



**COMMENTS ON THE NOTES REFERENCED IN SPORTS ILLUSTRATED  
FROM THE USOC ANTI-DOPING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 3-5, 2000  
by Don H. Catlin, M.D.  
March 29, 2011**

**BACKGROUND**

**DOCUMENT TO WHICH MY COMMENTS APPLY:**

The document is titled:

**USOC ANTI-DOPING COMMITTEE MEETING  
NATIONAL ANTI-DOPING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
March 3-5, 2000**

The recent Sports Illustrated article, “The Case Against Lance Armstrong,” included a quote from me from these meeting notes and a suggestion by the authors that my goal was “not to sanction (athletes) but to help them to avoid testing positive at the Olympics.” Nothing could be further from the truth. After two written requests for the meeting notes, Time Inc. counsel finally released what they considered the relevant excerpts. The document provided by Time Inc. is not complete. Instead, it includes only the title page, page 1, and pages 86-91. Page 86 begins with an interrupted sentence concerned with the testosterone testing rules. Page 85 and relevant earlier pages would likely show additional context that refute the baseless SI suggestions.

**THE DOCUMENT IS NOT THE OFFICIAL MINUTES**

Although the document title contains the word “MINUTES” and some people have interpreted it as such, the text is not the official minutes. The text contains literal, informal phrases (blah blah blah... This...drives me nuts... gonna...); unfinished, restarted sentences (No, I think it's... I understand...); and gaps and question marks in parentheses (indicating that the note-taker was unable to capture what had been said). These are notes taken by a committee staff person. In contrast, official minutes would have been reworded to summarize key points in correct English. After the meeting, these notes would have been circulated to all persons present for review and correction. As this was the last meeting of this committee, the official minutes were distributed September 7, 2000 but were not voted on for approval as was usual practice. I have the official minutes in my records. They are brief; in fact, the entire discussion described in the notes was summarized in less than one page.

**CONTEXT OF THE MEETING**

- In the 1980s, testosterone doping was difficult to detect because lab tests could not tell apart testosterone from the body (endogenous) and from the bottle (pharmaceutical, exogenous). But research had shown that taking testosterone increased its ratio in urine to an inactive analog, epitestosterone. Since 1984, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) had defined a positive sample for testosterone as having a testosterone to epitestosterone (TE) ratio greater than the cutoff of 6:1. One problem with any cutoff is that cheaters could use T, but not so much T that their TE

would go over 6:1, so they would test negative. By the 1990s, I and other anti-doping researchers had developed a new approach, the carbon isotope ratio test (CIR), which could detect exogenous T. By March 2000, CIR was scientifically ready to catch users even if their TE was not above 6:1.

- CIR had been used at the Winter Olympics in 1998 in Nagano, but only in a research capacity. It was applied to negative samples with TE between 4:1 and 6:1, to discover the extent of T use.
- Meanwhile, the IOC cutoff had remained at 6:1, meaning that the legal basis existed to prosecute cases with TE greater than 6:1, but not to prosecute cases with TE between 4:1 and 6:1. Such samples were considered negative.
- By March 2000, WADA had been created but had not yet taken control of worldwide programs or rules.
- The meeting agenda item under discussion was Exhibit A – a resolution of the USOC in regards to “protocol for use whenever a drug test conducted by the USOC... reveals a testosterone to epitestosterone ratio greater than 6:1.” Unlike the IOC rule at the time, which allowed for isotope ratio to be used to “draw definitive conclusions regarding the use of anabolic androgenic steroids,” the USOC protocol did not specifically allow follow up using isotope ratio, or CIR.
- Some of the committee members learned at this meeting that CIR had been used in a research capacity at the 1998 Olympics in Nagano, and that it would be used again at the 2000 Olympics in Sydney, six months later.
- The committee was discussing whether CIR should be used on US athletes samples with TE between 4:1 and 6:1, given the inconsistency between the IOC rules and USOC protocol and lack of legal basis for either using CIR on such samples or reporting such TE values. I was ready to do it, to take positive cases to court, and to defend them based on pure science, even though the rules and legal basis had yet to catch up with me.
- Some committee members wanted to test a number of athletes with the CIR test to find out how many were using testosterone, others wanted to educate athletes about CIR (warning athletes of a new test is a strong deterrent against doping), and some didn’t feel that anything should be done before the Sydney Olympics.
- There was discussion of the pro and cons of performing CIR testing as a research study, which was perhaps the only way to move forward, once the committee recognized that doing the tests for the purpose of enforcement was not an option from the systematic or legal standpoint.

