



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Executive Summary	4
Findings	10
<i>International Team Staff Selection System</i>	12
<i>International Team Selection Process</i>	14
<i>Olympic Team Preparation</i>	17
<i>Relay Preparation and Training</i>	20
<i>Management of Team USA at International Competitions</i>	26
<i>Team USA Performance in Beijing</i>	31
<i>USATF High Performance and Development programs</i>	34
Recommendations	41
<i>Hire a professional General Manager of High Performance</i>	42
<i>Create a transparent, criteria-based Team Staff selection system</i>	43
<i>Restructure the composition of Team USA staffs</i>	45
<i>Shorten the U.S. Olympic Team Trials – Track & Field to 5 days</i>	47
<i>Terminate the National Relay Program</i>	48
<i>Establish a comprehensive 2012 team preparation program</i>	49
<i>Target technical events for medal growth and develop those events</i>	53
<i>Create a well-defined Professional Athlete designation</i>	57
<i>Establish a more stringent anti-doping reinstatement system</i>	58
<i>Promote and foster a self-sustaining professional athletes' union</i>	60
Appendices	61
<i>Appendix A – Project 30 Task Force Members</i>	62
<i>Appendix B – Project 30 Task Force Charter</i>	64
<i>Appendix C - Select Performances by Team USA Athletes</i>	66
<i>Between the Olympic Trials and Olympic Games</i>	



INTRODUCTION

Background

The Project 30 Task Force was formed in mid-October by USATF CEO Doug Logan to impartially evaluate USATF High Performance Programs, analyze Team USA Performance in Beijing, and chart a course for programmatic change to maximize Team USA performance in Olympic and World Championship competition. Initially dubbed the USATF High Performance Audit Panel, its members were selected by Mr. Logan in consultation with varied individuals throughout the sport. His stated goal was to choose individuals who weren't directly involved in preparing or coaching the 2008 Olympic Team. Renamed the Project 30 Task Force following Mr. Logan's goal of 30 medals at the 2012 Olympic Games in London, which he made public on December 7, 2008, the Project 30 Task Force is composed of Carl Lewis, Benita Fitzgerald Mosley, Ralph Mann, Mel Rosen, Aretha Hill Thurmond and Deena Kastor. (Ms. Thurmond and Ms. Kastor joined the panel in early December.) The USOC nominated to the Task Force Steve Roush, Doug Ingram and Jay Warwick, making the Task Force a nine-person group. (*See Appendix A – Project 30 Task Force members.*) USATF Director of Communications Jill Geer was designated as Administrator to the Task Force.

Methodology

Mr. Logan provided the Task Force with a Charter on October 13, 2008 (*see Appendix B – Project 30 Task Force Charter*). The Task Force then received more than 240 pages of documents, reports and reference materials detailing USATF's programs relating to the Charter. After reviewing these materials, the Task Force embarked on a series of interviews via conference call and in-person meetings. The Task Force as a whole conducted personal interviews with 30 people, including athletes, personal coaches in various disciplines, national team coaches, college coaches, athlete managers/agents, USATF National Office Staff and USATF volunteers. In addition to these interviews, the Task Force met with the Athletes Advisory Committee at USATF's Annual Meeting in Reno, via a Town Hall-style session. Task Force members conducted countless "off-line" one-on-one interviews on a personal basis, and many did their own statistical analyses.

Report

In the report that follows, the Task Force will summarize its findings and set forth a series of recommendations to ensure increased success for the sport domestically and for American athletes in international competition. If the Task Force's recommendations are followed, it believes that the goals of Project 30 at the 2012 Olympic Games are realistic and attainable.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Project 30 Task Force's report is comprised of an Introduction, Executive Report, Findings and Recommendations. Below is a summary of key components of the Task Force's work.

Findings of the Task Force include:

- **Overall, there is a lack of accountability, professionalism and cohesion in the areas the Task Force studied.** High Performance Programs and athlete development are splintered systems of competing interests, with no single person possessing ultimate authority or accountability. The sport needs to be more professional in structure, with professional staff overseeing national programs; athletes need to view and conduct themselves as professional athletes; professional coaches should act and be treated as such. Athletes, USATF staff, volunteer coaches, professional coaches, agents and volunteer administrators must be held to much higher levels of accountability to ensure the integrity and success of USATF programs.
- **The International Team Staff selection system lacks transparency and accountability, creating a culture of mistrust for coaches and athletes alike.** Fairly or not, the current committee-based selection system is viewed by many athletes and coaches to be an insider system driven by a "good old boy" network. Coaches on the outside of the system consider it unfair, and athletes sometimes don't hold the Team staff in high regard as a result. While some staff get high marks from athletes, others are considered under-qualified.
- **International staffs need more managers and fewer coaches.** The reality of serving on a Team staff is that a coach's job is primarily managerial, particularly given that most athletes' personal coaches travel to major competitions. Teams need more people ensuring that equipment is where it needs to be, athletes are getting to practice and competition, and that the overall needs of athletes are met. When these details are taken care of, athletes can devote their mental, physical and emotional energy to the competition rather than to logistics.
- **The criteria for selecting track and field's U.S. Olympic Team should not change, but the Olympic Trials themselves should.** Although there are some strong individual opinions supporting the concept of an unspecified "bye" system for key athletes, the vast majority of athletes and others feel the fairest system of selecting Olympic teams is the current "top three" system. However, the Task Force found that the length of the Olympic Trials as they are currently staged (eight days of competition over 10 calendar days) to be overly burdensome on athletes and counterproductive to the goal of selecting a team that will perform at its best at

Olympic competition. The physical and mental exhaustion can be too much for some athletes to recover from.

- **Excessive travel and poor long-term planning on the part of athletes, their coaches and agents appear to be the greatest controllable factors negatively affecting Team USA performance in Beijing.** At first blush, athletes competing too much between the Trials and the Games was speculated by some to be a cause of sub-par performance. (Untimely injuries, mental lapses and some athletes' inability to deal with the unique challenges of the Olympic experience also were obvious factors.) But in examining the issue and speaking to athletes, coaches and managers, it is clear to the Task Force that as long as competitions are part of a long-term plan laid out months and even more than a year in advance, pre-Olympic competition in itself does not negatively impact performance. It is when athletes and their agents decide to capitalize on their newfound status as Olympians by entering European meets last-minute, when they chase appearance money for its own sake, or when they make more than one trip to and from the U.S. and Europe, that performance suffers. They must keep their eyes on the prize – an Olympic medal.
- **Spending more than \$1 million in the last six years, and with as many as 173 athletes taking part in it each year, the National Relay Program has failed to produce results that justify the costs of the program.** How USATF trains and prepares its relays must be overhauled into a cost-efficient, results-oriented program overseen by people who are held accountable for their decisions and relay results. Relay underperformance is not unique to this country, nor is it a new development. But American results have not improved consistently since the founding of the National Relay Program, and the structure of the Program is such that those overseeing it are not held accountable for relay success or failure, or for the program's budget.
- **Lack of communication between coaches and athletes, poor management of the relay pools and questions over which coaches were responsible for relays resulted in the 4x100m relay failures in Beijing.** Chaos reigned in the lead-up to the 4x100m relay semifinals, and chaos reigned on the track as the American athletes failed to technically execute handoffs. USATF policies called for the National Relay Coaches to oversee the relays in Beijing, but volunteer coaching staff ultimately took control. Athletes wondered who was truly calling the shots and therefore lacked confidence in their coaches and the system. Athletes themselves were not informed of relay lineups until 48 hours before their semifinal race, leaving them ill-equipped to practice and prepare. Coaches made poor decisions in selecting relay orders, and they gave conflicting accounts of which athletes would have run in the men's 4x100m final. Incomprehensibly, coaches and managers failed to pick up bibs for both relays,

further undermining athlete morale and confidence. It ended with poor execution on the part of athletes and, ultimately, failure.

- **American coaches and athletes under-utilize the facilities and USATF sport science available to them.** USATF has a robust system for making advanced analytic information and data available to all athletes and coaches who compete in certain meets. The Task Force found that there is insufficient follow-up by USATF for ensuring that this information is being applied productively ó or correctly ó into athletes' training and competition. In addition, many athletes face problems gaining adequate access to training facilities, yet the facilities USATF has controlled in the past, such as the Olympic Training Center in Chula Vista, have been under-utilized by the organization. USATF must systematize its sports science application and the management of training centers around the country.
- **Inroads have been made into catching and punishing doping cheats, but more must be done to strengthen the anti-doping culture.** Catching athletes is just the first step. USATF must have a comprehensive anti-doping education program, overseen by one individual, in all components of the sport, if it is to change the anti-doping culture from one of turning a blind eye to drug use to one of being aggressively antagonistic toward it. From youth through professional, including athletes, coaches and agents, a singular system must be put in place. Coaches must be adequately educated so they can rely on coaching skill, rather than pharmacology skill, to produce top athletes. Agents must be investigated if the athletes they represent have a proven pattern of drug use. USATF can and must institute a post-suspension program to ensure that past cheaters do not relapse into their old methods.
- **American athletes as a group do not conduct themselves as true professionals, and USATF does not hold them to professional standards.** The Task Force found that the majority of athletes do not understand what it means to be a true professional, and USATF does not adequately educate them about what being a professional athlete entails. Too many athletes let others make decisions about their careers for them: they do not plan their goals and seasons in advance; agents choose them rather than vice versa; shoe companies choose their coaches for them. In short, support teams are in charge of the athletes, but the opposite should be the case. Athletes must understand that they control their professional careers, and with professionalism come certain responsibilities to the sport, other athletes, coaches, family and country. USATF, rather than external forces with interests often times at odds with those of the athletes, must educate them and set professional standards.

Based on its findings, the Task Force makes the following 10 Recommendations:

- **Hire a professional General Manager of High Performance.** Reporting directly to the CEO, the GM must have the resources and authority necessary to succeed, as he or she will be responsible for the majority of recommendations laid out in this report. It is the responsibility of the GM to produce a seamless athlete-development pipeline, from youth to elite. The GM will supervise USATF's National Office management of High Performance, Elite Athlete Services, Team USA Management, Team USA Staff management, National Championships, Sport Science application and Sports Medicine, Youth Development and Anti-Doping programs.
- **Create a transparent, criteria-based Team Staff selection system.** A system that is transparent and merit-based will ensure that the Team coaching staff is as accomplished as the teams they oversee. Under the supervision of the GM and in conjunction with USATF's Athletes' Advisory and Coaches' Advisory Committees, USATF should develop an impartial, point-based system for evaluating coaches who wish to be on national team staffs. Coaches who achieve a certain point level will be eligible to be on various team staffs; the GM will choose the staffs from any given pool of coaches. The coaches and staffs will be accountable to the GM.
- **Restructure the composition of Team USA staffs.** The Task Force recommends the following staff structure for up to 18 credentialed Team Staff positions at World Championships and Olympic Games. The staff will be led on the volunteer side by a Women's Head Coach, Women's Assistant Coach, Men's Head Coach and Men's assistant coach. Event coaches will serve both the men's and women's teams and will include Event Coaches for: Sprints and Relays, Hurdles, Jumps and Multis, Middle and Long Distances (including race walk) and Throws. Volunteer staff managers will include a Head Manager, Assistant Manager and Event Manager ó Friends and Family, who will focus exclusively on assisting athletes with issues pertaining to their families and other support mechanisms at international events. Three other unspecified óEvent Managersö will assist in all managerial functions. Credentialed professional staff will include the Team Leader, Assistant Team Leader, and the General Manager of High Performance.
- **Shorten the U.S. Olympic Team Trials – Track & Field to five days.** As described previously, the current 10-day structure of the Olympic Trials is counterproductive to fostering Olympic success. The argument that the Trials mimic the Games and therefore put American athletes at an advantage isn't valid: the Trials schedule does NOT mimic the Olympic schedule. Team USA's World Championships teams are chosen at a national championships lasting only four days, and Americans have had higher medal counts at Worlds than at Olympics. The number of competitive rounds or event field sizes may have to be reduced, but a five-day schedule should be more

than adequate to conduct the Olympic Trials. The rigors of multi-round competition will be achieved while ensuring athletes aren't physically, emotionally and financially spent at their conclusion.

- **Terminate the National Relay Program.** The Task Force recommends that relay pools be selected and managed by each national team's Sprints/Relay coach in consultation with the GM. The Sprints/Relay coach will have sole authority over and responsibility for relay practices, determining lineups and all other matters pertaining to the relay. The relay pools should be determined and published on the USATF Web site within 48 hours of the end of the national championships or Olympic Trials, and all relay pool members must sign a statement of conditions indicating they will commit to the demands of being on the relay. Standard relay best practices and methods must be established, published by USATF online and in print, and used not just in competition but also in Coaching Education curriculum and clinics nationwide.
- **Establish a comprehensive 2012 team preparation program.** It is the responsibility of the GM to ensure that athletes and their support teams are educated on the importance of long-term planning, with peak performance at the Olympic Games the goal. Additional incentives for peak performance may be provided by offering bonuses to athletes achieving personal- or season-best performances at the Games. Leading up to the London 2012, USATF should partner with the USOC to create a summer-long European Training Camp to serve as a training base for athletes as they prepare for the Games and/or compete in Europe. Training camp should include televised, international dual and triangular meets to enable athletes, especially those with few competitive opportunities, to get "competition sharp" while raising the profile of Team USA as a whole.
- **Target technical events for medal growth and develop those events.** To achieve 30 medals in London, American "favorites" heading into the Games must perform up to expectations, and additional medals must be forthcoming in other events. The Task Force believes the greatest potential for upping the American medal tally lies in the technical events, particularly men's and women's jumps and throws. To cultivate success in these and all events, USATF must identify and support High Performance Training Centers (HPTCs) throughout the country. These HPTCs will serve as the anchors for athlete and event development, provide the foundation for trusting athlete-coach-agent relationships, be the backbone for possible team- and club-based competitions and be a key cog in USATF's coaching education and sport science programs. USATF funding for event development and sport science must be multiplied many times over, focusing funds on athletes and events with few existing competitive opportunities to make money.

- **Create a well-defined Professional Athlete designation.** USATF must establish this designation for all athletes with no high school or college eligibility remaining who wish to receive USATF support funds (including prize money, insurance and other stipends) or who wish their coaches to receive USATF support (including stipends, credentials and other support). The Professional Athlete designation will establish minimum obligations for all professional athletes, such as participating in a minimum number of press conferences, promotional events and local, grass-roots functions during the course of the year, and a commitment to abide by new anti-doping programs (see below).
- **Establish a more stringent anti-doping reinstatement system.** USATF should give the anti-doping system more teeth by enforcing obligations on athletes who have doped. Athletes coming back from suspension should be required by USATF to provide a deposition under oath detailing what went into their decision to cheat, how they obtained and used their drugs, and who contributed to their cheating. USATF should set up a rehabilitation education program designed to teach doping-sanctioned athletes and their coaches how to train and compete clean. Any athlete who has been convicted of a doping violation who later pursues a coaching career should not be eligible for any USATF coaching support, programs or benefits, or to participate in any USATF sport science programs.
- **Promote and foster a self-sustaining professional athletes' union.** If athletes unionize and establish their collective strength, the sport will be stronger and more professional. The Task Force recommends that USATF provide seed money for a true Players' Association or union. This seed money will be a grant to be used to recruit and pay for an executive to organize and oversee the union for two years. This executive should be an experienced Players' Association and/or union organizer, not a former track and field athlete. Once on its feet, the Players' Association should follow the model of other sports and oversee several programs now under the auspices of USATF, including management of the Agent program. It could be a leader in establishing an international union that will ensure minimum pay for athletes at all sanctioned meets and other minimum-standard benefits.

Complete descriptions of the Findings and Recommendations follow below.

