

# Squaring the Blade

Volume 19  
Number 2  
FALL  
2001

T

## REPORT FROM THE MANAGING COMMITTEE

### Women's Crew Update; Managing Committee Grows

We are pleased to report that the MIT administration has approved a decision to petition to make women's crew a Division I sport at MIT even though the rest of the Institute is Division III. The athletic department has undertaken an intensive review of this issue while at the same time it has been engaged in an overall strategic planning process. The petition, which will be filed next June, automatically goes into effect at that time.

As a result, although the women's teams will be restricted to a more limited training schedule this year than they have had traditionally, they will attempt to compete in the same races and will look forward to resuming a normal schedule next year. The athletic department has also made a decision to attempt to obtain special permission for the lightweight women to compete in the IRA this year,

even though that would not normally be allowed under Division III rules.

The managing structure of Friends of MIT Crew has been going through changes. The Managing Committee has grown from three members to six. We are delighted to have Pete Peterson, Mike Scott, and Jack Frailey join the Managing Committee during recent months. The Managing Committee intends to continue to develop the structure of Friends and to continue working jointly with the administration, coaches, and alumni/ae on issues surrounding intercollegiate rowing at MIT. Many senior alumni/ae who have contributed significantly in time and energy as well as financially have shared ideas concerning restructuring Friends.

In addition, there are many younger alumni/ae who have become involved and have shown a great deal of interest in

contributing. We need to develop a structure that makes it easy for anyone who wants to help support competitive intercollegiate rowing at MIT to do so. Further, as a growing organization, we also need to develop our relationship further with the alumni/ae office, which provides dedicated staff support to assist us with our many activities. We look forward to reporting to you soon on developments in this regard.

Please contact the Managing Committee with your ideas and suggestions.

Managing Committee  
Friends of MIT Crew

E-mail: [mitcrew@external.cisco.com](mailto:mitcrew@external.cisco.com)

Dustin Ordway, <i>Chair</i>	Pete Peterson
John Everett	Mike Scott
Joan Miller	Jack Frailey

## FRIENDS OF MIT CREW FINANCIAL UPDATE

### Sizing Up The Cost Of Placing MIT Crew On Even Footing With Competitors

By Mike Scott

This is meant to be a short update on FOMITC financial matters. An update will also be provided at the annual dinner on October 20. Send any questions/comments to me by e-mail at [miscott@cisco.com](mailto:miscott@cisco.com).

The current balance of the FOMITC fund is approximately \$800,000. This is not an endowment fund, although it is an interest-bearing account. We will be meeting with the athletic department in October to discuss how some of this fund will be spent this school year and to plan to place a majority of the fund in the endowment to maximize earnings. There are also eight endowed funds intended to pay for various MIT crew expenditures. The endowed funds are commingled with other MIT endowed funds so that they can be in-

vested and grow in size. The market value of these endowed funds as of June 30 of this year was approximately \$4.8 million.

There is an effort under way to summarize prior, current, and future MIT crew expenditures. Information was obtained by talking with current and former crew coaches, and there is ongoing discussion with staff in the athletic department. MIT crew expenditures for this current year have increased due to increased coach salary costs (this is good!). However, we (FOMITC, coaches, and athletic department) all agree that much greater expenditures are required to facilitate the development of crews competitive with our Ivy League counterparts. The underspending on MIT athletics the last 10-20 years relative to that of our peer schools has created

a huge competitive disadvantage.

Our plan is to develop a clear understanding of current and necessary future spending over the next month to six months. Based on the spending model, we will then calculate the necessary endowments that are required to supplement the existing endowments. We are looking at the possibility of MIT crew naming opportunities for those groups or individuals with the financial wherewithal to endow a particular ongoing expenditure. A simple example would be to endow an eight-person racing shell that is replaced (sold) every four years.

MIT endowments have historically "paid out" 4 percent/year to allow for the fund to grow and keep up with inflation  
(continued on page two)

# MIT CREW: VOICES FROM THE PAST

## Alumni/ae Update Us About Their Lives

**Melissa Anne Jenkins '91** writes, "My family (husband Stephen and six-month-old son Cameron) and I moved to the USA from Poland (P.O. Box 430007, Pontiac, MI 48343; e-mail: mjenkins@mba1998.hbs.edu). I am a full-time mother and am enjoying the exploits of our young son."