Ms. Roberts and Mr. Epstein apparently did not understand this context or that the committee discussions show that I was advocating for tougher doping control, and so was the entire committee. I provide my annotated version of the notes for those with additional interest.

Sincerely,



Don H. Catlin, M.D.

*[I annotated the notes using brackets and italics.]*

**USOC ANTI-DOPING COMMITTEE MEETING  
NATIONAL ANTI-DOPING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
March 3-5, 2000  
Location: Le Baron Hotel, Colorado Springs, CO.**

**PRESENT**

Baaron P. Pittenger, Chair  
Wes Barnett/AAC  
James Betts, M.D.  
Larry Bowers, Ph.D./Lab Consultant  
Ollan C. Cassell  
Don H. Catlin, M.D./Lab Consultant  
Brian Derwin  
Wade F. Exum, M.D./Starr liaison  
Elaine Hagen  
Ralph W. Hale, M.D.  
Allison Lynn Jones, M.D.  
David Joyner, M.D.  
Christopher Lindsay, J.D.  
Philip Milburn

*[Three names are illegible on the copies provided, presumably because someone used a highlighter on the original page. When such pages are copied, the highlighted lines appear to be blacked out. From my official minutes I can see that the blacked out text includes the following: "OBSERVERS: Terry Madden, Rich Young." Richard Young, the USOC Counsel for doping affairs at that time, speaks often during the meeting.]*

**ABSENT/EXCUSED**

Herman R. Frazier/E.C. Liaison  
Thomas H. Murray, Ph.D.  
Timm Peddie/AAC  
Karen Smyers/AAC

### **Page 1 of the Meeting Notes**

#### 1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Called to Order at 8:20 a.m., March 4, 2000 by Baaron Pittenger. Mr. Pittenger welcomed those present and verified the existence of a quorum for conducting committee business.

#### 2.0 Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes

##### 2.1 October 8-10, 1999 Minutes

Baaron: I would accept motions with respect to the minutes of the last meeting.

Ollan: I make a motion that they be accepted *[the text skips the next 85 pages]*

### **Page 86 of the meeting Notes**

*[This the first page of the Notes that were provided to me by Time, Inc. The first speaker is explaining what must be done if a sample from an athlete has a high TE. I have asked Time, Inc for the few relevant pages that precede page 86 because I have reason to believe that they pertain to the following discussion in very relevant and important ways.]*

mandatory that the relevant medical authority conducts an investigation” blah, blah, blah.

Joyner: You cant just use CIR until they change it.  
*[It is not clear what Joyner means by ‘they change it’. He probably means that the IOC has to change the rules before CIR can be used in certain cases. At this point Joyner and others do not realize that the IOC used CIR two years earlier at the 1998 Nagano Olympics.]*

Don: It’s already in the rules to ...  
*[I am trying to explain that the IOC rules already allow the use of CIR so that I can argue in favor of using CIR on USOC samples.]*