FINDINGS



Project 30 Task Force Report

The Findings of the Project 30 Task Force are laid out below, categorized according to the Task Force Charter. In more than two months of interviews, the themes of professionalism and accountability were echoed by every sector of the sport during the Task Force's interviews. In short, the sport needs to be more professional in structure, with professional staff overseeing national programs; athletes need to view and conduct themselves as professional athletes; and professional coaches should act and be treated as such. Athletes, USATF staff, volunteer coaches, professional coaches, agents and volunteer administrators must be held to much higher levels of accountability to ensure the integrity and success of USATF programs.

USATF's volunteer base is the backbone of the sport, but to achieve professionalism, accountability and continuity, oversight of programs must lie in the hands of professionals whose jobs depend on their success and performance. The volunteer base will benefit by having a more structured and professional mechanism to implement the programs they activate on a grass-roots level.

All of the recommendations provided by the Task Force are intended with two basic goals: to achieve the goal of 30 medals in London, and to increase the visibility, viability and value of track and field as a sport. These recommendations will be provided in the final section of this report. Below is a summary of the Task Force's findings in the course of their work.

1. International Team Staff system

Composition of the staff

Coaching staffs for Team USA at international competitions are composed of a volunteer staff chosen from primarily the collegiate coaching ranks. In recent years, coaches of strictly professional athletes also have been included, as have a small number of high school coaches. Since 2005, this staff has been supplemented by pool managers and paid staff from the National Office to manage the logistical affairs of the team. At the 2008 Olympic Games, there were seven coaches each for the men's and women's teams, two relay coaches, a professional Team Leader and Assistant Team Leader, bringing the number of credentialed staff to 18 (16 volunteer and two professional). Three pool managers augmented that staff. Nine medical officers/trainers assisted the team, as did a staff member to facilitate Team Training Camp and drug testing.

The volunteer-based system of choosing a coaching staff is one of few ways in which USATF has direct interactions with college coaches and a way in which these coaches are part of USATF. Coaches view staff selection as a reward system for service to the sport and a track-record of success. They view an Olympic staff position, particularly, as a career-capping achievement.

Staff selection

The volunteer staff is selected by subcommittees of the men's and women's track and field committees, respectively. The composition of these subcommittees is such that the chairs of the men's and women's track & field committees – especially the men's – have a great deal of control in determining the composition of team staffs. This has led to many in the sport, including coaches themselves and particularly athletes, viewing the selection system as a "good old boy" system. Athletes were particularly strong in expressing this opinion to the Task Force. It was clear that, justified or not, the athletes lack confidence in the volunteer staff because of this belief. In theory, the staff selection subcommittees give heavy consideration to each coach's qualifications and performance on previous staffs. In the end, selection of staff comes down to a popular vote.

Athlete evaluations of National Team Staff are generally favorable, with a great deal of variation from coach to coach. Certain staff members received more critical reviews. Professional staff are consistently rated highly by Team USA athletes. These are the team staff members with whom athletes interact most often on multiple teams over multiple years. Personal coaches, athletes and managers indicate that when they have an issue to resolve, they normally go directly to the professional staff rather than the volunteer staff due to the level of familiarity and comfort with

professional staff, and the perception that professional staff are most knowledgeable about IAAF and Olympic rules and issues.

One pitfall of the volunteer selection system is a "revolving door" of staff, which can be and usually are different for every championship. Although as a general rule they perform ably and earnestly, volunteer coaching staff members return to their regular jobs at the conclusion of a championship, with no accountability for their performance and no apparatus for rewarding exceptional work. The "revolving door" also means athletes don't have an opportunity to establish trust and familiarity with coaches.

Role of the staff

Although called the coaching staff, each position on the staff is largely managerial. The duties for each position are clearly laid out in a National Team staff manual, and professional staff verbally reinforce that the coaches' first responsibility is to serve as a resource to the athletes in the event groups they oversee. Some coaches embrace this role, while others have a hard time accepting the managerial aspect of their roles — they are coaches and resent being considered "only" a "manager." Yet the managerial role of the staff is critical for Team USA success at international events. A poorly managed team falls into chaos and performs poorly.

Most (but not all) athletes on international teams either travel with their personal coaches or are in regular contact with them. Any coaching that takes place on the part of staff tends to be overseeing workouts provided by personal coaches not in attendance and observing the competitions of their event-group athletes, especially those whose coaches are not present. Far more of their time is devoted to ensuring their event group understands rules, procedures, and practice and competition times. Some coaches, especially former international athletes, provide a valuable resource of advice and counseling for Team USA athletes. They provide counsel on how to handle certain situations and act as a source of knowledge and insight. In addition, only national team coaches, not personal coaches, can help force a sense of "team" and "nation-building" amongst a national team.

Personal coaches often view the National Team staff resentfully at the Olympic Games, given the difficulty of obtaining credentials. Team staff have the credentials that personal coaches feel they deserve. *(For more on personal coach credentials, see Section 5.)*

Nearly every person interviewed by the Task Force expressed a desire for more managers, fewer staff coaches and more personal-coach credentials. The first goal is within the purview and power of this Task Force, but the latter is in the hands of the IOC and/or IAAF.

2. International Team Selection Process

Selection process

Since the first Olympic Trials were held in 1908, the selection process for the Olympic Team has varied. Semi-final Trials, regional Trials, multiple Trials and Trials that were supplemented by athletes being selected by the AAU were utilized in various forms. Separate Trials for men and women also were held.

In 1976, the Olympic Trials in their current form became standard: a combined men's and women's Olympic Trials, with the top three finishers who have met the IAAF Olympic "A" qualifying performance standards being selected to the Olympic Team. This usually means the top three finishers in each event make the team. In events where the U.S. is weak, it sometimes means finishers other than the top three are selected, if top finishers lack the Olympic "A" standard.

In the past, athletes were allowed to "chase" the A standard after the Olympic Trials, but in 2008 that was not the case. The need to officially name the Olympic Team the day after the Olympic Trials; the logistical considerations of providing paperwork for Chinese travel; and the fact that athletes who chase the A standard rarely finish or have a medal impact at the Olympic Games all contributed to athletes not being able to chase the standard. Although one athlete sued USATF for the right to chase the standard (the athlete's request was denied by the courts), others observed that the "no chasing" rule made for a more meaningful Olympic Trials. At the end of their competitions, athletes and fans knew exactly who was and wasn't on the team.

The benefit of this selection system is that athletes select themselves, based on performance. It is an objective process free from politics. It puts athletes through a pre-Olympic test to determine which athletes perform best in rounds. There are many recent examples of athletes unexpectedly making the Olympic Team and going on to medal: Calvin Davis in the men's 400 hurdles in 1996; Lauryn Williams in the women's 100 in 2004; Dawn Harper in the women's 100 hurdles and Stephanie Brown Trafton in the women's discus, both of whom won gold, in 2008; David Payne winning medals in the 2007 World Championships and 2008 Olympic Games in the 110m hurdles. Because of the depth of American talent in most events, to have someone select a team based on a judgment call can be nearly impossible.

The drawbacks are equally clear. There have been very high-profile examples of athletes who were favored to win at the Olympic Games not making an Olympic Team: Dan O'Brien's pole vault no-height in the Olympic Trials decathlon in 1992; Michael Johnson and Maurice Greene both pulling up in the 200 at the 2000 Olympic Trials; Tyson Gay pulling up in the men's 200 in Eugene in 2008. In events where there is one athlete head and shoulders above all other

Americans – such as the women’s pole vault and women’s 400 – if the favorite has a bad day or slight injury, American medal opportunities at the Olympics may be diminished.

The Task Force spoke to individuals who favored the concept of developing some kind of “bye” system, to ensure that gold-medal favorites are named to the team, though none had a specific proposal or system that could be implemented across the board. The *concept* was favored by people ranging from past medalists, current athletes who themselves had no chance of medaling, some coaches and some Task Force members themselves. The large majority of athletes oppose a bye system.

Timing and scheduling of Olympic Trials

The timing of the Olympic Trials for Track & Field and USA Championships are typically anywhere from six to nine-and-one-half weeks prior to the start of track and field competition at the Olympic Games or World Championships. (2000 was 9 ½ weeks; 2004 was 6 ½; 2008 was almost 8.) In choosing a date for the Olympic Trials or USA Championships, USATF also takes into consideration the avoidance of conflicting schedules with NCAA Championships, which usually take place in early June, and the European schedule, which takes place in July and August.

After a trend in the early 1990s of Olympic Teams getting older, with the 2000 Olympic Team averaging an all-time peak of 28.5 years old, the last two Olympics have seen the average age decline, making the consideration of NCAA schedules important once again. In 2008, the average age of the team was under 27 years old for the first time since 1992, with 16 athletes age 22 or under. Of those, at least five had become professional athletes prior to completing their collegiate eligibility.

The competition schedule and format for the Olympic Trials and USA Championships are primarily in the hands of the men’s and women’s track and field committees, assisted by the USATF High Performance Division and influenced by NBC. The guiding philosophy for the current format has been to mirror as closely as possible the rigors of Olympic competition in order to select a team that will perform best under those peculiar circumstances. Therefore, four rounds of competition are held in the sprints; three in the 400m; and so on. There are a few exceptions to this philosophy.

A large majority of people interviewed by the Task Force favors having fewer rounds at the Olympic Trials and considers the Trials schedule too long and physically and emotionally taxing. It must be noted that the selection meet for World Championships lasts only four days, with fewer rounds, and Team USA is traditionally even more successful at World Championships than at Olympic Games. Several people pointed out that unless rounds are held at the exact time of day, on the same day and in the same sequence as the Olympic Games, the schedule cannot mirror the Olympic schedule. And no Olympic Trials can mimic the challenges of dealing with transportation, housing and cultural conflicts present at an Olympic Games. Therefore, most

athletes and coaches favor having fewer rounds ó even if it means accepting fewer athletes into the Olympic Trials.

The 2008 Olympic Trials were considered among the most successful Trials ever, yet the success and intensity of the meet led to athletes being perhaps even more physically and emotionally tired than normal after an Olympic Trials.

In addition to being physically draining, the 10-day length of the Trials can be emotionally and financially cumbersome for athletes. Athletes are given a small stipend for travel, and if they must be on-site at the Olympic Trials for in some cases more than a week, they must pay for many costs themselves. Several cited the high costs incurred by their families, as well. A handful of athletes favored having multiple days between qualifying and final rounds in field events at the Olympic Trials, as is the case at the Olympic Games, but many also cited the boredom and financial cost of such a lengthy schedule.

A shorter Olympic Trials would not preclude a 100m-200m double, but it would likely make a 200m-400m double impossible without a premeditated change in schedule. Currently the Olympic schedule does not accommodate a 200-400 double, but at least two American women sought to get such a schedule change in 2008, and they may do so again in 2012. A shorter Trials would make that double logistically difficult.

A shorter Olympic Trials could potentially reduce ticket-sale revenues for local organizers, but having higher-quality sessions over fewer days may enable ticket prices to be higher. TV revenues may be impacted as well. These considerations factor in, but USATF must not lose sight of the fact that the purpose of the Olympic Trials is to select the best Olympic Team that will go on to perform at its peak at the Games themselves. Financial and other concerns should be secondary to this goal.

3. Olympic Team Preparation

Post-Olympic Trials competition

After qualifying to represent Team USA, many athletes continue robust competition schedules in Europe. No fewer than eight IAAF Permit Meetings were held between the conclusion of the Olympic Trials on July 6 and the start of Olympic competition on August 15. The most lucrative meets, the IAAF Golden League Series, had two meetings: July 11 in Rome and July 18 in Paris.

European performances by Americans between the Olympic Trials and Games, particularly short sprinters, generally were significantly lower than at the Olympic Trials. This dip is usually attributed to an emotional let-down, as well as the physical drain of competing in multiple rounds over multiple days at the Olympic Trials. As Doug Logan cited in his blog on September 11, 2008, Americans had 66 individual performances in men's Olympic competition, exclusive of relays, and 65 individual performances by women. In the instance of men, only seven performances out of 66 were their best performance for the year (10.6%) while the women had 11 out of 65 performances (16.9%) that were their best of the year. The reasons for the performance declines are varied, from more tactical race plans in Beijing to overly emotional competition at the Olympic Trials to almost suspiciously fast sprint times in the windy conditions of Eugene. The performances of most field event athletes were precipitously worse after the Olympic Trials, particularly in the jumps. (*See Appendix C, Select Performances by Team USA Athletes Between the Olympic Trials and Olympic Games.*)

Athletes choose their own competition schedules after making a Team USA roster, just as they do during any other time of year. USATF can and should do more to ensure that athletes realize the benefits of physical, financial and otherwise that to be reaped by making winning an Olympic medal their #1 priority. Competing frequently in Europe is not inherently bad, and some athletes thrive on competing frequently.

Competing in Europe with a purpose other than setting a personal best in each meet seems key for optimal performance at the Olympic Games or World Championships. While competitive opportunities for sprints and hurdles and some middle-distance events abound in Europe, other events have few or no opportunities. This is especially true in the throws, where many Olympians, if they competed at all, did so in local all-comers meets in the U.S.

In order to best prepare an athlete for late-summer championships, any pre-Olympic or pre-World Championship competitions need to be planned a year out, at a minimum. Having competition decisions made in the wake of making an Olympic team, when an athlete can reap a quick benefit from competing as an "Olympian" in Europe, does nothing but interfere with athlete preparation and is counterproductive to maximizing performance. The financial benefits

for such European competitions can be relatively small, as low as \$2000-\$3000 per meet. Contrasted against the financial windfall of an Olympic gold medal ó which can range from \$100,000 to more than \$1 million in residual benefits ó having a long-term plan is critical. Again the Task Force considers competing between the Trials and Olympics acceptable and necessary. What is suspect in some cases is the decision-making process that goes into whether to decide to compete.

The Task Force found that the quality of planning for European competitions by athletes varies widely. Veteran athletes who have strong relationships with their coaches and agents generally plan well in advance, but athletes without an agent, or with agents who may advocate competition when it is not in the interest of athletes themselves, have a more haphazard approach. It seems that excessive travel to and from Europe, more than excessive competition, negatively impacts Olympic performance.

USATF can and must do more to educate athletes on good decision-making and planning, particularly in Olympic years.

Team Training Camp

Team "Training Camp," in various levels of formality, long have been part of Team USA preparation leading into major international events. Since 2000, these training camps have become more structured in an effort to ensure athletes have access to daily training within the country in which they will compete. USATF Professional staff arrange all logistics, from transportation to practice facilities and hotel accommodations. Hosting a formal training camp helps USATF ensure that athletes are in the host country an adequate time ahead of their competition in order to adjust to time difference, transportation, logistics and food, in a controlled setting. Training camp includes a full staff of coaches, trainers, doctors, sport psychologists and USATF professional staff. Cost of putting on training camp in 2004 was approximately \$332,000; in 2008 it was approximately \$375,000.

The philosophy behind the training camp is to enable athletes to remove themselves to a relatively calm situation where they can focus on training and not have to worry about other details. Heading into Training Camp prior to the Beijing Olympics, USATF had considered whether to have training camp in Japan or China. Travel costs and logistical concerns eliminated Japan as a possibility, and the Chinese ocean resort city of Dalian was selected. A hotel was secured in 2007. The Chinese government had made clear that security would be significantly more strict than the team had experienced in 2004 at the training camp on Crete, and that friends, family and others would be required to stay at a nearby hotel rather than with the team. However, training facilities were to be excellent, including having access to China's national training center for throwers. Camp was to be open from August 1 through approximately the 18th, although most athletes intended to depart for Beijing on the 10th or 11th.

In late March of 2008, USATF was notified that, because of a heightened security level mandated by the Chinese Government, they would need to move training camp housing and find a new practice facility. This required 11th-hour efforts by National Team management to restructure everything from housing to practice to transportation and meals. On July 25, Team USA visitation policies were finalized after Chinese security stated that athlete activities would be restricted to group travel, and that visitation hours for friends and family would be very limited. The hotel offered many on-site amenities for athletes, including a Dartfish facility, meeting rooms, a bowling alley, pool tables, ping pong and other diversions, but overall the camp was much more restrictive than previous camps. USATF continued throughout camp to try for a decreased security level, but after the attack on Americans at the Drum Tower in Beijing, there were no more negotiations. Many athletes had a hard time in this highly controlled environment, with limited visitation and movement.

