles
Barbara	Kalbus	Female	Men's Team Leader	Men's Team Leader	
Guy	Baker	Male	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	
Kyle	Kopp	Male	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Assistant Coach	
Rachel	Scott	Female	Women's Assistant Coach	Women's Ass't Coach	

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Weight	Sport/Title	Team/University/High School
Radko	Rudic	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	
Daniel	Leyson	Male	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach	
Ricardo	Azevedo	Male	Men's Assistant Coach	Men's Assistant Coach	
Tara	Cunningham	Female	53kg	Weightlifting	
Cheryl	Haworth	Female	75+kg	Weightlifting	
Oscar	Chaplin, III	Male	85kg	Weightlifting	
Shane	Hamman	Male	105+kg	Weightlifting	
Chad	Vaughn	Male	77kg	Weightlifting	
Leo	Totten	Male	Team Leader	Team Leader	
Mike	Cohen	Male	Women's Head Coach	Women's Head Coach	
Gayle	Hatch	Male	Men's Head Coach	Men's Head Coach	
Sara	McMann	Female	63 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Lock Haven University
Patricia	Miranda	Female	48 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Stanford University
Toccaro	Montgomery	Female	72 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Cumberland College
Tela	O'Donnell	Female	55 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs
Stephen	Abas	Male	55 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Fresno State University
Daniel	Cormier	Male	96 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Oklahoma State University
Rulon	Gardner	Male	120 kg Greco-Roman	Wrestling	University of Nebraska
Jim	Gruenwald	Male	60 kg Greco-Roman	Wrestling	Maranatha Baptist Bible College
Eric	Guerrero	Male	60 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Oklahoma State University
Dennis	Hall	Male	55 kg Greco-Roman	Wrestling	University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point
Jamill	Kelly	Male	66 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Oklahoma State University; Lassen College
Garrett	Lowney	Male	96 kg Greco-Roman	Wrestling	University of Minnesota
Kerry	McCoy	Male	120 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Pennsylvania State University
Cael	Sanderson	Male	84 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	Iowa State University
Brad	Vering	Male	84 kg Greco-Roman	Wrestling	University of Nebraska
Joe	Williams	Male	74 kg Freestyle	Wrestling	University of Iowa
Oscar	Wood	Male	66 kg Greco-Roman	Wrestling	Oregon State University
Art	Martori	Male	Women's Freestyle Team Leader	Women's Freestyle Team Leader	
James	Ravannack	Male	Men's Freestyle Team Leader	Men's Freestyle Team Leader	
Jeff	Levitetz	Male	Greco-Roman Team Leader	Greco-Roman Team Leader	

First Name	Last Name	Gender	Event/Position/Class/Division	Sport/Title	High School
Terry	Steiner	Male	Women's Freestyle Head Coach	Women's Freestyle Head Coach	
Kevin	Jackson	Male	Men's Freestyle Head Coach	Men's Freestyle Head Coach	
Steve	Fraser	Male	Greco-Roman Head Coach	Greco-Roman Head Coach	



APPENDIX C



Olympic Sports Endowment

ENDOWMENT	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Contributions						
NCAA & USOC	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$40,000,000
Others	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$20,000,000
Interest to Inflation Proof (3.5%)		\$950,000	\$712,250	\$1,157,179	\$1,687,680	\$3,907,109
Subtotal	\$10,000,000	\$10,350,000	\$12,712,250	\$15,157,179	\$15,687,680	\$63,907,109

SOURCES

Investment Earnings (3.5% contribution/ 7% total earnings)	\$350,000	\$712,250	\$1,157,179	\$1,687,680	\$3,907,109
---	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-------------

USES

Staff - (Salaries & Benefits)						
Professional (1.0 FTE)	\$185,000	\$191,475	\$198,177	\$205,113	\$212,292	\$992,056
Support staff (1.0 FTE in year 1, 2.0 beginning in Year 2/or contractor fees in lieu of FTE)	\$40,000	\$82,800	\$85,698	\$88,697	\$91,802	\$388,997
Travel and Operations (includes all educational and promotional materials)	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$55,000	\$60,000	\$65,000	\$270,000
Accounting, audits, gift reporting, etc.	\$25,000	\$25,875	\$26,781	\$27,718	\$28,688	\$134,062
Start-up costs	\$25,000					\$25,000
Subtotal Uses	\$315,000	\$350,150	\$365,655	\$381,528	\$397,782	\$1,810,115
Available for distribution to membership	(\$315,000)	(\$150)	\$346,595	\$775,651	\$1,289,898	\$2,096,994