Rich: It says, on T:E’s, I’ll tell you exactly what it says. This is one of the things that drives me nuts. “In the case of T/E great *[greater]* than 6, it is mandatory that the relevant medical authority conducts an investigation and before the samples is declared positive. A full report will be written and will include a review of previous test, subsequent test and any results of endocrine investigation. In the event that previous tests are not available, the athlete should be tested unannounced at least one per month for three months.” In another section it says, “evidence obtained from metabolic profiles and/or isotopic ratio measurements may be used to draw definitive conclusions regarding the use of anabolic androgenic steroids.  
*[Indeed, the rule for calling a positive for T requires an investigation using a review of TE over time or isotopic ratios (CIR). The rule does not cover cases with TE below 6, which are reported negative.]*

- Joynner: Which is what we really just said on this piece of paper here.
- Rich: You know, please tell us what you want us to do. And until they make that clear I would be really reluctant legally, to bag the follow-up tests when its so bleary.  
*[Rich is pleading for the USOC to clarify its protocol for applying the TE ratio and states that until the IOC clarifies the rules on samples below 6:1, which are reported negative, he would be reluctant legally to prosecute athletes with TE ratios under 6:1.]*
- Don: No, I think its ...I understand the language is confusing, I don't think you can expect the IOC to clarify the language...they just don't do that. But I do think that, my concern is, that the plan now as of today is to do CIR, *[on]* about 600 samples in Sydney. So that means our athletes will be subjected to it. And if I'm there and they *[The Sydney laboratory]* bring me a *[sample]* with a TE ratio *[of]* 5 and a CIR of 32 *[-32]*, I'm going to say, "throw em out."  
*[As a member of the IOC Medical Commission, I know that the IOC is planning to use CIR in Sydney - like they did at the Nagano Games two years earlier. I am explaining that if I am asked to review a case in Sydney with TE=5 (not greater than the current IOC cutoff of 6) and a CIR value of -32 (indicative of T use), I would argue for sanctioning the athlete, because although the TE would be negative under the current rules, the CIR result is consistent with T use.]*
- Hale: How many TE ratios do we have? Do you have any data on how many we have, say over 4 to 1, 5 to 1...  
*[Hale wants to know how many U.S. Olympic athletes have ratios between 4 and 6 to 1. These are the athletes who are most likely to be using testosterone and therefore might be detected by CIR in Sydney.]*
- Exum: We haven't really looked at it that way.
- Hale: Do you have any idea, Don?
- Larry: Wade wouldn't know because they don't get a report.  
*[Larry is pointing out that samples with TE between 4 and 6 are reported as negative, so no one knows how many samples are in that range.]*
- Exum: If it's less than 6 to 1 it just gets reported as a negative...
- Don: Three per thousand males over 6. Five, I think, I'd have to check the records.  
*[I am recollecting that my results on research samples show that about 3 samples in every 1,000 have a TE greater than 6, but for athletes' samples I would have to check my peer-reviewed publication: Clinical Chemistry 1997;43:1280-1288, which includes nearly 4,000 athletes' TEs.]*
- Hale: It seems to me one thing we could do with this is that we could establish a value that we could test for, not necessarily punish that we would test for using CIR. Come up with 50 to 100 tests and then that becomes Wade's budgetary impact that he has to think about it. In terms of, and then draw a level to do that, and it gets a way to start introducing. And it's a great concept... This gives us a way to start introducing that

between now and Sydney. But there will be a limited number of tests. We're not going to do all this and then...

*[Hale favors using CIR, perhaps with no sanctions since the IOC legal basis is unclear, but at least to educate athletes about it before Sydney, and within budget limitations.]*

Don: They're *[The IOC is]* planning, they're working right now on the details of which samples of whether just... and details of how to do it. Now mind you, the IOC could come in at the last minute and say we don't want to do this. The IOC has proved *[approved the purchase of]* a second *[CIR]* instrument at Sydney. We *[the IOC Medical Commission]* believe we can get 500 samples done during the Sydney Games.

Hale: Considering we have 10-12 per year of TE's over 6, we want all of them tested with CIR.