"I'm doing some consulting," writes **John W. Leonard '47** (1012 Wyndemere Dr., Boise, ID 83702). "I retired from full-time work in '87. I have two daughters, two sons-in-law, two granddaughters, two grandsons, but only one wife. We stay in Boise over the winters now—I can't get anyone to take my paper route! **Jim Robertson '47** calls from Denver. After reading a recent blurb about beating Haahvaard three times, I dug out a Harvard shirt, and lo and behold I could get it over my head (size 7). Could they truly be pinheads?"

Writes **Malcolm J. Abzug '41**, "I still row twice a week in a MAAS single at the UCLA Marina Aquatic Center (I'm an alum there, too)." He was hoping to row in the class of '41 eight at his 60th reunion this past June. He recently saw **Rod Dick '84** at MIT, who rows at UCLA, too, in a single. Malcolm keeps in touch with **Bob Blake**, who was cox of the '40-'41 varsity lightweight crew, and with **Chet Hasert**, who was a varsity lightweight in '40-'41. Drop Malcolm a line at 14951 Camarosa Dr., Pacific Palisades, CA 90272; mjabzug@aol.com.

A former CEO of biotech systems in Dallas, Texas, **Charles A. Church '50** has retired and now lives in McKinney, Texas (7101 Virginia Parkway, #928, McKinney, TX 75070). "I have a gulf coast residence for boating and recreation." He fondly recalls as a freshman successfully challenging Harvard.

Keep in touch with **Heather Hardy** at 3435 E. Winona St., Phoenix, AZ 85044.

"I survived my 88th birthday and am still hanging on," writes **W. Whitney Stueck '35** (690 Jackson Court, Satellite Beach, FL 32937). "The only 1935 survivors I've heard about recently are **Art Haskins** and **Don Wood**." Among his many good memories about rowing at MIT, he notes, "Coach **Bill Haines**, the old Pocock shell, the old boathouse at Cottage Farm Bridge, **John Westfall**, **Tuffy Emery**, **Charlie Lucke**, **John Newbegin**, coach **Al Dunning**, and **Al Mowatt**."

Greet **Ford M. Boulware '36** at 1104 Montecito Dr., San Angelo, TX 76901. His favorite memory is of the MIT Boat Club, "because we lost only one race—freshman heavy crew."

**Wilfred H. Shaw '42** notes that alumni/ae might have across his book, *Bottoms Up Cookery*, which has fish cooking tips and recipes. He pens, "Living at the beach keeps one young biking, surfing, and swimming." Contact him at 49 20th St., Hermosa Beach, CA 90254.

## SQUARING THE BLADE

A NEWSLETTER FOR  
THE FRIENDS OF MIT CREW  
VOLUME 19 • NUMBER 2

### MANAGING COMMITTEE OF FRIENDS

DUSTIN ORDWAY, CHAIR

JOHN EVERETT

JOAN WHITTEN MILLER

PETE PETERSON

MIKE SCOTT

JACK FRAILEY

JOHN MILLER, MEMBER EMERITUS

### WOMEN'S ROWING

VARSITY HVY. & LT. COACH SUSAN LINDHOLM

INTERIM VARSITY COACH RICHARD BRANCH

ASSISTANT COACH SARAH LYNCH

NOVICE COACH ANDREA GREELEY

### MEN'S ROWING

VARSITY HVY. COACH GORDON HAMILTON\*

FRESHMAN HVY. COACH MIKE LANE

VARSITY LT. COACH IAN HUTTON\*

FRESHMAN LT. COACH BILL PATTERSON

VOLUNTEER ASSISTANT COACH ADAM REYNOLDS

VOLUNTEER ASSISTANT COACH TONY CRONIN

\*NOTE: CO-DIRECTORS

### FRIENDS MANAGING COMMITTEE

mitcrew@external.cisco.com

"I have fond memories of lightweight crew in '43," writes **Robert Nicolait '44**, "with **Frailey** and others. I've lost the pictures of our crew. I retain my rowing ability by rowing a half mile to my schooner several times a week." Send him best wishes via e-mail at nico lait@bt.net.