USATF required track and field athletes to be in country no less than 10 days and no more than 15 days prior to the start of their event. Other than relay pool athletes, Team USA athletes were not required to be at Team Training Camp at Dalian, and several opted instead to use the USOC facility at Beijing Normal University(BNU). BNU saw use much greater than the USOC had expected from athletes from all sports, including track and field. Prior to the start of the Games, many athletes had been frightened by reports of excessive pollution and therefore planned to spend as much time away from Beijing and at training camp as possible. However, after arriving in Beijing, several noted that the air posed no problems for them. That fact, combined with an exceptional set-up by the USOC at Beijing Normal, including a modern weight-lifting facility, led to some athletes choosing to stay in Beijing rather than continue traveling to Dalian.

There is a great deal of personal variation for how much time an athlete needs to acclimate to a time change. After interviewing many people, the Task Force found that the training camp concept is a sound one, but where and how it is executed might vary by location. Enabling athletes to have access to physio therapy, training facilities and their personal coaches, as well as a sense of team-building, is the most important function of a training camp.

As is often times the case when people travel internationally, particularly to Asia, many athletes suffered intestinal distress of various sorts. Some at training camp believed there was an outbreak of food poisoning, but doctors were unable to verify the claim. Sport doctors estimate that for any trip, 10-15 percent of athletes will experience intestinal distress from change of habits, stress, and alterations in diet. American athletes from all sports had difficulty with these intestinal issues, including after relocating to the Olympic Village.

4. Relay Preparation and Training

Relay pool

The Team USA Relay Pool slots are the only Team USA roster positions not chosen exclusively by athlete performance at the Olympic Trials or national championships.

Each relay pool ó menø and womenø 4x100 and 4x400 ó has six positions. By IAAF rule, the top three finishers in each relevant event (100 and 400) at the Olympic Trials or National Championships are automatically selected to the pool. The remaining three positions in each relay are chosen from people who did not make the national team in another individual event. These remaining spots are chosen by USATFø National Relay Coaches, who oversee the National Relay Program (see below). In theory, these positions are chosen by examining the relative relay strengths of each athlete. Typically, they are chosen from finalists in the 100, 200 and 400 who did not make the top 3.

Athletes do not seem to understand or have confidence in how relay pool athletes are chosen. As one coach pointed out, in 2007 a woman was named to the 4x100m relay pool who had not made the final at the national championships, and other relay pool members did not understand why she was in the pool and resented her presence. Some believe the relay pool should be chosen well before the Olympic Trials, so relay lineups can practice together all year; others believe the top six finishers in the menø and womenø 100 and 400 alone should be selected to the pools. Regardless of what the system is, the system needs to be established and clearly communicated to all interested parties.

National Relay Program

Following initial meetings in 2001 and 2002, The National Relay Program was launched in 2003 after a òmeeting of the mindsö in Las Vegas the previous November. At that meeting, nearly 60 athletes, coaches, and administrators developed the template for the National Relay Program. The program was created in order to streamline methodologies for running relays in international team competition, and to provide American sprinters with several opportunities each year to practice and compete with each other in relay competition. Establishing a singular technique for handoffs and execution ó rather than athletes having to adapt to a Team USA head coachø personal handoff philosophy for every major championship ó was seen as critical to establishing consistency and decreasing chances for dropped batons and other infractions. Beginning in youth competition, American athletes often times must learn new hand-off techniques each time they reach the next level of competition ó junior high, high school, and elite ó as the preferences

of coaches change. The National Relay Program was intended to help minimize that inconsistency.

Brooks Johnson was named Program Director since its inception, and Orin Richburg has served as Relay Coach. They have been supported at various times by 8-10 additional coaches and several administrators.

The National Relay Program brings together American sprinters six to ten times per year, often in early-season meets, for relay training and competition. USATF flies athletes into locations to take part in the program and leverages local athletes as well. In 2008, 98 men and 75 women, for a total of 173 athletes, participated in the program in at least one location.

In addition to providing relay training and development, the program also has been part of USATF's development of sprinters, given the vast number of athletes who take part in the relay program each year. In addition to running relays at meets, athletes also may compete in individual events, providing early-season opportunities to compete. Hurdlers and field event athletes also have participated, furthering their early-season development and providing a boost to meets such as the Texas Southern Relays, Modesto Relays and other events.

The National Relay Program is augmented by formal relay camp leading up to Olympic and World Championship competition. It is at these camps, held after the U.S. Trials, that specific lineups are considered. The Program was also meant as a means to remove, as much as possible, political factors and lobbying by athletes, coaches and agents for individuals to be named to relay teams.

The concept of the National Relay Program is sound, but the nearly universal opinion is that it has been a waste of money and a failure as it relates to its expressed goals. Relay team performances in major international competitions have not justified the expenditures over the last five years. 4x400m relays do not require a yearlong relay program, and an excessive number of athletes have been part of the program. As one Task Force member repeatedly observed, in looking at the list of athletes who participated in the relay program in 2008, many star athletes ran sparingly. Participants in the relay program instead tended to be "a bunch of guys named Joe."

One medal-winning athlete's coach noted that the athlete typically ran only once per year with the National Relay Program: at the Penn Relays because the athlete's shoe sponsor required it. Competing in other meets typically involved three days of being away from training base to compete in only one 4x100 relay; the coach determined it was better for the athlete to stay home, compete locally in multiple events and train through it.

The National Relay Program's annual budgets/expenditures have been as follows (figures approximate and include travel, coaching stipends and costs for relay camp):

- 2003:** \$95,000 budgeted/\$17,200 spent
- 2004:** \$20,000 plus a portion of \$800,000 meritorious grants so budgeted/\$250,500 spent
- 2005:** \$194,000 budgeted/\$212,000 spent
- 2006:** \$152,000 budgeted /\$224,000 spent
- 2007:** \$145,000 budgeted/\$174,000 spent
- 2008:** N/A

Relay results at Worlds or Olympics or World Cup, since 2003:

2003: M4x100 gold; W4x100 silver; M&W 4x400 gold ó men later DQ for doping violation

2004: M4x100 silver; W4x100DQ; M&W 4x400 gold

2005: M4x100 DQ; W4x100 gold; M 4x400 gold; W4x400 DQ

2006: World Cup M4x100 gold, CR, 37.59 with Kaaron Conwright, Wallace Spearmon, Tyson Gay, Jason Smoots; W4x100DQ; M4x400 gold; W4x400 silver

2007: Gold in all four relays

2008: M4x100DQ; W4x100DQ; M&W 4x400 gold

Summary of performances since 2003:

M4x100: 3 gold, 1 silver, 2DQ

W4x100: 2 gold, 1 silver, 3 DQ

M4x400: 6 gold (1 later DQ)

W4x400: 4 gold, 1 silver, 1 DQ

Problem areas

The Task Force found the fundamental problem with Team USA relays and the National Relay program is a lack of communication between coaches and athletes and no clear lines of who, in fact, is in charge of relays. Various coaches involved in the 2008 Olympic Games have different answers when asked who was in charge in Beijing, and on the men's side, different coaches gave different accounts of which athletes would have run in the men's 4x100m final had the team advanced. USATF policies indicate that the National Relay Coach was to make decisions regarding lineups at the 2008 Olympic Games, but particularly on the men's side, the head coach took responsibility for the lineups and supervising relay practices. Having the national coach be in charge is not inherently bad; the problem was that the expectation by athletes and others going in was that the relay coaches would be in charge. In the end, nobody ó least of all the athletes ó seemed to know who was making decisions and why. In the words of one staff coach, "the kids don't know what's going on. There are no guarantees of who is on the relay and that becomes a problem. You never build that camaraderie. That is the initial problem."

Although political lobbying was supposed to be greatly decreased by the relay program, the Task Force found that an inherent problem with relay performance over the years is that relay lineup

decisions seem to be made at times to maximize the number of athletes who might receive medals, rather than trying to maximize performance. Up to six medals can be awarded, with two substitutions allowed between the first round and the final. The Task Force found and believes that the first goal should be to have the same lineup run both rounds; only if scheduling and an athlete doubling prevents such a plan should substitutions be considered.

Once the 2008 Olympic Team was selected, the relay pools practiced and competed together several times in Europe, but with many different lineups. The order was different in all of them according to one female sprinter, and the women's team never practiced in the order that they ran in the first round in Beijing. Due to injury and schedule issues, the men's lineups weren't able to practice together with all relay pool members present until after the 100m final in Beijing.

The relays constitute a very small percentage of events at an Olympics or World Championships. Yet they receive the majority of attention, and failure in these events is viewed by the public and the track world as a team-wide failure, thus creating much greater significance. The never-ending internal drama over who is going to run in the rounds also creates drama for other athletes on the Team.

Beijing 4x100m performance

The Task Force analyzed video footage and conducted scores of interviews on the relays in Beijing and makes the following observations on the technical failures of the relay in Beijing:

In the women's 4x100m, "drama," a "total lack of chemistry" and poor mechanics caused the failure. The mechanical failure was clear: the outgoing runner, Lauryn Williams, dropped her hand during the attempted handoff, and incoming runner Torri Edwards did not deliver the baton. The Task Force was troubled by the fact that the athletes themselves seemed to have no idea why the stick dropped, beyond saying it was "one of those things" and the stick had a mind of its own.

The drama and chemistry issues were as troubling as the technical breakdown and were the direct result of a lack of leadership and communication in the relay. As has been standard practice for U.S. teams in championships, runners were not told until 48 hours before competition who would be running. There was no lineup, so athletes could not start building a cohesive sense of team unity. Multiple people reported that on the way to the track for the first round of the women's 4x100, one athlete who was not chosen for the pool called the relay team together to talk of why she should have been in the relay pool, venting her frustrations. The result was tension among the team just hours before competing.

Once on-site at the Bird's Nest stadium, in the call room, the athletes discovered that the Team USA staff had failed to pick up the USA bib numbers – one of the staff's managerial functions. Instead, bibs had to be hand-written. The Task Force had not fully realized the psychological impact of this failing until it spoke directly with athletes. One athlete was on the verge of tears as

she spoke of how the staff had let them down, nearly crying when she spoke of how embarrassing it was to them. That the bib debacle transpired just moments before taking the track did not help the team's fortunes, as it was clearly a very significant distraction and cause of negativity.

The same issues played out in different ways with the men's 4x100m relay. Again, uncertainty about who would run was the over-riding mental state. One runner asked a volunteer staff member, on the way to the track for the first round, if he would be running in the final. "I don't know" was the honest response. It was a response that put the athlete on edge.

In the opinion of the Task Force, the issue of whether and where to run Tyson Gay was grossly mishandled and did a disservice to Gay and the relay team. Throughout his career, Gay has run third leg, as was the case in college, at the 2007 World Championships, and at and the hugely successful 2006 World Cup. Running third leg, Gay accepted the baton in his right hand.

Entering Beijing, Gay's fitness was uncertain given his hamstring injury. His performance in the 100 indicated he was racing himself into shape but he wasn't at full fitness. Placing him on anchor leg – the most high-pressure position – when he himself had to be questioning his fitness was a poor decision, especially since that would pit him against the 100m Olympic silver medalist, Richard Thompson of Trinidad, in the semifinal round. Contributing to the poor decision was that running anchor required Gay to accept the baton in his left hand, which he was unaccustomed to doing. On the exchange between Darvis Patton and Gay, Gay's hand position was askew, and Patton never cleanly or definitively delivered the baton.

Overall analysis

Generally speaking, the National Relay Program has been beset by cost over-runs due to last-minute additions and changes to which athletes attend certain National Relay Program events. Decisions over who will take part in the Program is at the sole discretion of the National Relay Program Director and National Relay Coach – two paid "volunteer" positions not accountable to the CEO or any other person. Success in Olympic and World Championship competition has been inconsistent and has not shown systematic improvement to what existed prior to the National Relay Program. That said, the U.S. has a long history of relay problems, and the issues encountered in the last five years are nothing new.

One area in which the Relay Program has utterly failed is in establishing standard practices. The National Relay Program Director indicated that coaches don't try to change an athlete's individual quirks and habits, instead tailoring each relay to each runner's tendencies. Video footage of various relay practices and competition reveals the presence of personal coaches and agents, who are invited to attend practices. This results in having "too many cooks in the kitchen" and runs contrary to the notion of having one centralized system.

There are uncontrollable risks involved in any Olympic relay scenario. No event can prepare athletes for the adrenaline rush, huge crowds and high speeds unique to the Olympic Games. Yet the National Relay Program and the oversight of relays did nothing to put the relay teams in a position to win. Rather, they put the teams in a position to fail. How USATF trains and prepares its relays must be overhauled into a cost-efficient, results-oriented program overseen by people who are held accountable for their decisions and practices.

5. Management of Team USA at International Competitions

Beijing 2008 staff

The staff for the 2008 Olympic Games was reported to be among the most highly functioning of the last decade. They first began having meetings in mid-2007, having three in-person meetings and six to eight conference calls prior to the Olympic Games. During this time, the staff was able to work out their staff dynamic, thus eliminating the adjustment period typically encountered in a staff. Given that staff members are nearly always all head coaches, establishing this dynamic is important when working with a group of up to 14 people, all of whom are accustomed to being in charge of their teams.

Staff members met early with athletes, assisting with Team Sign-Up at the Olympic Trials. In addition, as is the case with all Team USA staffs, assistant coaches were instructed to keep in touch with the athletes in their event groups, keeping up-to-date on athlete location, health and preparations. Staff members performed this to varying degrees of thoroughness; some were vigilant in communicating with athletes beforehand while others had less interaction before the Olympic Games. For any National Team, some staff coaches are very involved with their event-group athletes, but there are inevitably athletes who have no idea who their event coach, or even Head Coach, is.

All staff on USATF international teams, at all levels, are provided with a general Staff Handbook. Medical staff are chosen by the USATF Medical and Sports Science Committee. For the Olympic Games, the USOC also provides medical staff. These team medical personnel were required to go through a USOC training seminar. One medical staff person who is preferred by the athletes and who has been part of many USATF staffs did not take part in the seminar and therefore was not able to be properly credentialed. After athlete complaints, USATF took dramatic steps to ensure athletes had access to the medical staff person, but the situation could have been avoided had the person gone through the required USOC protocol.

Team travel and lodging

The USATF Travel Agent contacts each athlete to book travel for Team USA events. Cost, athlete location and preferences all are taken into account. Each athlete arriving at an event site is met at the airport by at least one USATF staff member, typically a Pool Manager. Transportation to the hotel is provided, as is transportation to and from practice facilities and competition.

Team USA housing at a World Championship typically is located at an official Team Hotel; at the Olympic Games it is in the Olympic Village. Single rooms are provided for select athletes based on criteria such as past medals won. Other athletes have roommates assigned by USATF.

Athletes often make, and are granted, specific roommate requests. Provided space is available, athletes wishing to have a single room who don't otherwise qualify for one can pay additional money for an "upgrade" to a single.

Troubleshooting

When athletes have issues to resolve, they are instructed to go first to their event-group coach to seek resolution. As noted above, because event-group coaches change from Championship to Championship, and because athletes have a familiarity and comfort level with USATF professional staff that are part of every international team, they often go immediately to the professional staff.

Athlete access to personal coaches/staff

USATF recognizes that most athletes are coached by personal coaches in their individual events while at championships, not by Team USA volunteer coaches. USATF makes every effort to ensure adequate athlete access to their personal support staff. At World Championships, a "transferable" credential enables all personal coaches to access the warm-up track prior to their athletes competing. (They also have in-stadium access via tickets or other means.)

Olympic access is very different. In 2008, USATF was initially told that it would be granted six Personal Support Staff ("P") credentials by the IOC, none of which were transferrable and which gained access only to practice tracks, not the warm-up track. USATF continued to lobby the IAAF and USOC, eventually getting that number boosted to 14. In addition, access to the warm-up track was added to the credential.