*[Hale is now suggesting that all US athletes' samples with TE over 6:1 be tested by CIR.]*

Don: Yeah, that is a pretty straightforward decision.

Hale: Then, were estimating there's another 10-12 with 20. Say for 50 tests, we want to ...\$60,000...then if you can give us a better deal... keep it along.

*[Hale is estimating a need to test about 50 samples by CIR, at a cost of \$60K, and hoping for a volume discount.]*

Don: Well, I think that bothers us (?).

*[(?) indicates that the transcriber is not sure what I said.]*

Hale: No, I understand that. What I'm say~~ing~~ is, I think we should probably consider looking at this, under 6:1.

Whether we do anything with them or not, we've got to get that down. We don't have any data right now. ...Sydney, we found out that they're going to use CIR at Sydney. The least we should do is alert our

### **Page 87 of the meeting Notes**

athletes...not punish them, but alert them that they are going to be tested, and that they're finding positives at less than 6 to 1.

*[Hale wants to do CIR tests on U.S. Olympic athletes' samples with TE below 6:1. He understands that this may detect users. He wants to know what the results will show. He wants the athletes to be informed.]*

Don: I can't pledge a promise ...

Baaron: I'm going to call the motion, if we want to discuss it further we can do that, but I want to get the vote done. David?

Joyner: I want to ask a question...item 9.

Baaron: which is what we are discussing.

Joyner: My question is if you think we ought to, Rich's suggestion about changing nine, I'd just be interested to hear...

Baaron: Rich, do you have language suggested for nine?

Joyner: Are you ready Steph? This is suggested for nine...

Rich: If a test is declared to be negative by the USOC, the USOC may at its discretion consider a request from the athlete, and then the second line remains the same.  
*[The Committee is looking at Exhibit A the official USOC resolution and protocol for testosterone testing leading up the 2000 Olympic Games and discussing whether to amend item 9.]*

Joyner: How do I introduce that Ralph? Can I add that myself or should somebody propose that?

Hale: No, we can get a first order amendment.

Joyner: Yeah, I'll amend that as a friendly amendment.

Baaron: Now we're in a position to vote. Is there any further discussion? Or do you think we're where we want to be? All right, then I should call a vote. All I *[in]* favor? Opposed? One. Abstentions? None.  
*[According to the official minutes, the amendment to item 9 and several other amendments to the resolution were voted on and approved with one objection, presumably Wes who voices his opinion below.]*

Wes: I just don't believe in false positives in principle...I just don't believe, a test that says you're positive, I don't think there's a false positive. As many loopholes, we may think that we do this T:E ratio and people are getting off. I just think that paying people who are guilty.  
*[The last sentence does not make sense. This is likely due to transcription difficulties. From the official minutes, I can deduce that Wes is complaining about the amendment to item 9, which allows "the USOC to consider a request from the athlete for financial assistance with expenses to be incurred in connection with the investigative process." He does not want to pay people who are guilty to assist in their defense.]*

Baaron: Ralph?

Hale: I'd like to make a motion that we request to amend the budget to include 50 CIR tests on athletes tested before the Sydney games.  
*[This is the motion that ultimately is withdrawn later on page 90 of the meeting notes. This is what I am referring to in the statement quoted in the SI article.]*

Baaron: Okay, do we have a second?

Joyner: I'll second it.

Baaron: Discussion.

Hale: What I said before, and Baaron appropriately cut us off because of the discussion. We really need ... 10 T:E that we're going to test, and that we need at least another 40 to look at the...ones...and the...ones, whatever Larry and Don tell us. And then educate our athletes that this is a concept that they may face under the... without knowing that CIR...not call it positives, nothing at all, just we've done...the athletes know we're doing it, I think we'll be with the rest of the world.