## Sizing Up The Cost Of Placing MIT On Even Footing With Competitors

(continued from page one)  
and other cost increases. Based on the assumptions we make on initial costs and resale value, such an endowment for an eight-person racing shell would "cost" on the order of \$125,000. We will obviously be interested in any and all donations to the endowments we end up creating, so it won't be limited to those who can afford very large donations.

Similar calculations will be made for other expenditures such as coaching staff, although personnel costs will incur additional costs, for which we would need to account. For example, endowing a crew coach position will likely cost on the

order of \$1.6-2.8 million, depending on whether it is a freshman or varsity coaching position. Our goal is to have eight full-time, competitively paid coaches (light/heavy, men/women, freshman/varsity), so you can see how the required endowments will start adding up very quickly.

Other expenses include launches, other crew shells (4s, pairs, singles), travel for training, travel for competition, supplies, boat and boathouse maintenance personnel, ergometers, weight equipment, etc.

FOMITC still has a number of issues to work out with MIT prior to kicking off a major fund drive, but after a couple of

years of discussion we feel we are getting close to resolving the key issues. MIT crew has enjoyed focused and concerted alumni/ae influence to increase athletic spending, particularly for crew. We believe we can "set the example" for other sports and alumni/ae groups that can be used to increase intercollegiate athletic funding. MIT is far behind what other schools and alumni/ae groups have done with athletic program funding.

The good news is that we think we can see light at the end of the tunnel. We have been planning our fund-raising efforts, so we hope we can move quickly after resolving the remaining issues.

# FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

## Friends Of MIT Crew Address Common Questions

### Question:

What is the status of Friends' Agreement with MIT?

### Answer:

A revised Agreement has been signed (copy enclosed).

### Question:

What is being done to implement the Strategic Plan for Friends of MIT Crew?

### Answer:

We are now past the two greatest hurdles we faced to implement the Strategic Plan (see the report on page one from the Managing Committee) and are now focusing our efforts on the following tasks. First, the Planning Committee, headed by Jack Frailey, is continuing to reach out to alumni/ae who over the years have demonstrated their commitment to MIT and their ability to assist in a substantial way. Those efforts are intended to lay the groundwork for a formal fund-raising campaign. Second, Mike Scott is communicating with the athletic department to transform our estimates of needed funds into hard figures. (See his article on page one.) Third, the Managing Committee is continuing its discussions with MIT administrators to lay the groundwork for an effective fund-raising campaign.

### Question:

What are the goals identified in the Strategic Plan that our money would support?

### Answer:

The first goal was to make coaches' salaries competitive with those of other Eastern Sprints schools. Other strategic goals included dealing with gender equity; covering more of the cost of trips for the team, from winter training trips to competitive travel for successful teams; supplementing the equipment budget even more than Friends has already done over the years; covering the cost of support staff to supplement the regular support we receive through the MIT alumni/ae office; increasing alumni/ae involvement; and, someday, building a boathouse expansion or new boathouse to provide adequate space for all of the men's and women's lightweight and heavyweight teams.

### Question:

How will funds be applied to these different strategic goals?

### Answer:

See the enclosed Agreement with MIT. The plan at this time is to set up several agreements with MIT to endow funds specifically for one purpose or another. If we succeed in setting up those separated endowed funds, then a donor could give generally to Friends of MIT Crew or specifically to one purpose or another.

### Question:

This fund-raising will take a great deal of time. How can Friends support the intercollegiate teams in the meantime?

### Answer:

The entire amount in the Friends of MIT Crew account is fluid or usable at this time. These are MIT funds, not ours. However, we believe we are now back to a state of positive communication with the MIT administration and anticipate that the administration will take seriously our advice how to use funds from that account. We will hold our first budget review meeting with the athletic director and with the dean for student life in October to consider what funds are needed for the activities of Friends and to provide support to the teams in the coming year. Two of the most critical needs at this time may be acquiring additional equipment to make better use of the rack space in the boathouse and supplementing freshman coaches' salaries.