Which personal coaches would get this credential was determined by volunteer staff although it is unclear precisely by whom it to be a "competition issue." Under the current structure, the volunteer Team USA coaching staff oversees competitions issues while the professional staff oversees logistical or managerial issues. Therefore, the Head Coaches determined which personal support staff would have access to these credentials, based on the number of athletes each coach/support staff had and their athletes' medal chances. One coach said that head coaches deciding on who got P passes made the coaches "look like dragons. USATF should have done it, not the head coaches."

For field events, where athletes warmed up inside the stadium, personal coaches used tickets and coaching box credentials to access their athletes. All coaches of medal-winning athletes were covered by this system except two, because they had not completed the USOC-mandated background check information necessary to obtain a "P" credentials.

Clearly, "P" credentials are a controversial topic that leaves some coaches and athletes feeling left out or not appreciated. However, the extreme limit on "P" credentials is entirely in the hands of the IOC and will not change without heavy lobbying efforts by the IAAF. Athletes and

personal coaches were told by USATF well in advance that they should assume they would not have "credential access, but this instruction seemed not to be effective. USATF must do a better job of reinforcing that personal-coach access to the warm-up and practice tracks at the Olympic Games will not be possible; access is the exception rather than the rule.

Athletes needing to access their personal physios leading up to the Olympic Games while in Beijing could do so at the USOC's High Performance Training Facility at Beijing Normal University, or at the Olympic Village between morning and evening sessions when an athlete competed twice in the same day.

Athlete Services

USATF tries to make an athlete's experience as seamless as possible. A USATF travel agent handles the booking of travel, and National Office staff handle all logistical arrangements for the team, from uniform distribution to travel to buses to hotels, food, practice facilities and ensuring plenty of ice and water is on hand. Volunteer staff handle all competitive aspects of team management. The vast improvement in services provided to athletes has been a blessing and a curse. As one staff member stated, "We have done the job so well that athletes' expectations for every training camp and every event is higher, and they expect us to do more for them."

Managing expectations is key for ensuring athlete happiness. For instance, in Beijing one athlete demanded a personal TV in her room. She went to the Athletes Advisory Committee's Athlete Ombudsman, who instructed the Professional Staff to procure the requested television. The TV was not procured, as it is not a vital part of providing services to the team and was considered by staff to be an inappropriate request and expectation. One medal-winning sprinter is pointed to as a contrast from this demanding approach: "She is the same everywhere we go. She is thankful to you for everything you do, but she is fully capable of taking care of herself. That is the attitude we need in our athletes."

Athlete Village life

Some athletes warm up immediately to Village life; others chafe under it or avoid it entirely. The decision of whether to stay in the Athlete Village is up to each individual. Visitation of family, friends and support staff is consistently an issue when living in an Olympic Village. In Beijing, the USOC was allotted a given number of Day Passes for access to the Village each day, for the entire U.S. delegation across all sports. The USOC's Athletes Advisory Committee oversaw distribution. These Day Passes were typically "spoken for" days, and sometimes more than a week, in advance. Athletes putting in requests for day passes a day or two in advance simply could not be accommodated by the USOC, given their quota had been filled. Athletes believed that other sports were getting same-day visitor passes but that track and field athletes weren't given the same luxury. The USOC worked closely with USATF to ensure that on days when an athlete competed in both the morning and evening, that athlete's personal coach/trainers had access to Day Passes in order to advise and treat athletes between sessions.

Athletes who choose not to stay at the Village faced different challenges. They were not as aware of team meetings or announcements, which are posted prominently in Team USA living quarters at the Village.

The Task Force observed that the most independent-minded athletes seemed to fare well in Beijing while those who were most dependent on specific, personal support staff fared less well. It was independent-minded athletes who could adjust to limited access to their support staff and changing living conditions. For instance, Stephanie Brown-Trafton did not have personal coach access in Beijing and did not expect any special treatment. She won the first gold medal in the women's discus since 1932. Similarly, Walter Dix's personal coach was not on hand at the stadium, yet he was the most successful American short sprinter at the Games. Athletes who can roll with the punches and make decisions for themselves are best prepared for the Olympic Games and its specific, off-track challenges. USATF should have a system in place that reinforces this and which seeks to establish independence in its athletes. One personal coach of a past medalist said that it is her job to prepare athletes for the unique, isolated atmosphere that is specific to the Olympics. If her athlete needs his or her personal coach there to see every moment of warm-up, she said, it is "pretty pathetic."

6. Team USA Performance in Beijing

Team USA's Olympic performance in Beijing was roundly attacked by television commentators, some members of the written and electronic press, and fans around the country (who were watching television commentators). By the conclusion of the Games, some written media had produced more circumspect analyses, but there is no doubt that the overall feeling among track fans watching the Games was one of underperformance. That feeling was tied primarily to underperformance in the high-profile sprints and relays. A full analysis of the team's strengths and shortcomings is below.

Positives

Team USA once again stood atop the medal charts at the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing, retaining its long-held status as the World's #1 Track & Field Team. The medal total of 23 actually exceeded the medal projection provided by USATF in its High Performance Plan for 2005-2008, which it had submitted four years ago to the USOC as the basis for its quadrennial funding.

Overall superlatives included:

- The 23 medals won by the team matched the medal tally won in Atlanta in 1996 and far exceeded the 14 won in Sydney.
- The U.S. women won nine medals to post their best medal tally since 1992.
- The three golds won by the U.S. women matched their total in 1996 and exceeded 2000 (2) and 2004 (2).
- Team USA's men won 11 of 15 available medals in individual sprinting events ó 100, 200, 400, 110 hurdles and 400 hurdles. They swept the 400 and 400 hurdles.
- Two American records were set in competition: the women's 10,000m (bronze medal) and 3,000m steeplechase.
- Team USA's men's 4x400m team broke the Olympic record with their winning time of 2:55.39.

Several surprises provided unexpected highlights. The team's first three gold medalists all were third-place finishers at the Olympic Trials. In addition to Brown Trafton in the women's discus, Dawn Harper won the women's 100m hurdles and Angelo Taylor took the men's 400 hurdles. Hyleas Fountain became the only American other than Jackie Joyner-Kersey to win a medal in the heptathlon, placing second.

Negatives

There were multiple instances of athletes failing to live up to expectations.

Many of Team USA's top contenders failed to medal, or even make the final of their events. This was due in some cases to injury, in some cases to bad luck and in other cases to simply poor performances.

Although Team USA once again topped medal tables and the total of 23 was relatively high, gold medals were down. The American team posted its lowest gold-medal total of seven since the 1997 World Championships. The seven gold medals were exactly half the team's gold-medal haul at each the last two world championships, in 2005 (14 golds) and 2007 (14).

USATF's Bylaws indicate it is the organization's duty to field teams to compete at optimal performance levels. Historically, only a select proportion of athletes achieve even seasonal bests at Olympic Games. Americans had 65 individual performances in men's competition, exclusive of relays, and 59 individual performances by women. For the men, only seven performances out of 65 were their best performance for the year (10.8%) while the women had 11 out of 59 performances (18.6%) that were their best of the year.

For the women's medal winners in Beijing, 3 of 8 had seasonal bests (37.5%); only 2 of 13 male medalists had SBs (15.3 %).

In Athens in 2004, 10 of 60 American men posted seasonal bests to date in Athens (16.7%) while 9 of 49 women had SBs (18.4%). Although the number of women with SBs was actually slightly lower than Beijing, it is very significant that every American woman who won a medal in Athens posted a seasonal best in doing so. Ten of 16 male medalists (62.5%) had SBs in Athens.

Historical Team USA performance

The diversity of competition on the international level has increased substantially in the last 20 years. Despite this, Team USA has increased its medal counts in World Championship and Olympic competition. American medal counts never reached higher than 20 from 1997 through 2003, but starting in 2004, medal counts have ranged from 23 to 26. It is important to note that, in the last 20 years, significantly more countries have been winning medals on the international level. At the 1976 Olympic Games, just 20 different countries won track and field medals, with no African countries winning a single medal. In 1988, the last year before the fall of communism in Eastern Europe, there were 22 medaling countries. At the 2000 and 2004 Olympic Games, 40 countries won medals, and in Beijing in 2008, that number stood at 42.

The clear trend is that the United States is encountering more competition for medals than ever before. The emergence of Jamaica in the sprints, which had been building for years, is just one example. This increased competition makes it even more important that USATF maximize its development resources.

Analysis for improvement

The Task Force acknowledges, and knows first-hand, that there is an element of surprise and chance at any international championship, particularly the Olympic Games. Based on interview findings, however, the Task Force believes that too few American athletes enter an Olympic Games with a goal of winning, or even medaling. Certainly for many athletes, a medal of any kind is outside the realm of likely outcomes, but too many view making the Olympic Team as their primary achievement. By one coach's estimate, a tiny fraction of athletes enter the Games with the idea of setting a personal best. For these athletes, the Olympic Trials is their personal Olympics.

USATF must cultivate a culture that views optimal performance, and medals, as the goal of the Olympic Games and World Championships. Based on statistical analysis, it seems that too many athletes left it on the track at the Olympic Trials, from the vertical and horizontal jumps to the 800 and 100 meters.

Although gold medals in the sprints were not forthcoming in Beijing, there are limited opportunities for medals in those events, given current USATF tallies. Short of sweeping all sprints, there are minimal opportunities for more medals. However, there are tremendous opportunities in the technical events, particularly throwing and jumping events. In the men's throws and jumps (discus, shot put, javelin, hammer throw, high jump, long jump, triple jump and pole vault), Team USA won only one medal (silver in men's shot put). Without the men's shot put, it had zero medals and only one finalist in those events. The women's team had far more finalists, including three in the long jump alone, and came home with two medals in the field events (gold in discus and silver in pole vault). USATF must, in its development and high performance programs, cultivate those events if it is to achieve Mr. Logan's goal of 30 medals in London 2012.

7. USATF High Performance and Development programs

USATF High Performance structure and funding

USATF's Director of High Performance oversees HP Programs from the USATF National Office in Indianapolis. Until circa 2000, USATF's volunteer HP structure consisted of Development Committees for Men's and Women's Track & Field, with each event group having their own Broad Event and Single Event subcommittees. The Men's and Women's Development Committees each received roughly \$280,000 per year for development programs. Sport Science had its own budget of approximately \$125,000. These funds were put toward event summits, HP centers (key meets), and competitive opportunities. These funds were spent to develop a wide range of athletes and event groups, immediate post-collegiate athletes and "development" events where the U.S. has lagged (women's field events, some men's throws, walks, etc.)

Beginning roughly in 2000, a High Performance Division was added to USATF volunteer-based governance, and the Men's and Women's Joint Development Group came under oversight of the High Performance Division Chair. All development funding went through the HP Chair and was subject to the approval of the Chair and the HP Executive Committee. *[Bylaw changes adopted in December, 2008, stipulate that all expenditures now must be approved by the CEO.]*

Funding to the Development committees has decreased drastically since the advent of the High Performance Division. The Men's and Women's Development Committees now each receive only \$75,000/year for their programs. Those funds are bolstered by roughly \$1 million in USOC funding for the HP Division, which goes to HP Summits, HP Centers, Competitive Opportunities and Sports Science.

The funding change was accompanied in the last five years by a shift in USOC funding philosophy to one of targeting funds away from "developmental" events to event groups and athletes who are judged to have viable medal potential. The philosophy is popularly known as "money for medals." Since this change, U.S. medal counts in track and field have risen from the 17-20 range to the mid-20s.

Development Committees continue to function, with a Chair serving for each broad development group in men's and women's track and field: sprints and hurdles, endurance, throws, jumps and combined events (heptathlon, decathlon). Under each broad event group chair, each specific Olympic Event has a single event development chair who oversees day-to-day contact and interaction with athletes, coaches and agents in any given event. They track performances and make recommendations for athletes to receive financial support for development or funds to attend summits, etc. USATF's High Performance department in Indianapolis charts potential

areas for individual athlete development through a complex series of statistical charts, identifying "best bet" events (robust medal potential and success), "target" events (events that are generally weak but have individuals with medal potential) and "developmental" events (little current medal potential). Generally speaking, the greatest funding is appropriated to the areas with the most potential and track record of success.

Philosophically there is a debate about whether funding should go to "best bets" or events where medal tallies have historically been low, since it is in these events where the U.S. can pick up the largest number of additional medals. The women's discus often is cited as an event where continued development helped lead to medals. Likewise, summits in the marathon, particularly a training summit with the 2004 Olympic marathon team, helped lead to two marathon medals in 2004 and generally increased success in distance events overall.

Statistical analysis has shown that if an athlete does not achieve a top 25 world ranking by age 25, their chances of having a break-through are slim to none. Even a 30-year-old who has finaled at the World Championships or Olympic Games is not likely to make the next step up and medal in the future; the belief is that funds should be applied toward young, up-and-coming athletes. However it appears that in the current system, funding continues to go to athletes much later in their careers, even ones who have not been successful. One Task Force member often noted that these older athletes, if they haven't yet made it to the medal stand, "need to get a real job."

Developmental Event Summits

Summits are held at the discretion, and depend on the enthusiasm, of broad event and individual event chairs. The Pole Vault Summit, held each year in Reno, is an extraordinarily successful event attracting athletes from high school through college. Summits also are held fairly regularly in the high jump, combined events and throws. There is no national and centralized oversight for systematic summits and no system for managing their quality. Different event groups have had differing degrees of effective summits; some have no summits whatsoever.

Rather than focusing on event-specific summits, USATF's Podium Education Program is now in its fifth year. It is an annual, major summit attracting the highest level of sports scientists, coaches and athletes in all broad event groups. The five-to-six-day event is held annually in the first week of December, traditionally in Las Vegas. In 2007, more than 400 people paid their own way to attend the event; 125 speakers, panelists and staff were brought in by USATF.

The Podium Education summit is sport science-intensive and generally is considered the most beneficial summit for coaches. The most important part of any summit is not the knowledge imparted but whether and how coaches take that information and apply it to athletes' training. Coaches are the most important cog for athlete medal development. USATF has ample programs for analyzing performances and imparting information, but it does not appear to have a mechanism for ensuring that this information is consistently "bought into" by athletes and coaches and applied to training and competition.

Chula Vista Olympic Training Center

Athlete use of the Chula Vista Olympic Training Center in Chula Vista has changed, commensurate with the USOC's change in funding philosophy. The year-round Residence Program provides free room, board and access to training facilities and sports science and other amenities of the training center at no cost to athletes. At its peak in 2003-2004, roughly 32 USATF athletes were part of this program. While some of these athletes were in "developmental" events, most were qualified under fairly stringent standards. During these years, USATF had four paid staff members at the Center: A Director and three coaches.

Since the recent tightening of standards by the USOC, there currently are approximately 20 athletes who are part of the Residence Program, all of whom qualify based on USOC Performance Pool Funding guidelines. These athletes include male high jumpers and men's and women's long jumpers, pole vaulters and discus throwers. Starting in October, 2007, all coaching positions at the training center are hired by and under the direction of the USOC; USATF no longer is part of staffing.

Athletes may also apply for Short-Term Programs at the Training Center. If beds are available, qualified athletes may live cost-free, at the same level of funding, as full-time residents. Those not qualifying for financial support who wish to use the facility may do so, space allowing, for \$40 per person, per day. Athletes who live in the Chula Vista/ San Diego area may use the Center in what are called "Facility Use" programs. Some middle and long distance runners seeking to escape cold winter climates use the facility in this capacity.

In the past, the Chula Vista training center was grossly under-utilized by USATF and its athletes. USATF has not adequately leveraged what the Training Center has to offer with any consistency, for years having only a group of lower-level development athletes living at the Center. When USATF focused on using the Center, there have been productive results: the marathon summit held there prior to the 2004 Olympic Games is credited with having a major role in the U.S. winning two medals in Athens; a group of pole vaulters, including 2004 Olympic silver medalist Toby Stevenson, has trained there in the last several years as well along with other Olympic jumpers. USATF should partner with the USOC to more fully utilize the Chula Vista facility, especially given the preference of many athletes to live and train in Southern California.