Baaron: Ralph, I am concerned, we started out in this *[USOC]* program under a cloud because we did not education program, uh testing, in 1984 which the rest of the world viewed as our finding out that we had athletes that were cheating and we did nothing about it. and I think I think if we go to CIR *[do CIR tests]* for people who are under the level *[with TE below 6]* and we truly believe that CIR will identify the use of drugs *[and we catch users]* and we don't take action on it *[and don't sanction them]*. I think I would not like to be in that position.  
*[Baaron is referring to the testing program that the USOC instituted in January 1983. The USOC labeled it an 'educational' program, to introduce athletes to doping control tests, and did not sanction positives. Other countries viewed it as a way for the USOC to find out if its athletes were dirty. The samples were tested at my lab at UCLA. After about three weeks, it became clear to me that some groups of athletes were abusing the program to figure out how long the lab could detect a high TE after a dose of T, so I stopped the program by refusing to do any more tests for it. In fact, the USOC was doing what the international community suggested they were doing.]*

Allison: I agree with Baaron.

Don: I don't.

Hale: Uh, it could be done anonymously, without report. My concern is that we say the IOC says six or more, we try to identify less than 6 to one, regardless of what they're doing as a positive. I think we set ourselves up until we get better

### Page 88 of the Meeting Notes

information...We set ourselves up, until the IOC changes *[its rules]* and says that six to one or evidence of the CIR, that may get in trouble. I don't know.

*[Hale is suggesting that the Committee should abide by the TE 6:1 rule and /or evidence from the CIR test unless the IOC changes the rules. He still favors an anonymous study to obtain CIR values for athletes with TEs in the 4 to 6 range.]*

Rich: Well, that not the exception. The IOC has got two different languages....I just asked Don, "Don if you get a sample that's 5 to 1, that it's a flaming positive with the CIR, are you going to report that to the IOC?" and the answer's yes. That's a positive, so...I'm concerned about and then you have to prosecute that case...

*[Rich asks rhetorically whether I would report a case as positive if it had a TE=5 (not positive per IOC rule) but was positive by CIR. Rich knows that I would, to catch cheaters if at all possible. That is quite the opposite of covering up positives.]*

Don: ...winds are blowing, you have to read the words of Richard Pound...he's actually a no-nonsense guy... I don't give a damn whether you guys are alerted in advance. If we want to put in a new test a day before the Games we'll do it. My job is to say, I'll stand up in court and say [to] Richard and everybody else, I believe in this [CIR]. Now if it's overthrown, it's overthrown.

*[I want to do new and better tests as soon as they're scientifically ready, regardless of whether the legal framework provides the basis for sanctioning positives. I'm willing to go to court and defend the science, even if I'm not sure that the case can be won.]*

He's not saying...Maybe we will have an EPO test, a growth hormone test...but they're not saying we're going to give you all this advance notice on what we're going to do. But I tell you one thing, if you start...with CIR before Sydney, you're going ...

Hale: Set a level, we'll test it 4 to 1. If it comes up positive [by CIR], then Rich has the problem he has to deal with...

Don: No, I didn't say it would be reported to Rich in this country. *[This is because USOC rules are not clear on this.]* I need to think about that first, talk to Rich first. CIR in Sydney is another one, is a bigger issue. I'd like to see it done, I think it can withstand it. *[withstand legal scrutiny]* If you do 5 to 1 in Sydney, you've got...

Hale: ...6 to 1.

Don: Well today it's 6 to 1. We've written, we asked them, we've given them data, all kinds of things, we don't get answers.

*[...from the IOC. I had lobbied the IOC to change the rule and apply CIR in the 4 to 6 range to close a loophole, and I am pointing out that I have not received answers.]*

Hale: My concern would be, Baaron, is that what we would test at below 6 to 1 would be an anonymous test. It would be, we do not notify the athlete because you wouldn't know who it was. You take samples, you would blind them and, so we could get somebody to get ourselves (?)