### Question:

How can Friends help the women's lightweight and heavyweight teams grow?

### Answer:

Members of the Managing Committee have already talked with the athletic department about the desire of Friends to help facilitate expanding the women's program so that there are separate coaching staffs for the lightweight and open or heavyweight women just as there are for the men. Discussion on these issues will continue during this year, and we understand that the administration and coaches favor this development. Your ideas are welcome, and your financial assistance

will be critical.

### Question:

I understand that a separate Friends account for the women's team was established in the 1970s. Is that account still active and, if so, for what purpose?

### Answer:

That account was established in the early days of women's rowing at MIT, before Friends of MIT Crew was established, to ensure that donations could be made specifically to assist the women's team in its infancy. While some alumnae have donated specifically to it, it is little used and relatively small in size compared to the Friends of MIT Crew account. Since Friends has attempted and intends always to assist all teams equally, the suggestion has been made to consider merging the women's account into the Friends of MIT Crew account. In order to ensure that any such action is appropriate, the Managing Committee has asked Ann MacKinnon, class of 1975, to make contact with other women rowers from the earliest years of the program to assess their reaction. She will report back in the future.

### Question:

Isn't there already a great deal of alumni/ae financial support for rowing at MIT?

### Answer:

Yes, a substantial portion of the funds used to support rowing every year already comes from alumni/ae. We think it is fair to say that crew alumni/ae are easily the most supportive of any group of athletes in MIT history. Nonetheless, while alumni/ae giving has substantially supplemented the athletic department budget, it still is not adequate to provide today's students the same opportunities we had in the past. Donations for a particular named shell have not always been adequate. Endowed funds designated to support coaching positions have not been adequate to provide sufficient income to cover the entire cost of such positions. Other examples could be given. It is our goal at this time to supplement prior giving to a sufficient level, based on careful review of budgets and analysis of financial projections, to ensure that there is adequate funding for the future.

# MEN'S HEAVYWEIGHT CREW WRAP-UP

## Hard Work, Tough Competition Mark Last Season

By Gordon Hamilton  
Men's Heavyweight Coach

Our spring season began with a race against Riverside Boat Club (RBC). We have competed against the club the past few years as a way to help us prepare for the upcoming season. The races have always been close. This year was no exception. Our varsity came in second behind a good Riverside lightweight eight, which had two members of last year's national team in the boat. RBC lights were 6:09, and MIT was 6:11; Riverside heavyweight "A" was 6:17, MIT "B" was 6:34, and RBC "B" was 6:35.

The next week, the season started in earnest with the Alumni Cup at home. Columbia had seven people returning from last year's highly successful varsity, which placed very well in the Sprints and IRAs (they had beaten Yale for the first time in some 40 years). We knew we had our work cut out for us, especially since we were such a young crew—five sophomores were in the first eight for this race.

I was quite encouraged by the way we were able to hang in the race and keep it somewhat close. Columbia had already beaten Rutgers by six seconds, so I felt that we could hold our own this year. Columbia beat us by five seconds. The second varsity had an extremely close race. It had a good start, getting nearly a one-length lead by the 700 meters gone. Columbia began a gradual, painful comeback. It drew even around 1400 meters, and we went through a period of give and take, and then, with about 400 meters to go, Columbia moved to a two-seat lead. It certainly looked grim; however, the 2V had other ideas and put on a final push and took back those seats, crossing the line with its nose just ahead of the Lions, 6:24.7 to 6:24.8. It was quite a victory. The frosh eight had a decent performance, but lost by 10 seconds to the cub Lions.

Our next test came against always troublesome Williams, Connecticut College, and WPI. Although we won the varsity race 6:04.3 to Williams' 6:07.9, Conn's 6:17, and WPI's 6:18,

the day was very frustrating as the remaining races were cancelled because it was considered too rough to race right after the varsity races. This was unfortunate because those races have always been an opportunity for the second varsity and frosh to win some shirts.

The following week brought us and Harvard to Princeton and its lovely course for the Compton Cup. None of our boats performed well, and I was very disappointed with the outcome.