Sport Science

Funded under the HP plan, USATF's Sports Science Committees are comprised of biomechanists, physiologists, nutritionists, psychologists and others assigned to single or broad event specialties. These individuals perform high-speed filming, analysis and breakdown of athlete performances and work with athletes at summits and at HP centers to assist in athlete development and training.

High Performance Centers are locations where USATF pays to travel athletes to track meets around the country, for the purpose of filming using special Dartfish equipment. When Dartfish is being used for filming at the USA Indoor and Outdoor Championships for all events, and at 8-10 additional meets around the country athletes can immediately review film with their personal coaches and/or support staff. Individualized electronic files of competition footage are available for each athlete to take home and/or USATF sends it to athletes. Extensive scientific and statistical analysis is part of the athlete-benefit program. Athletes and coaches are provided with the information, but there is little follow up to see how it is being applied. When it is applied, success often follows. One multiple medal-winning athlete said the USATF program that contributed most to his success was sport science analysis provided by USATF to his personal coach. The coach worked closely with the scientist to understand the analysis and apply it accordingly to the athlete's training and racing.

Cutting-edge sport science is available to every event group, but they leverage it to different degrees. Sprints and hurdles are the most receptive to the application of sport science, while the distance events are most resistant to it. In one coach's words, American distance runners and coaches focus almost exclusively on physiology and endurance training, while it is biomechanics that is the difference between winning a medal and not making a final. Sport scientists confirm this reticence on the part of most American distance coaches. (It should be noted that two of the most successful distance coaches in the last three years have been the two coaches most often cited as applying sports science and biomechanics. At least one of them consults regularly with sprint coaches to discuss and analyze the biomechanics of his runners.)

The Task Force is concerned that jumping events, particularly, have not adequately availed themselves of available sport science and coaching philosophy resources. The information is available, but do coaches and athletes apply it? Especially given the inconsistency of U.S. jumpers in particular, USATF has a responsibility to ensure that best practices are being employed. To establish such a best practices program, USATF will need to devote nearly twice the financial resources than it currently does to sport science.

Event group variations

The Task Force would like to note (but not comment exhaustively on) other trends in various events. Sprints and hurdles have always been a strong suit of Americans, and despite some high-profile disappointments in Beijing, medal tallies are still robust. (Note sweeps in Beijing the men's 400 and 400 hurdles; two medals in the 110m hurdles; medals in both women's hurdle events, etc). Success in the high jump and vertical jumps have been inconsistent at best. The talent is there, but the Task Force believes that training, talent identification and systematic athlete development is lacking. One prominent high jump coach noted flatly that American high jumpers as a group simply do not train hard enough or focus enough on strength training, especially when compared to their more successful European counterparts. Americans generally

have been successful in the pole vault, due perhaps not coincidentally to the grass-roots popularity of the sport and successful USATF development summits.

Training situations and professionalism

There is no doubt that training groups provide the key element of success ó sprinters and hurdlers have trained together for years, and distance runners and throwers have been doing so once again. The technical events need to follow the same type of structure. Unofficial training centers have sprouted up on their own as athletes have sought out coaches and other event-group athletes to train with. Don Babbitt's throws group at the University of Georgia was cited as a successful example of a training group, but there is no system and no template in place for what constitutes a good training group for athletes. What resources are needed? What can or should USATF's role be in these groups? What is the role of the agent and how should it fit into a professional athlete's career? What considerations should an athlete make before choosing a coach, agent and/or training group? The Task Force will provide such a template in its recommendations, to follow.

The Task Force found that the over-riding theme in training and development is that, despite certain USATF programs and resources being available, there is no systematic implementation and follow-up. This is due largely to the programs being overseen by the High Performance Division, which is volunteer-based, rather than the National Office's professional High Performance Department.

The Task Force often came back to the glaring problem of athlete professionalism. What constitutes being a professional track athlete? The Task Force believes it to be an athlete who has long- and short-term plans for success and who takes the lead role in controlling his or her training and competitions, with clearly stated goals. A professional athlete seeks out the best agent and coach that suits his or her needs and professionally delegates responsibility.

At present, the Task Force believes far too few American athletes conduct themselves in a professional manner. Shoe companies determine who is professional based on to whom they give contracts; they often guide athletes to specific coaches. Athletes let their agents choose them rather than vice-versa. Too often, athletes look only at the short term and allow others to make decisions for them. As one professional athlete put it, athletes must make decisions for themselves. They need to start making the right choices. They are choices, not sacrifices. Having a coach and agent that the athlete trusts is crucial for success. If athletes seek the best modes of therapy and have good relationships with the people in their professional and personal lives and establish consistency, success is inevitable. The Task Force will recommend standards for professionalism in the final section of its report.

Youth/Junior Development Programs

Youth (age 18 and under, with no performance minimums) and junior (age 19 and under, developing elite) developmental efforts fall under both the High Performance and Grass Roots Departments of USATF.

Under High Performance, prior to 2005 USATF hosted annual camps with elite junior athletes at the Chula Vista Olympic Training Center. USATF invited high-caliber junior athletes for weeklong summits with coaches and sports scientists to advance future individual athlete development.

The philosophy behind the program has changed. Now operating under the concept that "one coach is worth a thousand athletes," USATF invites elite high school coaches for an annual summit at Chula Vista. For both coaches and athletes, USATF also provides Dartfish filming and analysis each year at the USA Junior Track & Field Championships.

USATF annually fields a number of youth/junior teams for international competition. Depending on the year, these could include the World Junior Championships, World Youth Championships, Pan Am Juniors and World Cross Country Championships, as well as Race Walk competitions.

While the USA Junior Championships are overseen by High Performance, USATF's Grass Roots Department provides the primary participatory opportunities for youth athletes domestically. These meets include:

- Youth Championships is a national meet with no qualifying standards (only "guidelines"), featuring 2,000-3,500 participants each year
- USATF's Junior Olympic Program is roughly 50,000 athletes 18 and under compete in regional qualifying competition, with 6,000 competing at the Junior Olympic national championships. This is USATF's single biggest meet and largest participatory program.

Many future elite stars, including Olympic medalists Deena Kastor, Lashawn Merritt, Sanya Richards and Lauryn Williams, came up through the USATF youth program. The Youth program nationally includes 1,700 clubs and 55,000 athletes.

The Task Force considers it a misnomer to discuss USATF youth development "programs." The Junior Olympics and Youth Championships are competition programs, not development programs. As is the case in nearly all USATF "programs" to date, the fact that the programs are largely overseen by a volunteer base and that can change every few years, and that has little professional accountability, prevents establishing a systematic national program. As is the case for High Performance, oversight of nationwide youth development programs should be brought in-house under the supervision of professional staff who would leverage and work with volunteer resources to implement those programs.

Even more so than is the case with professional athletes, there is huge variation nationwide in the sophistication and organization of local and regional youth clubs. USATF must establish national curricula and standards, which integrate the involvement of current and past professional athletes, for local youth programs to help provide a template for volunteers. Active athletes and legends must give back to the sport at the grass roots level to help develop and inspire future stars.

A young person who has a bad experience with the sport early on is lost to the sport forever. But a good experience that provides structure, encouragement and success will breed more enthusiastic and more highly accomplished athletes.

It is vitally important that comprehensive anti-doping education programs are part of this curriculum. Indifference to and embracement of performance-enhancing drugs can begin as early as the youth level. It is an obvious statement that the earlier this education starts, the more effective it will be.

Coaching Education

As part of its "One coach is worth a thousand athletes" outlook, and recognizing the importance of coaching on all levels of the sport, USATF has a robust Coaching Education Program. Since its inception, Coaching Education has educated more than 15,000 coaches.

For Level I certification, coaches take part in a 3-day, 2-night seminar covering all broad event groups, physiology, and sports science. It is an introductory course for high school or beginning college coaches who want a good, comprehensive overview. Roughly 1300 coaches attend the 30-odd Level I schools held around the country each year.

For Level II certification, coaches take part in an 8-day, 7-night seminar in one specific event group, with the attendee focusing on only one event group and the heavy application of science. Coaches may obtain Level II certification in multiple event groups. Roughly 200 coaches attend Level II each year, and since its inception, more than 2,000 coaches have successfully completed the requirements of the Level II schools program.

Level III certification involves a symposium where coaches are asked to publish articles or do specific research projects, along with educational component. Over 200 coaches are Level III certified.

USATF's program as it exists has reached a large number of coaches, but several people interviewed questioned the qualifications of some coaches involved as instructors. Once again, the need for professional oversight of this program was often cited. The National Office oversees administration of the Coaching Education schools, but volunteers establish the curriculum. The curriculum should be revised and more innovative means of disseminating information must be established. The need to reach youth and junior-level coaches is especially critical to long-term

development of medal-winning athletes. Sport science should have a more prominent role in the curriculum.

Anti-doping programs

Though not specifically listed in its charter, the Task Force feels compelled to comment on performance-enhancing drugs. This is the single most important issue to the long-term success of track and field, domestically and internationally.

USATF's "Zero Tolerance" policy is strong in principal, but it lacks cohesion, professional oversight, consistency and depth. Different USATF staff members oversee USADA interaction, the Win With Integrity outreach program and fledgling youth anti-doping programs. Anti-doping education is limited in its reach.

Although USADA is responsible for drug-testing and adjudication, USATF must be the leader in educating athletes, coaches, parents, teachers, and people of influence in youth track athletes' lives. Once again, a single professional should be in charge of overseeing and administering the program. In every instance, having a single, professional point person in charge of any program provides the program with inherent accountability. The more splintered a program's oversight structure, the less accountability there is – again reiterating a recurring theme.

Coaching education also should be tied strongly to anti-doping efforts. Athletes and coaches must understand that drugs are not necessary to win, and they need to understand how properly to train in order to win clean. In a prior era where drug use was more rampant, the Task Force observed that the technical skills of coaches whose athletes doped were significantly below other top coaches. Instead of focusing on technique and training, coaches of dirty athletes instead focused on how to be good chemists. Coaching, not chemistry and pharmacology, creates clean gold medalists. It is clean athletes who will have successful and sustainable careers.

RECOMMENDATIONS



Project 30 Task Force Report

Recommendation 1

Hire a professional General Manager of High Performance

To successfully streamline all USATF High Performance-related areas, they must be brought under the oversight of one professional who is held responsible for their success or failure. A General Manager of High Performance (GM) should be hired as soon as possible by the CEO, as it is central to the implementation of many of the Task Force's Recommendations. The position will report directly to the CEO and have a strong presence in Indianapolis, overseeing several key professional staff departments. Most important, the General Manager (GM) should be given the power, resources and accountability necessary to make the position successful.

The most critical qualities of the GM will be strong leadership and managerial capabilities, with the decision-making skills inherent in good leaders. Building consensus between various groups of athletes, coaches, agents, staff, and volunteers is critical. The GM need not be a coach and need not be from the sport. In fact, the Task Force believes there are several advantages to the GM being familiar with track and field but coming from a different athletic or professional arena. Not the least of these advantages is having no prior alliances or debts of gratitude that must be repaid. Leadership abilities trump sport knowledge. Given that the GM will be the point person for many key and highly visible USATF programs, it also is critical that he or she be comfortable with the press and comfortable with public controversy.

The over-riding goal of the GM is to produce a seamless athlete-development pipeline, from youth to elite. The GM will oversee the personnel and resources needed for achieving Project 30's medal goals.

The Task Force recommends that the GM supervise the following areas of USATF's National Office staff:

- High Performance (HP Department, HP Development and the HP Program; Coaching Education, etc)
- Elite Athlete Services (Professional Athlete Designation and other administration)
- Team USA Management (Managing the affairs of Team USA and its relays)
- Team USA Staff management (Staff selection, supervision and accountability)
- National Championships (Site selection, event scheduling)
- Sport Science application and Sports Medicine
- Youth Development
- Anti-Doping programs

Specific functions of the GM are described throughout the Recommendations below.

Recommendation 2

Create a transparent, criteria-based Team Staff selection system

The Task Force considers it critical for the success of American athletes that coaches are involved in USA Track & Field, and that coaches are recognized for their contributions to the sport. USATF can help to re-enfranchise coaches by establishing a more transparent staff selection system that rewards and recognizes achievement and provides incentive for USATF involvement.

To receive the respect they deserve from athletes, Team USA's coaching staffs must be as qualified for an international team as the athletes on that team. Under the supervision of the GM, USATF should develop an impartial, point-based system for evaluating coaches who wish to be on national team staffs. Such a system would de-politicize selection and create an incentive-based criteria that could serve as a source of inspiration and aspiration for coaches of all levels.

A small sampling of the many criteria and achievements that would result in coaches earning points are:

- Being a former international athlete
- Coaching past international athletes and medal winners
- Coaching past NCAA and national champions
- Selection to previous staffs
- Attending USATF events and summits
- Being a USATF certified coach

The General Manager will work in concert with USATF's Coaches Advisory Committee and Athletes Advisory Committee to establish the specific point-rating system and criteria.

Under the above system, if a high school coach has an athlete who years later wins Olympic gold with a different coach, the high school coach still would be rewarded (though with a different point scale) for that athlete's achievement, as a person who was part of the developmental pipeline. Such a system catches coaches on the way up and enfranchises them as part of the system at all levels.

Coaches wishing to be eligible for a team staff must submit an online application to be put into the pipeline for selecting staffs. When a coach reaches a certain point value, he or she becomes eligible for a certain level of team, from Youth to Junior to World Championships and Olympic Games.

Final staff selection for all teams will be made by the General Manager from the pool of coaches eligible for each team. The GM is the ultimate decision-maker but will leverage the knowledge and input of other coaches, athletes, staff and advisors to select the best coaching staff for any given team. The staff will report directly to the GM, who will be responsible for ensuring team staffs are fulfilling their job requirements for international teams.

Staffs for all events should be selected once per quadrennium. In the immediate post-Olympic year, staff selections should be made for (among other teams) Pan Am Games, World Championships, World Youth Championships, World Indoor and Outdoor Championships, World Cross Country Championships and Olympic Games. Given that several upcoming staffs already have been selected, this selection system could not be fully implemented until 2013, but its principles should be put into place as soon as possible.

Recommendation 3

Restructure the composition of Team USA Staffs

Many things were clear to the Task Force in looking into Team Staff composition: more managers are needed, and most coaches want to be coaches, not managers. To satisfy both impulses, the Task Force recommends the following staff structure and general job descriptions for up to 18 credentialed Team Staff positions at World Championships and Olympic Games. Job descriptions are intentionally vague in order to account for the specific coaching specialties of any given head coach or assistant coach. Managerial roles also are not specified save for one.

- Women's Head Coach: Generally oversee matters pertaining to the women's team and serve as team leader of volunteer coaching staff.
- Women's Assistant Coach: Also a general position. This coach will fill in if additional coaching duties are required by any particular event group, or provide other coaching duties as needed.
- Men's Head Coach: Same Description as above.
- Men's Assistant Coach: Same Description as above.
- Event Coach - Sprints and Relays: this position will serve both men and women in the 100, 200 and 400m dashes and both relays. This coach, in consultation with the General Manager, will be responsible for choosing the relay pools and will be solely accountable for coaching the relay teams. (See more recommendations for relays in the following section). This coach can and should be assisted by the Head Coach or Assistant Coach, but accountability and responsibility will lie exclusively with him or her.
- Event Coach ó Hurdles: Oversees men's and women's high and intermediate hurdles events.
- Event Coach ó Jumps and Multis: Oversees men's and women's long jump, triple jump, high jump, pole vault, men's decathlon and women's heptathlon.
- Event Coach ó Middle and Long Distances: Oversees men's and women's 800m through marathon and race walks.
- Event Coach ó Throws: Oversees men's and women's shot put, hammer throw, discus and javelin.
- Head Manager: Serves as chief manager for logistical issues for men and women.

