



The Equipment and Facilities Specifications Newsletter

An official copyrighted publication of the Equipment and Facilities Specifications Subcommittee of the National Officials Committee in its 19th Year of Publication

WELCOME TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS

This Newsletter is a semi-annually educational tool for Implement Inspectors, Technical Managers, interested Throws Officials, and certification chairs. Input and suggestions are always welcome. This copy is being sent to about 650 officials around the world. Welcome to our new subscribers this year.

Last Name	First Name	Association
Baker	Kenneth	Nevada
Hope	Arthur	Michigan
Marcinkowski	Jeffrey	Michigan
Beyerle	David	Mid-Atlantic
Williams	Jon	North Carolina
Jones	Timothy	North Carolina
O'Hara	Robert	Minnesota
Holmes	Carter	Minnesota
Bickel	David	Arizona
Gourley	Charles	Arizona

IF YOU KNOW SOMEONE WHO COULD BENEFIT BY GETTING THIS INFORMATION, PLEASE SEND HIS OR HER ADDRESS OR E-MAIL ADDRESS TO THE EDITOR. LIKewise, IF YOU ARE NO LONGER INTERESTED IN BEING ON OUR MAILING LIST, ALSO LET ME KNOW. WE ARE CLEANING UP THE LIST FOR THE NEW OLYMPIAD. FOR FASTER DELIVERY AND FOR UPDATES IN BETWEEN NEWSLETTERS SEND ME YOUR E-MAIL ADDRESS. IF YOU'RE GETTING THIS BY MAIL, I DON'T HAVE YOUR CURRENT E-MAIL ADDRESS.

NEW CHAIR AND NEWLETTER EDITOR FOR NEW OLYMPIAD

After 19 years the current editor, head and founder of the Equipment and Facilities Specification Committee is turning over the committee to Bob Springer of the Pacific Northwest Association. He has enlisted Ivars Ikstrums to edit the newsletter. I want to take this opportunity to thank all of you who have contributed to the success of the committee and the education of the US Implement Inspectors over the years. I wish Bob and Ivars the best of luck in continuing this endeavor. I will continue as a member of the

committee but with much less involvement so that I can devote more time to my

Editor: George Kleeman
5104 Alhambra Valley Road
Martinez, California 94553-9773
Home 925-229-2927
E-mail: george_kleeman@comcast.net

upcoming meet management activities and writing of the history of Implement Inspection in the United States over the last century as described on the last page. I would like to hear from any of you who know of the history of implement inspection in your area of the country. Any information is welcome. I want to record it before it is lost...

E&FS's ANNUAL CONVENTION MEETING

The annual meeting was held on Thursday afternoon, December 4, from 3-4:20 PM in Reno. The agenda was published in the last newsletter. There were 40 people in attendance. The meeting was called to order by Chair George Kleeman at 3PM. Everybody introduced themselves. The minutes from 2007 were approved. The agenda was reviewed and approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Two newsletters were written and sent out by George. Several revisions to the specifications in both the Rulebook and the Implement Inspector Handbook were issued during the year based on some errors in the rules for dimensions of masters' implements. There is a current review and update being done for 2009 by Ivars Ikstrums. There was also a submission of a revision to the weight specifications by the Rules subcommittee for the Weight.

NEW BUSINESS

There are no Federation Rules changes this year that affected Weights and Measures. There were several changes in the NCAA rules with regard to runways, mostly conforming with USATF and IAAF changes from the previous year concerning the portion that must be level. Likewise they adopted the USATF and IAAF rule that cones must be used at the 800 m breakline. They also specified some details about starting blocks when they are used. Generally the implement specs for NCAA are the same as USATF and IAAF with the exception of the weight. They now require the maximum thickness at 6mm inside the edge of the discus cannot be greater than 13 mm and the hammer handle specs are also now the same. David Katz mentioned that the new IAAF Facilities manual was now available and it would be on line also.