We had an opportunity to race against two of the finest crews in the country with basically nothing to lose and just did not come up to expectations.

With nothing to lose, we lost big time! Harvard beat Princeton by two seconds in 5:31 and us by 32 seconds. All of our other boats were about the same distance back.

We returned to Cambridge for a Sunday morning race against Boston College (BC). The Beavers' varsity beat the Eagles by 11 seconds. BC did not have a second varsity. The first and second frosh both beat the BC frosh eight.

Our next race was not for two weeks, against Dartmouth and Wisconsin on the Charles, so we were able to get down to some serious training and another round of seat racing. When we went to the line for the Cochrane Cup, the first eight now had a total of seven sophomores. Once again, however, we did not meet the challenge. We faced two excellent boats that were in a dogfight. The first eight finished some 23 seconds behind both, with Dartmouth taking first. Both of these boats were really good. Wisconsin was returning seven people from the eight that had come in third at the Sprints, and its frosh had won the previous year's Sprints. Dartmouth was returning six from the team that had finished in fifth place.

The next day we raced BU and Wisconsin again. The first eight was reasonably confident that if we raced well, we could beat BU. BU began to turn its season around right off the line and went with Wisconsin all the way to the 1600 meter mark, when a crab dropped them out and kept us

close. Wisconsin won in a time of 5:46; BU was 6:00 and Tech 6:03.

The next week, we had the Sprints. The frosh came in third in the third-level final, eight seconds behind Columbia. The frosh had improved two seconds on Columbia from the Alumni Cup. The second varsity was also third in the third-level finals, losing to WPI's varsity by two seconds and beating Columbia by 17 seconds. The varsity was also third in the third-level final, losing to Rutgers by four seconds.

The IRAs were a grind—there is no other way to put it. The varsity eight raced hard and fairly well the first three races; we just could never quite get over the top. We also ran into some bad luck with lane assignments. In the semifinals we drew lane 1. The strong quartering head wind was coming off the lane 6 shore, and when the course at Cherry Hill approaches the 600 meters to go, the course runs just off the lane 6 shore and becomes sheltered from the wind. At that point, we were two to three seats up on Rutgers, which was in lane 6. Rutgers just shot out and at the finish line was a whopping 10 seconds ahead of us. We had put in one of our best races ...the grind!

Going into the third-level finals, we were suffering from having rowed three very hard races with very little to show for the effort. The bottom sort of fell out, and we had a substandard race, coming in sixth.

In other races, the frosh four raced a little better each day and made the petite finals, finishing sixth. The open four was sixth in the third-level finals.

The squad came home looking forward to a summer of good training and getting back on the water in the fall. Although we had seven sophomores in our IRA boat, we will be losing three of them next year as they will be studying and, certainly, rowing, at Cambridge University. We will rely on some of the freshmen who showed promise to take their places. We are also looking forward to one of the strongest entering freshman classes we have had in a while, with potential perhaps close to that of our current sophomore class. Frosh coach Mike Lane has done an excellent job of recruiting. We can all be glad that he will be returning next year also.

*We are looking forward to one of the strongest entering freshman classes we have had.*

# MEN'S LIGHTWEIGHT CREW WRAP-UP

## Squads Develop Character During Bruising Competition

By Ian Hutton

*Men's Lightweight Coach*

After a late return to the Charles due to the severity of last winter's cold weather, the lightweights took the water with renewed enthusiasm and lofty ambitions. The IAP training trip to Florida was a tremendous success in terms of the volume and quality of rowing accomplished. Looking to capitalize on the progress made during winter training and keeping in mind the results of the fall season, the lightweights set out to shake up their competition.

The spring season opened against Yale for the Joy Cup, hosted by the Elis at their impressive new boathouse on the Housatonic River. In the first varsity, MIT got off to a good start and held the Yale crew off for the first 500, but an astonishing move by Yale in the second 500 proved to be too much as the Elis surged ahead and continued to open their lead in the last 1000. Yale went on to win in 5:27.2, with MIT finishing in 5:41.8. Despite the 14-second margin, the race proved to be substantially closer than in recent years.