- Assistant Manager: Assists Head Manager.
- Event Manager ó Friends and Family. A minimum of one manager should be dedicated exclusively to assisting athletes with issues pertaining to their families and other support mechanisms at international events. Concerns over family ticketing, housing, travel and other matters are significant stressors to athletes that can negatively impact their performance. Having a staff member in charge of handling these stressors should improve performance.
- Event Manager: Task Force recommends a second Friends and Family manager, at least for the Olympic Games and possibly for World Championships.
- Event Manager: general duties as needed.
- Event Manager: general duties as needed.
- Team Leader: As currently credentialed.
- Assistant Team Leader: As currently credentialed.
- General Manager: Will receive credential as the person responsible for the staff and HP/Elite Athlete issues.

Manager positions have as their fundamental duties providing customer service to athletes; as such they should understand the needs, challenges and importance of customer service. The Task Force encourages the GM to develop an incentive-based, national outreach system aimed at identifying prime candidates for these managerial roles. Managers should have familiarity with track and field, and past international team experience is especially helpful. However, as is the case for the General Manager, having general management abilities is the most important attribute of a team manager.

It is critical, in considering which coaches to choose for a given staff, that the GM consider staff chemistry, gender balance and diversity. The Task Force notes that a coach who has had the most medalists does not necessarily make the best team coach. Quite to the contrary, a personal coach with several athletes on a team is often times less qualified for a staff because she or he must devote so much time to his or her individual athletes, rather than the needs of a team. All such considerations should be taken into account.

Recommendation 4

Shorten the U.S. Olympic Team Trials – Track & Field to five days

The Task Force has exhaustively looked into the selection system for U.S. National Teams, particularly the Olympic Team. Although inevitably some favorites fail to make the team, the Task Force recommends against any change to the current "top three" system for selecting athletes to the team. The U.S. talent pool is simply too deep in most events to assume that an administrator choosing even one team spot for each event would result in a better team than the current system.

The Task Force feels strongly that the current structure of the Olympic Trials negatively impacts the performance of the U.S. team at the Games. The mental and physical exhaustion disadvantages athletes in a way that far outweighs the theoretical benefit of having the experience of going through the rounds. The Task Force recommends that the Olympic Trials be shortened to no more than five days. The shortening of the Trials could be achieved in several ways. Toughening qualifying standards, reducing the number of rounds and tightening the schedule are among the considerations. The GM should determine the method for shortening the Trials.

Ideally, the timing of the Olympic Trials would be moved earlier in June, but the Task Force does not condone having it about the NCAA Outdoor Championships. Instead, having athletes and coaches prepare and plan for their entire season through the Olympic Games or World Championships is the most critical element of ensuring an athlete recovers from the Trials. Building in recovery time and strategically choosing competitive opportunities is critical. With a well-laid plan in place for an athlete's season, the timing of the Olympic Trials almost becomes incidental.

Recommendation 5

Terminate the National Relay Program

The United States has made relay running a 400-meter enigma, wrapped in a conundrum and shrouded in mystery. The Task Force recommends that the existing Relay Program be terminated immediately. In its place, relays for each championship should be selected and coached via a transparent and well-defined system, as determined by the GM. Below are recommendations based on the Task Force's findings:

- The relay pools for any given team will be chosen and managed by the Sprints/Relay coach in consultation with the GM.
- Relay pools will be selected, announced and posted on the USATF Web site within 48 hours of the selection event (usually the USA Outdoor Championships or Olympic Trials). All athletes in the pool will be required to sign a statement of conditions indicating that they understand the goal of the relay pool is to win a gold medal; they agree to attend any and all practices; they agree to run all rounds at the International Championship; and that being in the pool is no guarantee of competing in the International Championship. Athletes/coaches and agents will be required to sign this form as well.
- The Sprints/Relay coach will be in charge of scheduling and conducting practices and will have sole responsibility and accountability for selecting relay lineups. Practices may include other members of the U.S. team who already are in individual events. The emphasis is on the team, not the pool.
- The intended relay lineups should be made clear to athletes as soon as possible, preferably weeks before the International Championship, so that relay practices may be conducted accordingly and athletes are clear about the expectations placed upon them.
- For the 4x100 relays, several practices should be conducted, with two preparatory competitions in Europe prior to the World Championships or Olympic Games. Competitions are not necessary for the 4x400 relays.
- Standard relay best practices and methods should be established, published by USATF online and in print and used not just in competition but also in Coaching Education curriculum and clinics nationwide. This will help move toward the concept of universal national standards for relays.

Recommendation 6

Establish a comprehensive 2012 team preparation program

The Project 30 Task Force takes its name from the goal of 30 medals in London. The recommendations below are designed specifically to help achieve that goal in team preparation for 2012.

As stated in its Findings, the Task Force recognizes the desire and need for athletes to compete between the Olympic Trials and the Olympic Games. Some observers have pointed to USA Swimming's controlled training camp between their Trials and the Games as a possible model for USATF, with the federation controlling the competitive choices and training of athletes. The Task Force feels this model is not applicable to track and field. Swimming has no top international competitive opportunities between the Trials and Games and does not have the same type of professional competitive and management/agent structures.

In addition, there is no "one size fits all" for track athletes. Different events have different competitive and training needs and opportunities, and different individuals within those events also have varying preferences. Instead, USATF should create platforms that will enable all athletes to maximize their Olympic success.

Planning

It starts first with planning and education. When an athlete moves up into the ranks of elite performances, he or she must be educated on learning proper prioritization of their careers and good decision-making. Previous Olympic champions must mentor today's athletes to get them to understand the long-term financial and reputational benefits of performing at their best at the Games. This mentoring would be coordinated by the departments reporting to the GM.

It is the job of the GM to work closely with athletes, agents and coaches to ensure that, especially in an Olympic year, an athlete's schedule for the summer has been planned well in advance, with the goal of Olympic performance taking priority. The GM should particularly advise athletes and their handlers against ill-timed decisions to engage in excessive trans-Atlantic travel.

Planning and communication also is vital for managing P Credential expectations and distribution at the Olympic Games. The GM will be responsible for managing expectations in this area and also will be responsible and accountable for P Credential distribution. Using impartial criteria that are well-defined, merit-based and publicly posted on the USATF Web site, the GM will identify which coaches will receive a P credential within three weeks of the conclusion of the Olympic Trials. That list then will be posted on the USATF web site. Creating this type of transparent system will help restore faith in how credentials are distributed, and

determining who will receive those credentials well before the Games will enable coaches to seek other options if they are not on the list, and/or will enable all parties to know what to expect in terms of coaches' access in the competition venue.

The Task Force does not accept that there will be absolutely no increase in P Credentials for London in 2012. USATF must urge the IAAF, via international relations efforts, to lobby the IOC for more P credentials for all of track and field (not just the United States but all countries). It is in the best interest of the IAAF to have athletes feel comfortable as they go to compete, which more often than not happens when they have access to their coaches. The IAAF is the most powerful single sport federation in the Olympic Family and must wield that power.

Training Camps

The Task Force fully supports the concept of pre-Olympic Training Camps, for the reasons noted in the Findings section of this report. For 2012, the Task Force recommends that the Training Camp be a summer-long training base, located in Europe to provide a home base for athletes as they either compete in Europe or focus on training for the Olympic Games. The camp need not be based in Great Britain, though it may be. Minimizing trans-Atlantic travel is of primary concern; any country with easy access to Great Britain and western European countries would function well. It should open shortly after the Olympic Trials and remain open through the start of track and field Olympic competition.

All personal coaches should have access to the Training Camp, as long as they submit to the required background check. Again, reducing stress and uncertainty on athletes is a key part of Olympic success. While at training camp with athletes, coaches and support staff, USATF must continually reinforce and remind them about policies and procedures for the Olympic Games. This would include Village Life, practice-track access and other uniquely Olympic concerns. Here the advantage of one-stop shopping at the Training Camp provides USATF with an effective means for communicating with all critical people associated with athletes.

Given the expense of such a long-term training base, USATF should look to the USOC and possibly combining with other sports to create a training venue similar to that of Beijing Normal University. Such organization would achieve efficiencies of scale in accessing medical and other support personnel as well as weight-training facilities. In addition, USATF must recognize the financial value to cities and countries which benefit from the prestige of hosting the U.S. Olympic Team. The site for the training camp can and should bear much of the cost for the camp, with USATF and USOC monies also going toward the camp.

USATF currently requires all athletes who take part in team Training Camp to wear official Team USA gear at all times, including at practice. With a longer-term training base concept, this requirement is not feasible. If athletes are going to use the Training Camp, they must be allowed to wear their non-competition gear when training. USATF's shoe sponsor provides substantial financial support to the federation for the right to require athletes to wear their gear in Team

USA competition, but a Training Camp is exactly what it says it is ó a training facility, not a competition. By dropping this apparel requirement, more athletes will attend camp and therefore more athletes will be in a comfortable, controlled, lower-stress environment overseen by USATF rather than running amok in Europe and traveling excessively.

Competitive Opportunities

USATF should work with fellow federations to organize three televised, country-based dual/triangular meets in Europe in the weeks leading up to London 2012. Such meets would be a profit generator in selling European and international television rights, would give American athletes ó especially those whose events have fewer existing competitive opportunities ó a chance to sharpen for the Games, and would contribute to generating more of a sense of team among U.S. athletes. The Task Force recommends event-specific meets in a dual or triangular-meet format. For example, USA vs. GB in selected events; USA vs. Scandinavia in throws; and an all-purpose, all-event meet. Athletes should be paid a stipend to compete in the meets to ensure their quality. The Statement of Conditions, which athletes sign as a requirement to be on national teams, should stipulate that all athletes who attend Training Camp participate in at least one such meet.

As noted in the Findings, not all athletes wish to travel to Europe to compete. Leveraging High Performance Training Centers (*see Recommendation 7*), USATF should organize a small number of pre-Olympic meets stateside in different geographical areas. The athletes who live in these areas and who prefer to stay home to prepare for the Games therefore can benefit from well-managed, limited pre-Olympic competition in the same way that their European-based colleagues do.

Financial Incentives

After speaking with athletes in a wide array of event groups, the unifying theme is that the bottom-line issue for them is money. No óstickö of punishment for not following protocol is as powerful as the ócarrotö of financial reward. The Task Force recognizes that talk of glory alone and representing one's country may not sway athletes and their agents into making choices that will help them set a personal best or medal at the Olympic Games. But money might.

The Task Force therefore recommends that USATF develop an incentive structure for the Olympic Games and provide financial rewards to athletes who achieve Seasonal Best (SB) or Personal Best (PB) performances at the Games. The amount of these incentives should be determined by the GM. Ideally the amount would be a few to several thousand dollars for SBs and PBs.

In speaking with the Task Force, many athletes requested a lump sum support payment from USATF when they make the Olympic Team, to help pay for their training and mitigate support staff costs leading up to the Games. Providing such money with no strings attached and with no

mechanism to ensure that money is used wisely is a non-starter. But if athletes are paid that support money after they have achieved a SB or PB at the Olympic Games, the carrot provides the quality oversight in a de facto manner. Athletes will be incentivized to chase the reward money and make good decisions, even if they do not medal; the financial incentive becomes an athlete-development program in and of itself.

Medical and Support Staff

Team USA medical and support staff (physios) are at least as important for generating success on the track as the Team USA coaching staff. As is the case for choosing Team USA coaching staff, an impartial system for selecting top medical staff should be developed by the General Manager. Among the possible factors that might go into such a system would be consideration of how many athletes on the team work with a physio; performance on past Team USA staffs; and athlete evaluations. The Task Force notes that to be on Olympic Staffs, medical personnel must take part in USOC training. Previously two weeks long, the training program is under consideration for being adjusted to make it more feasible for professionals to participate without having to take excessive time away from their full-time jobs. Athletes must encourage or even require their personal physios to go through the USOC program if they want to increase the chance that they will have access to those physios leading up to the Games. Any physios and medical support staff affiliated with High Performance Training Centers (*see Recommendation 7*) should be on-site at Training Camp.

Recommendation 7

Target technical events for medal growth and develop those events

To achieve 30 medals in London 2012, American favorites heading into the Games must perform up to expectations, and additional medals must be forthcoming in other events. Considering Team USA's history and the nature of the U.S. talent pool, the Task Force believes the greatest potential for upping the American medal tally lies in the technical events, particularly men's and women's jumps and throws. Americans have historically won medals in these events, and even recently have sporadically medaled on the Olympic or World Championships stage. The key is to establish a consistent and reliable medal production that is in line with the sprints and hurdles and the improved American performance in the middle- and long distances.

To achieve that consistency, a fundamental shift in the nature of USATF event development, coaching education and athlete training arrangements need to be made. USATF must take steps to streamline development from youth through professional ranks. The Task Force makes the following recommendations:

High Performance Training Centers

The linchpin for developing long-term, sustainable success in any event group is for athletes to train with other athletes in a stable environment with a trusted coach and agent. The Task Force offers as case studies the success of the Santa Monica Track Club (SMTC) in the 1980s and '90s, HSI in the 1990s and early 2000s, and Team USA California (now called the Mammoth Lakes Track Club) in this century. SMTC and HSI had primarily sprinters and/or jumpers, while Team USA California is an exclusively distance group that generated 2004 Olympic marathon medalists Meb Keflezighi and Project 30 Task Force Member Deena Kastor. All three share the same fundamental structure that contributed to their success:

- They are groups of athletes with a coach-agent-facility-community continuum.
- The clubs generally had only one coach and one agent for all athletes. These two people are trusted by their athletes and have a cooperative relationship with each other. The most effective agents of successful athletes all defer to the coach and athlete in scheduling competitions: the coach tells the agent when the athlete will compete, not vice-versa.
- Because of the group dynamic, the clubs achieved economies of scale in contracting with physios and negotiating facility
- Because of the success and cohesiveness of the groups, they marketed themselves locally, establishing a strong base of local support. Athletes were, and are, involved in their communities, and the clubs are part of the communities.

Following these models, USATF must create a template for group-training success, from the coach-agent-athlete relationship to local and national fundraising, and apply it to pre-existing regions where athletes have gathered to train. These locations will be called USATF High Performance Training Centers (HPTC). USATF, rather than shoe companies, will be the driving force in helping athletes benefit from the best possible training conditions. Taken to the next step, HPTCs also may be organized as teams or clubs, providing the basis for a return to fan-friendly, regionally identified, team-based competitions throughout the country.

Successful training groups already exist in Southern California, Oregon, Texas, Georgia and North Carolina, among other places. A group of throwers also is forming in Arizona. The Task Force recommends that USATF denote these groups as High Performance Training Centers and provide financial support to them. Provided each group follows a generally structured template that will be tailored to fit its particular needs, USATF will provide support for putting systems together, finding physio support, advising on fund-raising techniques and opportunities and, perhaps most important, facilitating the group's access to facilities.

USATF support of HPTCs

One of the biggest challenges faced by post-collegiate athletes and training groups is restrictive access to NCAA facilities. NCAA rules dictate only a small number of post-collegiate athletes may be on a track while collegians are practicing. Additionally, collegiate coaches who feel disenfranchised by USATF are generally not inclined to take on the additional liability of opening their facilities to professionals, especially those they do not personally coach.

USATF's new Team Staff selection system will engender good will from college coaches, and its advocacy for HPTCs will help athletes gain access to NCAA facilities. USATF may also negotiate arrangements with community colleges or high schools, where having Olympians train on a school's track is often regarded as an honor for the school. USATF should be the conduit and negotiator, and may offer to take on liability to ensure athlete access to those facilities.

USATF must facilitate having its best agents and best technical coaches affiliate themselves with these HP Training Centers, so athletes can gain from living and training in an environment where they know their staff has their best interests at heart. USATF should offer stipends to these coaches and agents of high integrity to entice them to be part of HPTCs.

A key part of the HPTC template must be local outreach. To be successful in the long term, HPTCs must reap financial support and win over the hearts and minds of the communities in which they reside. By having one agent work with each HPTC, the agent can focus on creating business and personal partnerships on the local level that benefit the entire training group. An HPTC will include athletes ranging from developmental athletes to gold medalists; the strength of the group will be determined by the support received by the lowest athlete, not the most accomplished.