*[The transcriber loses track of the discussion - this last sentence does not make sense. Hale is correct when he states that if the USOC tested samples with TEs below 6:1 by CIR, the tests would be anonymous, since the athlete would not be notified because the lab would report such a sample as “negative”. Later he realizes that anonymous testing cannot be performed on athlete samples unless it is done under a formal research protocol approved by the Human Subjects Protection Committee.]*

Don: You're positive by six to one. So if it's a positive by six to one...rely on CIR, that's how we've got positive positive. The issue is when you don't have a positive by six to one, but by five to one, a new criteria, then once your CIR, what I'm saying is...but legally...

*[I am explaining that if a sample has a TE of 5 and a positive CIR value, currently this scenario is not covered by the rules as you would have a negative TE and positive CIR. It would be a gray area. Earlier I pointed out that the IOC might consider that such a sample is positive based on the CIR evidence.]*

Baaron: Larry and Rich both have been trying to be recognized so I'm going...

Bowers: First of all, they [*the IOC*] did test it 4:1 at Nagano with CIR. I don't have the numbers, but I imagine we could find that out. It was an experiment for exactly the purpose that you're suggesting. So there is some data out there in that regard. The second point is, and I'm in a difficult position here because it's going to sound like I'm whinning, but that's not the point, but Don has the CIR instrument because he went to NCAA and NFL and got them to fund an instrument for him.

*[Bowers points out that CIR testing was performed at the Nagano Olympic Games by the IOC. He is correct. I was present and observed this in my role as a member of the IOC Medical Commission, which had an oversight role. Larry recalls that the TE cutoff for deciding which samples were sent for CIR was 4:1. The Nagano CIR testing experience has been published in a peer-reviewed article (Ueki M, Okano M. Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry 1999; 13: 2237-43). This shows the precedent that the IOC set for doing anonymous research studies on samples in the 4 to 6 range.]*

Don: No, that's not true.

*[I am referring to the statement about the funding of the instrument.]*

Bowers: Okay. I was told by NCAA and NFL that they funded an instrument for Don and the understanding that they had was that USOC would take care... to do it. I'm in position of asking a question. If I'm going to buy the instrument and then charge you for the cost of the instrument in addition to the test, and I'm not doing things the same as Don and I'm gonna get the feedback that were not doing things for the same price. This is a policy issue as far as I'm concerned. This is your discussion, but I'm just making a relevant point, which is, you know if you're going to do some of these things you need to decide how you're going to implement it. If you wanted, for the time being, send samples to Don from Indianapolis I don't necessarily have a problem with that, but you've got some policy issues like that that you need to deal with. And if we're going to continue to do this kind of stuff. Then I need to make some decisions.

*[At the time of this meeting in March of 2000, Larry Bowers was the laboratory director at the University of Indiana Sport Testing Laboratory in Indianapolis, where the USOC had some of its samples tested.]*

**Page 89 of the meeting notes**

- Hale: Let me ask you a question. Do you define below 6 to 1?
- Bowers: What do you mean define below 6 to 1.
- Hale: You can define 4 to 1 or 5 to one.
- Bowers: Absolutely
- Hale: You can blind those and send them to Don.
- Bowers: Absolutely
- Hale: That way we could get a handle on whether or not we have a problem. I don't know that we have a problem at below 6 to 1. Don thinks we have a problem and I think we probably do because I think the athletes are smart enough to..., but it might be interesting to find out whether we really have a problem or not, without getting into something that Rich would have to prosecute because Don would be doing a research study...  
*[Hale suggests doing a research study by CIR to find out whether many samples with TEs below 6 are from T users, and points out that Rich Young would not have to prosecute any positive cases because it would be a research study. At this point, Hale does not realize that conducting such a study would require authorizations, approvals, and consents from so many parties that for all practical purposes, it would not be feasible before the Sydney Games.]*
- Baaron: That would be my suggestion if we do this to do it as a research study, but I'm still uncomfortable with it.  
*[Baaron is likely uncomfortable because he believes that the CIR study could be misconstrued to be like the "educational" no-consequence testing performed in 1984 that was discovered and led to considerable criticism of the USOC.]*
- Allison: Yeah
- Don: There's confidence, there is no doubt about that. It's just a matter of time and I was...to tell you that. I want to see better and better doping [control]. And it's [CIR] ready to go...and I submit that there's tons of political and legal reasons not to do it and to do it. I'm making a statement that I'm willing to go to court to defend the test and I wouldn't have made that statement until very recently.  
*[This statement shows my confidence in the science and my readiness to defend cases based on CIR even if their TE is in the 4 to 6 range.]*
- Baaron: You know, Ralph, I wouldn't mind undertaking this [study] after the Games, but I just really have a problem with us doing something [this study] before