Yale's 2V was equally as impressive, gaining the lead in the first 500 and stretching it out through the rest of the race to win by the same margin as the 1V. Yale's 1F and 2F proved to be remarkably fast, beating the MIT freshmen quite handily. To the credit of the MIT freshmen, however, it should be noted that Yale's 1F was less than one second slower than MIT's 1V and one second faster than MIT's 2V.

The following weekend, the MIT lightweights faced a bit of local competition from Boston College as they renewed their traditional rivalry with Army. With the bitter taste of the defeat at Yale still in their mouths, the Engineers took to the Charles with something to prove—and that they did. The 1V battled through Army in the second 500, and once it got through the Mass. Avenue bridge, it was good night for the Black Knights. MIT went on to win in 6:15.58, with Army six and a half seconds behind. MIT left Boston College in its wake right off the start and never gave BC a second thought, going on to beat BC by over nine seconds.

The 2V race was a carbon copy in

the way it unfolded, though the results may have been a little more clear than the original. MIT's 2V won quite easily, more than 12 seconds ahead of Army and almost 16 seconds in front of BC. In the freshman race, however, the current was more than the MIT lightweights could handle. Their heavyweight counterparts from Army moved right through the 1F as well as the 2F, though the 1F did manage to stay ahead of BC.

In contrast, the following weekend was a harsh welcome back to the reality of lightweight rowing in the EARC. MIT faced off against Harvard and Dartmouth for the Biglin Bowl. Although the race was slated to take place in Hanover, New Hampshire, Dartmouth was still frozen in, and the contest moved to the Charles.

Harvard and Dartmouth both had designs on catching each other off guard, and MIT got caught in the crossfire. Both the Crimson and the Big Green came off the line at a 45, taking MIT completely by surprise at such an early point in the season. The surprise continued as both Ivy League rivals kept up the blistering pace, never falling below a 40 through the body of the race and leaving the MIT crew to play "catch up" at a paltry 34 strokes per minute. Harvard went on to win in 6:20.6, with Dartmouth six and a half seconds behind and MIT a good five lengths behind them.

Adding insult to injury, the 2V race went the same way—with Harvard and Dartmouth showing off their impressive aerobic capacity in severely overstroking the MIT crew. In an interesting turn of events, however, the Big Green surprised Harvard in the last 500. Dartmouth made an impressive move with 500 to go, stealing the lead and holding the Crimson off to win by less than a second. MIT trailed by six lengths, exasperated by the pace of its rivals. In a very unsurprising fashion, the 1F and 2F races went the same way, with Harvard sweeping both events, Dartmouth in second, and MIT in third.

On the third weekend in April, the lightweights returned to the river for yet another home race against Cornell and Columbia, this time for the Geiger Cup. True to form, the Charles reared its ugly head and provided a challenging headwind to go along with the

stiff competition. In the first varsity race, the first 500 meters proved to be the entire race. Having learned from the previous weekend's folly, MIT went off the line at a much higher rate, going stroke for stroke with its rivals. But the effort still wasn't enough. Despite the pace, Columbia moved out right away and kept on moving. MIT and Cornell struggled to come back, but Columbia was out to prove that its winning the Eastern Sprints the previous year was no accident, and it cruised to victory in 6:19.9, despite the headwind, 10 seconds ahead of Cornell and almost 17 seconds ahead of MIT.

In the 2V race, Cornell established command of the race in the first 500 meters. The Big Red broke Columbia at the 500 mark and left MIT steering through the pieces as both struggled in vain to catch up. Columbia was able to come within two lengths, but Cornell sailed on to win by five seconds over Columbia and almost 17 ahead of MIT. As if waging the same war in a parallel universe, the Columbia 1F replicated the results of the 1V race. The Cornell 2F went on to beat the MIT 2F by quite a convincing margin.

In a last-minute arrangement, MIT hosted the Naval Academy the following day. But exhausted by two consecutive weekends of defeat, the MIT lightweights failed to rise to the occasion and suffered yet one more loss to their league rivals. In convincing fashion, Navy swept all of the races and left the MIT crews even more haggard.