To obtain local partnerships, and particularly to win emotional support, it is extremely important that athletes are part of their communities. As part of USATF's Professional Athlete designation (*see Recommendation 8*), athletes must fulfill minimum community outreach standards; HPTCs provide a natural opportunity for outreach.

Local relationships also will provide the building-blocks for athletes to develop their public-speaking and PR skills. By speaking frequently on a local level, they will develop the poise, savvy and relationship-building skills necessary for PR success on the national and international levels. HPTC training will enable media training programs to much more successfully be applied, given that multiple athletes will be at each location. Toward this end, USATF should establish a sustained relationship with regional PR firms in each HPTC area to do regular media training.

USATF's event-development and coaching summits should be centered around each HPTC, with each center having one summit per year, for a total of 7-10 summits, depending upon the number of HPTCs. This will further tie HPTCs into their localities and regions while making it easier for coaches around the country, from youth coaches to professional coaches, to attend summits, given the regional variety available. These regional summits should culminate in USATF's annual Podium Education Summit, which has grown from a handful of coaches to an all-comers event of as many as 500 coaches.

Funding

The key to developing medal potential in technical events is to provide coaching and financial stability for athletes. Technical events also tend to suffer from a dearth of competitive opportunities.

The Task Force believes that USATF Developmental monies should go toward "target" events (events identified as having legitimate, yet sometimes unrealized, medal potential) in a need-based system, while also preserving support for existing medal-producing events. In a need-based system, USATF would give to the lower-income athletes rather than those already winning substantial prize money. For "Development" events with little forseen medal potential, funds should go only to individual athletes who are "outliers" and who have demonstrated medal potential, particularly if they are in their early 20s.

In such a system, funding would go to provide coaching and other support staff for athletes in these event groups, particularly those who are working with HPTCs. Money must be focused on immediate post-collegiate athletes. These are the athletes with the greatest untapped medal potential, yet they also are the athletes who are most likely to fall out of the sport as they struggle to establish coaching and financial stability after college. As cited in the Findings section of this report, if an athlete has not made an international impact by age 25 or 26, funding should be cut off so it may better be used to develop new and young talent.

That may be a bitter pill to swallow for many athletes, some of whom may be winning national championships at age 27, 28 or older. But if these athletes are not winning medals or earning top-10 world rankings by that point in their careers, USATF cannot afford to continue to provide additional funds to them. The Task Force does recognize, however, that certain technical events – particularly the throws – do have a somewhat later age-curve than other events.

Coaching

Technical events in the United States suffer more than any other event group from a lack of technically expert coaches. College coaches who may be qualified to coach professional athletes are often too busy to devote adequate time to professionals. Coaching is more than just giving athletes their workouts, it is a mentor role. Therefore, USATF should actively work to engage top-level coaches to devote the time necessary to develop professional athletes.

USATF must educate athletes – especially young professional athletes – to stay away from coaching “gurus” whose charisma and confidence can draw in an athlete, but who lack the technical skills to fully develop athletes. As one physiologist pointed out, these gurus “can sell ice to Eskimos but don’t know the fundamentals of coaching.”

USATF must establish relationships with the top technical coaches to make them part of USATF Coaching Education. Only when the country’s coaching base is technically sound can athletes fully develop from the grass roots level on up. These coaches should revise the Coaching Education Curriculum and, if they do not teach at Coaching Education schools themselves, they should train others to effectively present the curriculum.

USATF must take the next step and do more to get the best technical coaching information into the hands of coaches. Particularly in an effort to reach high school coaches, this information must be placed online in easy-to-access formats. Having valid technical coaching information online is vital for reaching youth and high school coaches in particular. Only when these coaches are “on board” with USATF standards and knowledge can a truly systematic national youth development system begin to take shape. The United States has the best coaches in the world; USATF must be the conduit for sharing that knowledge on the grass-roots and youth levels. Placing youth development under the GM will be the first step toward achieving that continuity.

Doing a better job of imparting top “best practices” to coaches at all levels also will function to make coaching more fact-based rather than opinion-based. Individual coaches have different opinions about athletes and training methods; technical data exist to take the art of coaching and inject the facts and science necessary to take such coaching to the next level. Level III Coaching certification likewise should be moved away from a research and publication process to a high-level, science-based curriculum.

Create a well-defined Professional Athlete designation

Through benign neglect, USATF has allowed shoe companies and agents to take over management of the sport. It is long overdue for USATF to take it back. USATF must establish a Professional Athlete designation that is required for all athletes with no high school or college eligibility remaining, who wish to be eligible for USATF support programs. Such a designation will enable USATF to garner support from athletes in growing and promoting the sport; will ensure that athletes are receiving impartial guidance on launching their careers; and will ensure that athletes who pursue the sport after college are not "hobby athletes" but athletes seriously focused on being professional.

Any athlete wishing to receive USATF support funds (including prize money, insurance and other stipends) or who wishes their coaches to receive USATF support (including stipends, credentials and other support) must declare him- or herself as professional with USATF. In doing so, they will sign a contract with USATF declaring their professionalism. This contract will:

- Declare the athlete professional, and therefore eligible for all USATF and other potential support programs.
- Establish minimum obligations for all professional athletes, such as participating in a minimum number of press conferences, promotional events and local, grass-roots functions during the course of the year. Failure to meet these obligations will result in penalties, including loss of support for the athlete as described in the first bullet point.
- Establish increased requirements for athletes coming back from a doping suspension, including to provide a deposition under oath and undergo performance-enhancing drug "rehab". The contract will further stipulate that if an athlete is caught doping, his or her personal coach will not be eligible to serve on any Team USA staff. Any coaches with a hope or intent to be part of a Team Staff will thereby be incentivized to keep their athletes clean (*see Recommendation 9*).

Once an athlete is professional, USATF will educate the athlete about High Performance Training Center opportunities best suited to him or her and advocate the professional growth of the athlete, including how to choose the right coach or agent. USATF's in-person rookie education program should be more robust and should be held at USATF's Annual Meeting.

At these sessions, athletes will be mentored by the "legends" who will be recruited by USATF. Each "rookie" athlete will be assigned a personal mentor with knowledge and success in their event group, who will serve as a resource and fount of knowledge for the rookie.

Establish a more stringent anti-doping reinstatement system

Under the rules of the Amateur Sports Act, USATF cannot bar an athlete from competing in certain "protected competitions" once they have served their suspension and gone through proper reinstatement testing, but the Task Force believes strongly USATF should leverage what resources it has to give the anti-doping system more teeth.

The current anti-doping system is almost entirely punitive. The U.S. Anti-Doping Agency has in some cases persuaded athletes to truly "come clean", but these instances are few and far between. Kelli White was an early, and remains the most prominent, example of this type of arrangement, but it is entirely at the discretion of the athlete as to whether they will ever truly tell the whole truth of their cheating. As long as they served their time and underwent required testing, they can come back into the sport with no strings attached.

The Task Force recommends adding several strings.

- Any athlete coming back from suspension should be required by USATF to provide a deposition under oath detailing what went into their decision to cheat, how they obtained and used their drugs, and who contributed to their cheating.
- Like an ex-convict who only knows no life other than breaking the law, most athletes serving doping suspensions only know how to participate in the sport by cheating. USATF should set up a "rehab" education program designed to teach athletes how to train and compete clean. In many cases, these athletes don't believe that it is possible to compete clean; even more important is that they have no idea how to do so. The rehab program must include instruction on nutrition and periodization of training and should guide the athletes to train with a "clean" coach. Without this education, a former cheater is likely to simply go back to his or her old ways, doing no favors for the sport or their own personal health.
- Any athlete who has been convicted of a doping violation who later pursues a coaching career will not be eligible for any USATF coaching support or programs, including but not limited to stipends, credentials, selection to Team USA staffs, affiliation with HPTCs and access to other USATF coaching programs.
- Coaches of banned athletes also should be required to go through this rehab program.
- Until and unless the athletes fulfill each of the above two requirements (deposition and rehab) they will not be eligible to receive USATF benefits and support monies or participate in USATF-affiliated events, such as the Visa Championship Series.

Such a system undoubtedly will be challenged by athletes in the courts, but the Task Force passionately believes that USATF will win. Most important, USATF has a moral obligation to make the effort to institute measures such as those described above. Any legal costs will be more than repaid by the culture shift it will help establish.

Recommendation 10

Promote and foster a self-sustaining professional athletes' union

American track and field athletes have talked for years about forming a union. It is time they act decisively. The Professional Athletes' Association (PAA) was started three years ago, with USATF funding and oversight, as a move toward a union. But from the start, the structure was such that being an independent union was impossible. The PAA was overseen by USATF's Executive Director of Elite Athlete Programs and largely organized by the Athletes Advisory chair. All monies came from USATF.

The Task Force does not fault USATF for trying to help athletes help themselves, but the conflict of interest inherent in this structure is obvious. Rather than being an independent and empowered athletes' group, the PAA as it currently exists is a relative impotent and co-dependent organization. Even the most well-informed athletes the Task Force spoke to had no idea who is on the PAA Board and who its executives are.

If athletes are stronger, the sport will be stronger. Track athletes should have access to health insurance, retirement plans and a minimum base pay, as is the case in other sports. But athletes need to stop waiting for USATF to make this happen and instead activate it themselves.

The Task Force recommends that USATF provide "seed money" for a true Athletes' Association or union. This seed money will be a grant to be used to recruit and pay for an executive to organize and oversee the union for two years. This executive should be an experienced Athletes' Association and/or union organizer, not a former track and field athlete.

Once on its feet, the Athletes' Association should follow the model of other sports and oversee several programs now under the auspices of USATF, including management of the Agent program. It could be a leader in establishing an international union that will ensure minimum pay for athletes at all sanctioned meets and other minimum-standard benefits. With a true union in place, the number of athletes traveling to the Annual Meeting could and should be reduced significantly, resulting in a potential savings to USATF of tens of thousands of dollars.

This union cannot succeed, however, unless the most successful athletes fully support it, both financially and philosophically. All athletes must support the union in this way, but it is especially critical that top-down support combines with bottom-up grass-roots organizing. Top athletes have an obligation to bring up the level of developing and less successful athletes if the sport is to prosper. It is not about the "me," it is about the "we."



APPENDICES



Project 30 Task Force Report

Appendix A – Project 30 Task Force Members

DEENA KASTOR: One of only two American women ever to medal in the Olympic marathon, Kastor was the 2004 Olympic Games bronze medalist at the distance. The American record holder in the marathon, she was the 2003 Jesse Owens Award winner as the nation's top female track & field athlete and is a past winner of the Visa Humanitarian Athlete of the Year award. Kastor is a three-time Olympian, two-time World Cross Country Championships silver medalist, a five-time USA 10,000m champion and the former American record holder in that event, a six-time USA 15 km champion and seven-time national cross country champion.

CARL LEWIS: One of only two men to win nine gold medals in Olympic track & field competition, Carl Lewis is considered by many to be the greatest Olympic athlete in history. A former world record holder in the 100m, Carl won four golds at the 1984 Olympics (100, 200, long jump, 4x100m relay); two golds (100, long jump) and one silver (200) in 1988; two gold in 1992 (long jump, 4x100, WR); and one gold in 1996, winning his record fourth consecutive Olympic title in the long jump. In 1992, he anchored Team USA to a world-record in the 4x100m relay that stood until 2008 (37.40), and at one point won 65 consecutive long jump competitions.

RALPH MANN, Ph.D: Dr. Ralph Mann has been at the top of his field as an athlete and now as one of the world's foremost sports scientists. The 1972 Olympic silver medalist in the men's 400m hurdles, Mann was a three-time NCAA champion in the 440-yard hurdles. Competing for Brigham Young, he won the 1969 title by tying the American record in 49.6 seconds and broke the world record in winning the 1970 crown (48.8). He won five national AAU titles as well. Now one of the world's premiere biomechanists, Dr. Mann in 1982 was one of the six individuals that created the framework that brought sports science to USA Track & Field's development programs. For the past 25 years, he has overseen USATF's sport science analysis of sprints and hurdles and was one of the initial recipients of the C. Harmon Brown award for contributions to sports science in track and field.

BENITA FITZGERALD MOSLEY: The 1984 Olympic gold medalist in the 100m hurdles, Fitzgerald Mosley has been equally successful in her career since '84, as an executive in and advocate for women in sport and business. Currently serving as President and CEO of Women in Cable Telecommunications, Fitzgerald Mosley previously worked with the USOC in various administrative and developmental capacities, including as Director of Olympic Training Centers from 1997-2000. She is a trustee and past president of the Women's Sports Foundation Board of Trustees. A native of Virginia, she was named Top Female Sports Figure of the Century from the state by *Sports Illustrated*.

MEL ROSEN: A member of the U.S. Track and Cross Country Coaches of America Hall of Fame, Rosen was the men's head coach of the 1992 Olympic Team, where American men won 20 medals, including gold medals and world records in both relays. He was an assistant coach on the 1984 Olympic Team staff and was head coach for the 1987 World Championships team. In 1978 he was named NCAA Coach of the Year for indoor and outdoor track and was NCAA indoor Coach of the Year in 1980. It was while coaching at Auburn, from 1963-91, that he saw his greatest success. He has served as USATF's men's track and field committee chair and in 1994 received USATF's Robert Giegengack Award for his outstanding service to the organization. During his career, Rosen coached 143 All Americans, including 63 SEC indoor and outdoor champions and eight NCAA champions and is a member of the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame. He continues to teach at Auburn and is a consultant for the men's track team there.

ARETHA THURMOND: A three-time Olympian, Thurmond has been one of the most consistent women's discus throwers in the last 10 years. She was the Olympic Trials champion in the event in 2004 and '08 and is a four-time national champion overall. Thurmond won the 2003 Pan Am Games gold medal in the discus and was second at the 2006 IAAF World Cup. In 1998, she threw a then-collegiate record while competing for the University of Washington, and in 2004 she owned all 10 of the top throws by an American woman that year. In one of her more remarkable performances, she was sixth at the 2007 USA Outdoor Championships just over a month after giving birth to her son, Devon.

DOUG INGRAM: Doug Ingram is the Managing Director, Performance Services, for the United States Olympic Committee. It has been his job to ensure that Olympic Teams perform to their highest levels as he oversees the USOC divisions of Sports Medicine, Sports Science and Coaching. He has been on the USOC staff since 1992, including serving as Director of Sport Partnerships and Managing Director of International Games. He previously had been a successful swimming coach for 23 years and won USA Swimming's highest award for contribution to the sport in 1994.

STEVE ROUSH: Steve Roush in December 2004 was named Chief of Sport Performance of the USOC, overseeing the USOC divisions tasked with providing targeted resources to NGBs, athletes and coaches in pursuit of sustained competitive excellence. He served in that capacity until January 2009. Roush joined the USOC in 2000, as Director of Sport Partnerships and was Managing Director, Sport Performance. He was Assistant Executive Director of USA Swimming from 1994-2000 and began his career as a coach in 1979.

JAY WARWICK: Also an accomplished athlete, coach and administrator, Jay Warwick is the USOC's Director of Sport Partnerships, overseeing USOC relationships with eleven national governing bodies – including USATF – in all matters involving allocation of USOC resources, national team selection and legal and governance issues. As a taekwondo athlete, Mr. Warwick was a silver medalist in the 1985 World Games, a two-time gold medalist in the Pan American Games, a three-time bronze medalist in World Championships and a bronze medalist in the 1988 Olympics. He was an eight-time National Champion. Warwick served as National Team Coach for the Pan American Games, World Cup and World Championships from 1989 to 1997. He was named USTU Coach of the Year in 1993 and USOC Taekwondo Coach of the Year in 1996. He served as Executive Director of USA Taekwondo from 1998-2002.