the Games which looks to the international community if it becomes public knowledge that we're diddling with the puck. It's just gonna kill us. It's gonna undo in my view even the positives that we are achieving with externalization. It says on one hand we're doing something, but on the other hand your just as dirty as you ever were.

Don: There's a lot of countries out there diddling with the puck, I can tell you that.

Baaron: Well, I don't care. It's our integrity that's at stake.

Allison: That's a good point. I think we've worked really hard to get to a different level of integrity and we need to lead on this issue. Although its very tempting to do this and we can afford to do it and it would provide great information we get to use, we need to look at it a different way.

Don: I don't know. I think every country is dirty, it just a matter of who's more or less dirty. An athlete, a smart athlete today says where's the line, where is it, right here, 6 to1, 7 to 1. So I'm going to get as close as I can because our program ain't working. And I think that's what most of them want to know. If they can get away with it, they can get away with it.  
*[I am suggesting that athletes are abusing the current system by taking testosterone in small doses that elevate their TE to just under the 6:1 threshold. That is why I want to put pressure on the international system by applying CIR testing in the 4 to 6 range, to close that loophole.]*

Baaron: Rich

Rich: Ralph, I had a conversation with Dick Pound about a month ago to try to solve this and if it works, I think it solves it. The question is whether it'll work. *[Rich is pointing out that if CIR works, it will solve the TE problem.]* What I suggested to him was that, one of the reason that the Atlanta Olympics was as clean as they were is because the drug testers had this new Star Wars machine of high resolution GCNS. *[he means GC-high resolution Mass Spectrometry, GCMS not GCNS]* It's supposed to go back and do all these things and it had a good deterrent effect. We need something like that. Surprises need to come out now and say we have this new technology called isotope ratio. It's the new Star Wars machine and you dopers better watch out because it'll do all these fancy things. Now, that by itself, *[even]* if you never plugged it in has some value. The second thing is, that sure you can decide you're going to use it 24 hours before the Games. But why not get athletes clean early. Tell people that this is what they are going to do, the more athletes you're going to get off the juice.  
*[This is a summation point from a number of comments earlier. Rich is saying that employing CIR at the Sydney Games is likely to lead to a cleaner Games overall. He says that there is an option to surprise athletes by deciding to use it 24 hours in advance but suggests that more athletes are likely to clean up if it is announced in advance. Rich is not discussing the motion here.]*

Hale: That's my point exactly.

*[Hale is suggesting that the CIR be used as soon as possible because it will discourage testosterone doping. This was the point of his proposed study all along.]*