Among the rule changes for USATF were those which conformed to WMA specifications. Most have been previously transmitted. George reviewed the rule submissions that had an impact on either Implement Inspectors or Technical Managers. Items 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 75, 83. The most significant ones are 56, 58 and 62. Item 56 allows use of wood or other temporary circles for shot outside. Item 58 deals with cast shots indicating in a note that indentations due to cast the implement weight should not normally be considered a reason to reject such implements. Item 62 deals with the weight and specifically that the head of an implement shall be a sphere and filled so material inside is immovable. The center of gravity as certified by the manufacture shall not be more than 6 mm from the center of the sphere. It can deform on impact but must return to shape of sphere. If a harness is used it may be connected with no more than two steel links

and a swivel. The harness must not stretch or show any evidence of elasticity where the overall length would increase while being thrown. As with other implements once inspected and approved it cannot be altered other than to be repaired by the Inspector of Implements.

Some of the other discussion items included:

1. When marking the javelins with the inspectors mark of the day, the mark should be no nearer the grip than 10 cm above or below. This is a general procedure recommendation by athletes. The reason is that they do not want to have the area of finger placement at the end or forward of the grip to be interfered with.

2. The 2009 IAAF Facilities manual is now available. This is an excellent resource for evaluating, or constructing, track and field facilities. The book may be ordered on line from IAAF and it will also be available in pdf format on line.

3. There was a suggestion that we develop an Inspector of Implements' Repair Manual. Though this may be a good idea, considerable amount of equipment and skill is needed to do this work. The work should only be attempted with an athlete's permission and when the Inspector thoroughly understands the implement manufacturing process. The idea is under consideration by the Committee.

4. A future goal of the committee is to look into developing a "Master Inspector/Technical Official Manual" similar to one developed and published by Italy. A copy was circulated in the committee meeting. Other goals (not specifically identified) could be: a write-up on environmental impacts on measurement devices, e.g., implement gauges, steel tape, etc.; a write up on the impact of changes in the center of gravity for weight and hammer throws; a write up on the inspection techniques of weight handles and weight ball.

5. The newsletter needs new articles for publication. We currently are recycling articles which help the newer members. Articles on Facilities and Equipment, or activities will be greatly appreciated.

At the end of the meeting, George handed out another study done by Dan Moy on the effect of contact of the high jump bar with the standards which is attached.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 PM.

George Kleeman Chair

THE TRAINING CENTER



This is a regular feature of this newsletter, where we discuss the method of measuring an implement, venue or a track facility. Your comments or areas of interest are welcome. It is through this kind of dialogue that we learn from each other and improve

our skills. Send the editor your stories and questions.

Checking of Indoor Shot:

I received the following email in December questioning the legality of a soft shot that not only deforms when it lands but can be easily deformed when holding it.

"For quite some time, a number of my colleagues have been discussing whether a particular type of indoor shot is legal under NCAA rules. It is the kind of shot that slightly deforms on landing so that it does not roll far. I believe they are specially designed for wood floors. I am not sure what kind of shot it is, since I have never seen a manufacturers' mark on the implements we have seen.

It appears the 2009 rulebook may address this issue, with Rule 10, Section 7, Article 2, which mandates that the shot be spherical and unalterable in

shape. These shots can be slightly compressed by hand.

I would appreciate your guidance on whether these shots are legal or not. If they are, I want to get one for my throwers! If not, I would like a definitive ruling so that we can stop discussing the issue and move on.

Thanks in advance for your help.

I got the following interpretation from Bob Podkaminer since it was an NCAA question. It is an illegal implement if a similar deformation can be obtained by being squeezed as the implement has upon landing. The intent is that the surface must be smooth and hard enough to not allow an advantage gained by a grip ... such as finger indentations. (See also USATF Rule 221.4 and IAAF 221.6.) With a legal shot the deformation due to impact... a flattening ... is usually not detectable or possible when gripping the implement. This rather than flattening when landing should be the primary concern.

The applicable NCAA rules are the new 10-7.1 and existing .2 which follow:

1. For indoor facilities, synthetic-covered implements shall be used.

Internal movement may be allowed. Rationale: To insure that all competitions are conducted with consistency

2. The shot must be spherical and unalterable in shape, and the surface must be smooth so that an advantage is not gained by grip.

In other words, if you can pick it up and squeeze it to gain a better grip than you would with the traditional indoor hard shell varieties, then it should not be considered legal - functionally, it is the same as having an indentation in an outdoor shot that improves grip. This is same interpretation for USATF competitions.