Appendix B – Project 30 Task Force Charter

The USA Track & Field High Performance Audit Panel (“The Panel”) is charged with examining USATF’s High Performance Programs, specifically as they relate to how we select, prepare and manage our International Teams. USATF bylaws stipulate that as an organization, we have a duty to develop the highest possible performance level for the United States in international competition and field the most competent United States individuals and teams. We must provide support and conditions for athletes at all levels of the sport which ensure optimal performance.

The Panel shall be composed of seven individuals who shall commence their work on October 14, 2008. In analyzing the topics below, The Panel should evaluate current systems, consider alternatives, and determine if, in its opinion, any changes should be made. A final report, including the Panel’s findings and recommendations, shall be presented to the USATF CEO by January 12, 2009.

The Panel shall evaluate the following:

1. International Team Staff system
 - a. Volunteer Staff Selection
 1. Selection process
 2. Qualifications for selection
 - b. Professional/Pool manager staffing
 - c. Responsibilities prior to and during International competition
 1. Responsibilities of each staff member
 - d. Accountability of volunteer and professional staff
2. International/Olympic Team Selection Process
 - a. Timing of Olympic Trials
 - b. Selection criteria
 1. Criteria for entry into Olympic Trials
 2. Criteria for Olympic Team selection – Individual events
 3. Criteria for selection into relay pool
 - a. Selection process and decision-making
3. Olympic Team Preparation
 - a. Volunteer and professional staff involvement with athletes between Olympic Trials and Olympic Games
 1. How often and in what context?
 2. Can USATF exert any influence over Olympic Team members between the Olympic Trials and Olympic Games, to best determine competition schedule and preparation?
 - b. Communication with athletes between Olympic Trials and Olympic Games
 1. How and how often?
 - c. Team Training Camp
 1. Philosophy behind training camp

2. Timing
 3. Location
 4. Management
 5. Athlete access to personal coaches/trainers
 6. Security, leisure and other issues
 7. Cost/Benefit analysis
4. National Relay Team Preparation and Training
 - a. Genesis of National Relay Program
 - b. How often and what context do athletes practice relays?
 - c. Who is required to attend relay camp?
 - d. Who conducts relay practice?
 - e. What standard practices are enforced?
 - f. Consequences for not taking part in camp?
 - g. Who selects final relay lineups for competition?
 - h. How many times do the final lineups practice before competing?
 - i. Cost/benefit analysis of National Relay Program
 5. Management of Team USA at International Competitions
 - a. Staff/athlete dynamic
 - b. Volunteer staff/USATF staff dynamic
 - c. Athlete support
 1. Access to personal coaches, trainers, and friends/family
 2. Logistical responsibilities to athletes
 - d. Travel arrangements
 - e. Olympic Village life and impact on athletes
 6. Team USA performance
 - a. Analyze team performance in Beijing
 1. Medal tally
 2. Individual performances – personal bests, seasonal bests
 3. Relay performances – analysis
 - b. Evaluate Team USA International Competition performance trends
 - c. Determine areas with developmental needs/underperformance
 7. USATF High Performance/Development programs
 - a. Do existing USATF programs adequately prepare athletes for future competitions?
 - b. Evaluate USATF Development programs overall
 1. Committee System
 2. Event Summits
 3. Training Centers
 4. Role of Sports Science
 5. Youth/Junior development
 1. Identify areas of success and areas of developmental need

Appendix C - Select Performances by Team USA Athletes Between the Olympic Trials and Olympic Games

European performances by Select Olympians

July-August 2008

Performances of U.S. Olympians in IAAF Permit Meetings

Athlete Name - Olympic Trials performance listed at top; Olympic performance listed at bottom

Walter Dix, 2nd in 100m (9.80w), 1st in 200m (19.86).

DN Compete in interim

3rd in 100 (9.91PR), 3rd in 200 (19.98) at Olympic Games

Darvis Patton, 3rd in 100m (9.84w). Competed 3 times.

10.09, Thessaloniki, July 9, (2nd)

10.14, Athens, July 13 (2nd)

9.98, Monaco, July 28 (2nd)

8th at Olympic Games, 10.03

Shawn Crawford, 2nd in 200 (19.86). Competed 3 times.

10.33 in 100, Paris, July 18 (6th)

10.33 in Stockholm, July 22nd, 6th in heat 2

10.39 in 100 in London, July 25, 7th in heat 2

2nd at Olympic Games, 19.96

Wallace Spearmon, 3rd in 200 (19.90). Competed 3 times.

10.28 in 100, Lucern, July 16, 4th in heat 3

10.35 in 100, Paris, July 18 (8th)

20.27, London, July 25 (2nd)

3rd in Olympics but DQ for lane violation; competed with torn meniscus

LaShawn Merritt – 1st in 400m (44.00). Competed 3 times.

44.37, Rome, July 11 (2nd)

20.25 in 200, July 14, Rethymnon (1st)

44.35, Paris, July 18 (2nd)

1st at Olympic Games, 43.75

Jeremy Wariner – 2nd in 400m (44.20). Competed 3 times

44.36, Rome, July 11 (1st)

43.86, Paris, July 18 (1st)

44.29, Stockholm, July 22 (1st)

2nd at Olympic Games, 44.74

David Neville, 3rd in 400 (44.61PR). Competed 2 times.

45.39, Stockholm, July 22, 5th

45.39, London, July 25, 4th

3rd at Olympic Games, 44.80

Christian Smith – 3rd in 800 (1:45.47). Competed 1 time.

1:48.20, London, July 25, 7th

4th in heats at Olympic Games, 1:48.20, DNQFinal

Bernard Lagat – 1st in 1,500m (3:40.37) and 5,000m (13:27.47). Competed 1 time.

3:55.20 in Mile, London, July 25 (3rd)

9th in 5,000m (13:26.89), 6th in 1,500m semifinals (3:37.39) at Olympic Games

Matt Tegenkamp, 2nd in 5000 (13:29.68). Competed 1 time.

7:40.75 in 3,000m, Stockholm, July 22 (4th)

13th at Olympic Games, 13:33.13

Anthony Famiglietti, 1st in 3,000m steeplechase (8:20.24). Competed 1 time.

8:25.16, Stockholm, July 22 (6th)

13th at Olympic Games, 8:31.21 (ran 8:17.34PR in heats)

David Payne – 3rd in 110m hurdles (13.25).

Competed 3 times.

13.43, Rome, July 11 (3rd)
13.27, Athens, July 13 (2nd)
DQ, Paris, July 18

2nd in Olympic Games, 13.17SB

David Oliver, 1st in 110m hurdles (12.95w).

Competed 3 times.

13.04, Stockholm, July 22, 2nd
13.20, London, July 25, 1st
13.11, Monaco, July 29, 1st

3rd at Olympic Games, 13.18

Terrence Trammell – 2nd in 110m hurdles (13.00).

Competed 2 times.

13.19, Paris, July 18 (2nd)
13.35, Stockholm, July 22 (4th)

Injured hamstring in Olympic warm-ups

Angelo Taylor – 3rd in 400 hurdles (48.42).

Competed 3 times.

50.93, Rome, July 11 (9th)
45.02 in 400m flat, Rethymnon, July 14 (1st)
48.91, Paris, July 18 (3rd)

1st at Olympic Games, 47.25PR

Kerron Clement – 2nd in 400 hurdles (48.36).

Competed 4 times.

48.23, Rome, July 11 (1st)
48.33, Paris, July 18 (1st)
45.47 in 400 flat, Stockholm, July 22 (7th)
48.26, London, July 25 (1st)

2nd in Olympic Games, 47.98

Bershawn Jackson – 1st in 400 hurdles (48.17).

Competed 3 times.

48.24, Rome July 11 (2nd)
45.47 in 400 flat, Rethymnon, July 14 (2nd)
48.92, Paris, July 18 (4th)

3rd at Olympic Games, 48.06

Brian Johnson – 2nd in LJ(8.33m). Competed 3

times.

8.08m in Rome, July 11 (8th)
8.10m, Athens, July 13 (3rd)
7.90m in Paris, July 18 (6th)

DNQ at Olympic Games, 7.79m

Miguel Pate – 3rd in LJ (8.22m). Competed 2 times.

7.61m in Rome, July 11 (9th)
8.06m in Paris, July 18 (4th)

DNQ at Olympic Games, 7.34m

Trevell Quinley, 1st in LJ (8.36m). Competed 2

times.

7.41m in Rome, July 11 (10th)
7.47, Athens, July 13 (14th)

DNQ at Olympic Games, 7.87m

Jesse Williams – 1st in HJ, 2.30m. Competed three

times

2.24m, Stockholm, July 22, t3rd
2.25m, London, July 25, 5th
2.25m, Monaco, July 29, t8th

DNQ at Olympic Games, 2.25m

Dusty Jonas, t6 in HJ, 2.24m. Competed 2 times

2.20m, Stockholm, July 22, 9th
2.20m, London, July 25

DNQ at Olympic Games, 2.20m

Derek Miles, 1st in PV, 5.80m. Competed 3 times

5.70m, Athens, July 13 (3rd)
5.40m, Paris, July 18 (t7th)
5.60m, Heusden, July 20 (2nd)

4th at Olympic Games, 5.70m

Brad Walker, 3rd in PV, 5.65m. Competed 2 times

5.90m, Athens, July 23rd, 1st
5.72m, London, July 25, t3rd

NH in qualifying at Olympic Games

Jeff Hartwig, NH in qualifying at Olympic Games,

did not compete

Reese Hoffa, 1st in SP, 22.10m. Competed 1 time.

21.13m, London, July 25 (1st)

7th at Olympic Games, 20.53m

Christian Cantwell – 2nd in SP, 21.71. Competed 2

times.

20.35m, Stockholm, July 22 (3rd)
20.52m, London, July 25 (4th)

2nd at Olympic Games, 21.09m

Adam Nelson – 3rd in SP, 20.89m. Competed 2 times.

20.75m, Stockholm, July 22 (1st)
21.07m, London, July 25 (2nd)
NM in final at Olympic Games (chest injury suffered week of Olympic competition, but posted top mark in qualifying)

Muna Lee – 1st in 100, 10.85P; 2nd in 200 (21.99w). Competed 2 times.

22.59 in 200, Paris, July 18 (3rd)
11.18 in 100, Stockholm, July 22 (6th)
5th at Olympic Games 100, 11.07 (hesitated out of blocks, thinking Edwards false started)
4th at Olympic Games 200, 22.01PR

Lauryn Williams – 3rd in 100, 10.90PR. Competed 3 times.

11.23, Lucern, July 16, 3rd
11.10, Stockholm, July 22, 1st
11.25, London, July 25, 5th in heat 2
4th at Olympic Games, 11.03

Torri Edwards – 3rd in 100, 10.90. Ran 10.78PR, WL in semifinal. Competed 3 times.

11.21, Stockholm, July 22, 6th in heat 1
11.09, London, July 25, 4th
11.02, Monaco, July 29, 3rd
8th at Olympic Games, 11.20 (slipped in blocks/hesitated)

Allyson Felix, 1st in 200m, 21.82w. Competed 3 times.

50.25 in 400, Rome, July 11 (1st)
50.88 in 400, Stockholm, July 22 (3rd)
23.00, London, July 25 (4th)
2nd in Olympic Games, 21.93SB
Ran fastest leg on gold medal 4x400m relay, 48.55

Marshevet Hooker, 3rd in 200 (22.20w). Competed 2 times.

11.13 in 100m, Stockholm, July 22, 2nd
11.07 in 100, London, July 25, 3rd
5th in Olympic Games, 22.34

Sanya Richards, 1st in 400m (49.89). Competed 4 times.

22.49 in 200, Rome, July 11 (2nd)
49.86, Athens, July 13 (1st)
22.56 in 200, Paris, July 18 (1st)
50.38, Stockholm, July 22 (1st)
3rd in Olympic Games, 49.93
Split 48.92 on gold medal 4x400 anchor

Mary Wineberg, 2nd in 400 (50.85). Competed 2 times.

51.27 in Rome, July 11 (5th)
50.78, Athens, July 13 (3rd)
5th in semifinal 1 at Olympic Games, DNQFinal, 51.13
Split 51.0 on gold medal 4x400 relay 1st leg

Shannon Rowbury, 1st in 1500 (4:05.48). Competed 1 time.

4:00.33PR, Paris, July 18 (2nd)
7th at Olympic Games, 4:03.58

Erin Donohue, 2nd in 1,500m (4:08.20). Competed 1 time.

4:09.63, London, July 25th (2nd)
8th in heats at Olympic Games, DNQFinal, 4:16.05

Jennifer Rhines, 2nd in 5,000 (15:02.02). Competed 3 times.

15:11.79, Paris, July 18 (4th)
8:53.26 in 3,000m, London, July 25 (1st)
8:51.29 in 3,000m, Monaco, July 29
14th in Olympic Games, 16:34.63 (sore foot)

Jennifer Barringer, 3rd in 3,000m steeplechase (9:33.11). Competed 2 times.

11th in 1,500m in Lucern, July 16
9:22.73AR PR, Heusden, July 20
9th at Olympic Games, 9:22.26AR PR

Anna Willard – 1st in 3,000 steeplechase (9:27.59AR). Competed 3 times.

8:58.07 in 3,000m flat, London, July 25 (4th)
4:07.32 in 1,500m, Lucern, July 16 (2nd)
9:22.76PR in 3,000m steeplechase, Heusden, July 20 (2nd)
10th at Olympic Games (9:25.63)

Dawn Harper – 3rd in 100H (12.62). Competed 2 times.

12.79, Paris, July 18 (3rd)
12.78, London, July 25 (5th)
1st at Olympic Games, 12.54PR

Lolo Jones, 1st in 100h (12.29w; 12.45PR in semis). Competed 2 times.

12.64, Stockholm, July 22 (2nd)
12.58, London, July 25 (1st)
7th at Olympic Games, 12.72 (hit 9th hurdle)(ran 12.43PR in semifinals)

Sheena Tosta, 3rd in 400m hurdles (54.62).

Competed 3 times.

56.02, Rome, July 11, (6th)

55.37, London, July 25, (3rd)

53.58, Monaco, July 29, (3rd)

2nd at Olympic Games, 53.70

Tiffany Ross Williams, 1st in 400m hurdles (54.03).

Competed 4 times.

54.97, Rome, July 11, (3rd)

54.79, Rethymnon, July 14, (1st)

55.46, Lucern, July 16, (1st)

53.54, Monaco, July 29 (2nd)

8th at Olympic Games, 57.55

Brittney Reese, 1st in LJ (6.95m). Competed 2 times.

6.80m, Stockholm, July 22 (2nd)

6.76m, Monaco, July 29, (2nd)

5th at Olympic Games, 6.76m

Grace Upshaw, 2nd in LJ (6.88mPR). Competed 2 times.

6.42, Stockholm, July 22 (t8th)

6.64m, Monaco, July 29 (4th)

8th at Olympic Games, 6.58m

Funmi Jimoh, 3rd in LJ (6.72m). Competed 3 times.

6.40m, Rethymnon, July 14 (5th)

6.21m, Stockholm, July 22, 7th in flight 1

6.52m, Monaco, July 29 (6th)

12th at Olympic Games, 6.29m

Chaunte Howard, 1st in HJ (1.97m). Competed 2 times.

1.94m, Paris, July 18 (6th)

1.98m, Stockholm, July 22 (3rd)

6th at Olympic Games, 1.99m (season best)

Amy Acuff, 2nd in HJ (1.93m). Competed 4 times.

1.90m, Rome, July 11 (9th)

1.91m, Paris, July 19, (9th)

1.95m, Stockholm, July 22 (4th)

1.92, London, July 25 (3rd)

DNQ at Olympic Games, 1.89m

Sharon Day, 3rd in HJ (1.91m). Competed 2 times.

1.88m, Paris, July 19 (10th)

1.86m, London, July 25 (6th)

DNQ at Olympic Games, 1.85m

Jenn Stuczynski, 1st in PV (4.92mAR). Competed 1 time.

4.81m, London, July 25 (2nd)

2nd at Olympic Games, 4.80m