**Page 90 of the meeting notes**

- Rich: And if the IOC changes it rule, because the CIR positive is a positive.  
*[Garbled and missing text]*
- Baaron: I don't care what...
- Rich: If they did that tomorrow, we're rolling. And that's what we need now. At that point were home free.  
*[Rich is suggesting that the minute the IOC changes its rule, we can prosecute cases with TE between 4 and 6 if their CIR is positive.]*
- Hale: I'm not impressed with ...Pound to do anything but I agree with you.
- Don: what it does is the same thing that the HRMS did a couple of years ago. It puts the heat on the IOC...they know it is a good test...they've already proved it, I think they're going to go *[use it in Sydney]*. But I agree with Rich. It should be advertised in advance that CIR is going to be done, *[but]* you better watch out. Because that's gonna clean up some big-time teams, like that one girl from China.  
*[I am pointing out that if you advertise the use of CIR in advance, it gives athletes a chance to get clean, including the Chinese team and one particular athlete whom the USOC suspects of doping, and few dopers will be caught.]*
- Hale: I have to agree with that. My only concern is don't want to get our athletes to get down there, and get caught and not know that this was something that's gonna happen.  
*[Hale wants to tell the athletes about the new test. He does not want them to be surprised].*
- Wes: Too bad.
- Allison: You do PR. You do a PR blip.
- Don: You educate.
- Allison: But we can accomplish that objective, I think with a PR blitz and some education rather than going and secretly testing people. I think that should be more proactive than the other way.
- Baaron: We can handle CIR in the same way we're handling marijuana in terms of notifying the athletes. You know, our international reputation is so bad, we're lumped with China, that's what were lumped with and I just don't want to run the risk.
- Don: I don't think you will, Baaron. I think your reputation is bad for other reasons.

Betts: Our reputation is bad because we're Americans. ...beat each other up about how the system is, system like this, it's a good system. The system is a good system. There's lumps along the way and there's been some problems, there's been some issues ...is coming down to the end result of sanctioning the athletes. And I think that's something that I don't know, but if we have a paradigm change for everyone involved, all the NGBs, everyone at USOC, everyone involved, that that's what our mission's going to be. It's not going to change. You know, I keep hearing about all these countries have far better system than we do. I don't see that. You know, I just don't believe that. So, I think that, my concern, and I'll come back to what Baaron said. To try and implement new before these Games that has a little risk involved, or some risk involved, or whatever, might not be a good choice at this time if its going to put us at risk of not so much of what the image is but having a system that's not going to work as well as we know this one will work. We start putting in different standards that aren't proven yet. ...it's going to make it very difficult to defend that if something goes wrong. And I think...positive athletes compete.

*[Betts is hesitant to perform CIR on TEs in the 4 to 6 range, before the legal framework provides a basis for prosecution. With no choice but to have no sanctions and risk being criticized by potential reviewers (same reason that Baaron Pittenger was reluctant to do CIR now with no sanctions) – he says that, 'It (applying CIR testing to samples with TE's below 6:1) might not be a good choice now.']*

Don: Just don't connect the CIR results to the athlete. Do it as a research experience. I guarantee you at the onset a whole bunch of other countries are going to be doing it real quick.

*[Because I want to use the CIR results as ammunition to help tighten rules and close loopholes, I defend the CIR research project. Research projects inherently and automatically protect the identity of sample donors by making them anonymous.]*

Ollan: ...then it's a different story.

*[Ollan recognizes that I am suggesting that a research study can be done on athletes' samples by making them anonymous as the motion suggests and is supportive - 'then it's a different story'.]*

2,

Don: I am telling you they did it in Nagano.

*[I am explaining that there is precedent for doing what I am suggesting. The IOC conducted CIR research on Olympic samples from the Nagano Games.]*

Baaron: We're starting to cover the same ground several times. So Ralph. Restate your motion.

Joyner: He withdrew.

Allison: He withdrew it.

Hale: I withdrew.

*[The motion to perform testing on samples collected from U.S. athletes with CIR values in the 4 to 6 range prior to Sydney is withdrawn.]*

Baaron: I'm all in of doing anything that we can, to improve both domestically and internationally and especially...to catch cheaters. I welcome CIR.development,

**Page 91 of the meeting Notes**

but I want to make darned sure that we apply it in the manner that is proper within our own U.S. effort. I think that anytime you know you've got a cheater and you don't act on it, you did not act properly.

Joyner: Agreed.

(The discussion moved to another topic)