An alternative opinion is offered by David Post of the committee who is a leading Implement Inspector and ex thrower himself. "From a technical point of view, the only advantage to using this shot is to the facility and for safety reasons. The impact force is spread out of a relatively large area due to the deformation, thus exhibiting a facility advantage9flow friendly0. Because it deforms relatively easy, it doesn't bounce or roll very far. Both are a safety advantage. If I was a throws coach, I would advised my throwers NOT to use this shot in competition as the deformation acts like an energy sponge. That is some of the energy from the thrower is inadvertently used to deform the cover and the fill material during the throw. This energy would have normally been used to translate a shot that relatively non-deformable. ... In summary, there is no advantage to this shot and I would not recommend to throwers even though it might feel good to grip. I have not tried to quantify the energy absorbed but I am positive that, with everything else equal, this shot will NOT go as far as ones with the harder cover (polyethylene). However, it is important to remember it not our place as officials to determine if there is an advantage or not but rather to enforce the rule for whatever reason it is a rule. So that means if the shot is not spherical and unalterable in shape and the surface smooth then it isn't a legal shot.

Likewise with the indoor weight, it the shell containing the weight for the implement is malleable enough that it can be flatten and not return to shape by itself, i.e particularly to make length, it is illegal.

Taping: As mentioned last newsletter the IAAF and now USATF have eliminated the restrictions on taping for basically **all field events**. The new rule approved by the Council in May and USATF in December allows any

type of taping except that fingers must be able to move independently, i.e. no taping of two fingers together. Otherwise taping on hands or back of hands or connections to wrists is now considered legal. This is in the throws section Rule 187 but the restriction on taping has also been eliminated from the pole vault in Rule 183. Taping of hands in other field events has no consequences since the hands are not an integral part of the conduct of the event, i.e. the horizontal jumps and the high jump. In any case there will continue to be a difference between what is allowed in NCAA and other jurisdictions. Remember at this point the NCAA allows taping of individual fingers but it can be continuous at the base of the fingers but cannot be connect to the wrist or on the hand, front or back unless there is an open wound. The restrictions are covered in each of the throwing implement sections and the pole vault section.

RULE CHANGES AFFECTING W&M OR THROWS

This was a Rules Change year for USATF. The rule changes for NCAA and the NFHS were discussed in the last newsletter and are listed on the officials' website since mid July at www.usatfofficials.com under Rules.

Note some of the items on the proposed list last newsletter were modified and others rejected or tabled. The full listing of changes can be found on the web site listed above. Here are the rule changes affecting Implements for USATF in 2009.

Item 58 – Amend Rule 188.3 as follows: **NOTE 2:** Indentations due to a weight stamp on cast shots or engraving of weight or size should not normally be considered reasons for disqualification of a shot for roughness or hand holds.

Reason: *To clarify that such shots are normally considered legal if they meet all the other specifications.*

Item 62 – Amend Rule 195 as follows: (was amended at convention)

3. **Construction** - The weight shall consist of three parts: a head (ball), a handle, and a connection assembly which may contain a harness.
4. **Head** - The head shall be a sphere. The sphere shall be (a) made of solid metal not softer than brass or (b) manufactured from a shell of such material, or a suitable polymer, entirely filled with lead or other material inserted in such a manner that the material is immovable. The center of gravity shall be not more than 6mm from the center of the sphere as certified by the manufacturer. A filled implement may deform upon impact, but must return to the shape of a sphere after such impact. See table in Rule 195.8 for specifications.
6. **Connection** - The handle shall be connected either directly to the head or to a harness.
 - (a) The direct connection shall be by means of no more than two steel links (loops), whose diameters shall not exceed 9.5mm. For the solid implement, the handle shall be connected to a steel link. A swivel may not be used at this connection. The head may be connected to the links by means of a swivel that may be either plain or with ball bearings. For the polymer shell implement, a swivel is allowed between the (~~ball~~) head and the handle without the use of links.
 - (b) The connection to a harness may be by means of no more than two steel links (loops), whose diameter shall not exceed 9.5mm and a swivel. Netting of any kind shall not be used to

form the harness. The harness must not stretch or show any evidence of elasticity where the overall length of the implement would increase while being thrown. A protective sleeve may be used around the links and/or swivel.

7. Length -

NOTE 2: An implement presented for inspection must be measured for length with all components at their maximum lengths as designed by the manufacturer. Once the implements has been inspected and approved for competition, the implement shall not be altered or adjusted other than to be repaired by the Inspector of implements.

Reason: *This recommendation from the work group is designed to clearly define what is allowable for the implement. The E&FS Committee was represented by David Post on this work group.*

Item 64 – Amend Rule 202.3 Table as follows:

For Women, add a 25# column and delete the 300# column.

For Women 70+, add an 'x' for 25# and delete the 'x' for 56#.

Reason: *Brings this age group into line with the pattern for all other age groups for the Ultraweight Pentathlon (weight, superweight, next three weights up the ladder)*

EQUIPMENT CORNER

If you have any information on equipment that you have purchased or built to help with your weight and measure or technical managers' activities a, please pass along the information. One of our goals is to disseminate that kind of information. I understand that Daktronics is looking at whether it makes sense to continue to make the Trackmaster™. They are currently selling down their current inventory.

Annual Certification of your Implement Equipment

You should be doing an annual check of your implement equipment at the beginning of each season and also before any major competition. The NCAA recommends that all such equipment for weighing and measuring implements be certified for accuracy by an appropriate testing agency in accordance with methods specified by the manufacturer in order to comply with Rules 6-1.12 which deals with implements meeting specifications. The USATF and IAAF rule books are not as specific but both call for calibration of such equipment. See Rule 148. If you aren't doing this annually for the equipment you use, you should be. Many of the new electronic scales have internal checks but you should also have an external check. This can be done by the scale retailer or your local county weights and measures department. You can also purchase calibrated weight from several of the track equipment suppliers. I happen to be lucky since our association has several sets of F standard weights that go from 600 g to 16 lbs so that I can verify the whole range of my scale. Likewise you need to check your templates with good calipers. Make sure there isn't wear so the template is oversized or that it is bent. Know whether your templates are right on or slightly loose or tight so that you can interpret correctly when an implement measurement is close to the maximum or minimum dimension. If it is always attempt to measure it in an alternate manner, either with alternate template if one is available or with calipers if a big enough one is available. Never force an implement into the template since you may cause wear or bend the template. This is particularly true of the thinner templates. If you don't have a 12 and 13 mm thickness gauge for the discus you need to get one. Clearly now all the rulebooks are intending to use all of the IAAF specifications for

implements with the exception of the discus for high school since they allow rubber discuses. But even there most of the specs are the same. For example the NCCA has had the words to each implement description that the implement will conform to IAAF published specifications.

CERTIFICATION

How do I become certified Implement Inspector a Technical Manager or recertified if I have let my membership lapse? Currently USATF is the only organization having a national training and certification program for Track and Field officials (particularly in the area of Implement Inspector or Technical Manager). You can become an USA Track & Field official by contacting your local association. To find out whom to contact, send the editor a note and he will send you your local contact name and the Weights & Measures open book review. This review is intended to test you on your knowledge of Implement Inspection techniques and Implement specifications so that you can be certified in this specialty. It covers all of the rulebooks. See the next article on the handbook. If you would like to have a clinic let the editor know. He can try to get some nearby clinicians to help out. There is also a review for becoming a Technical Manager. Both specialties have monographs which explain their duties. If you're interested in the Technical Manager's specialty contact George Kleeman for more details. The reviews as well as the monographs are available on the Officials website at www.usatfofficials.com under Certification.

UPDATED W&M HANDBOOK FOR 2009

There will be an update of the W&M Handbook (30 pg.) for 2009. The 2008-3 version is now available and can be downloaded at no cost from the USATF Officials website at <http://www.usatfofficials.com/training/WMManual2008.pdf>. The 2009 version which will include the 2009 rule changes will be available about the first of February. Look for it on the website.

George Kleeman
5104 Alhambra Valley Road
Martinez, CA 94553-9773

US HISTORY OF W&M AND THROWS

Spurred by a talk by Eric Zemper on the history of Rules given at the Olympic Trials, I have begun to collect information on the history of Implement Inspection in the United States. If you have any knowledge of when and who started to do implement inspection in your association, I would appreciate an email or letter giving me some details. I have some limited details concerning people and equipment used in the Pac 10, West Coast, Iowa and New England but need information on the rest of the country. I have started to compile the history of implement specifications as recorded in the various rulebooks. It has been an interesting exercise. If any of you know of a printed history for either, please let me know.