In an effort to regroup, the varsity crews went out to Worcester just days later to take on Holy Cross at Lake Quinsigamond. In an astonishing twist of fate, this proved to be the race of the season for the Engineers.

In the 1V duel, Holy Cross got out to a marginal lead early in the race, but the MIT crew demonstrated some necessary patience and moved back even right away—and even they stayed. For the next 1750 meters, neither crew could seem to shake the other as they traded bowballs for the lead down the entire course. With just 250 to go, MIT made a move and took a seat on the Crusaders but couldn't hold on to the lead as Holy Cross sprinted and moved back on the Engi-

*(continued on page seven)*

# WOMEN'S CREW WRAP-UP

## Squads Show Grit While Contending With Changes

By Susan Lindholm  
Women's Crew Coach

The women's team returned from Florida to a season of unknowns. The EAWRC increased the required number of competitions against league members, and we were required to add two more races to our schedule to remain in competition at Sprints. Columbia and Georgetown accommodated our request, and we added two more overnights to our schedule. NCAA rules were the bigger challenge. Division III women's rowing programs were allowed to coach their athletes for only 156 days for the 2000-2001 season. This will be further reduced to 21 weeks for the 2001-2002 season. A result of this change has been that we could not coach our athletes for the month of February!

Our new schedule started in New York on March 24. The only problem is that the basin remained frozen until March 19. BU thawed a little earlier and let us train out of its boathouse. We managed to row eight times before our first race. Our lack of water time compared to that of Columbia and Coast Guard, in addition to our February restrictions, placed the varsity squad (8:01.9) in the middle between Columbia (7:51.2) and Coast Guard (8:10.1). The lightweights fared better in the JV race, finishing two seconds behind Columbia and 33 seconds ahead of Coast Guard.

We returned home to host Dartmouth, Smith, and UNH. The experience we gained on our Columbia trip was not enough to help us topple Dartmouth (7:06.91), but the varsity squad (7:18.07) defeated UNH (7:20.27) and Smith (7:26.51) for the first time since the regatta was begun in 1999. Tech also cut the gap between Dartmouth and MIT by 50 per-

cent. The lightweights lost a heart-breaker in the last 100m to the MUCH larger Dartmouth JV squad, which sprinted through them to win by 7:28.69 (to MIT's 7:29.23). Smith finished third (7:52.16), followed by UNH (7:58.05).

The team was back on the road again for a double duel in Philadelphia on April 7. These races were the first races for our lights against other lightweights. The morning races with Georgetown left the lightweights two seconds behind and the varsity seven seconds behind. Both crews were very disappointed but quickly regrouped to be victorious over St. Joe's. The lightweights won by nine seconds over the fourth-place nationally ranked St. Joe's lightweight crew. The varsity came up with its first victory of the season by a four-second margin.

We came back to Boston excited to race Williams, Connecticut College, and WPI. The race with Williams is our only chance to get a bid to the NCAA against another top Division III school. Lake Quinsigamond thawed on Monday, but on Saturday only the varsity race got off before conditions deteriorated and racing for the day had to be cancelled. Unfortunately, Tech did not handle the rough water well and we lost to Williams but defeated Connecticut College and WPI.

We came back to Boston and stayed in the rough waters of the basin preparing for another weekend in Worcester for the NEWMACS followed by a trip to Navy. We combined the varsity and lightweights to form a new varsity and JV and moved freshmen back down to make the novice boats faster. The NEWMAC schools are MIT, Smith, Mount Holyoke, Wellesley, Coast Guard, WPI, and Clark. There is a V8 trophy as well as the Florence Jope Smith

team point trophy. Our rough water rowing and new combinations allowed us to win the V8, 2V8, and V4. We placed second in the N8 and third in the 2N8, enough to win the team trophy as well.

We left on our long road trip to Annapolis with added confidence and woke up to almost unrowable conditions. The varsity raced well but came up four seconds shy of Navy, the closest we have been in years. The lights once again had a great race against a larger crew, but another two-second loss loomed in their faces. Although we had not defeated a Sprints school, we all looked forward to our last home race and to Sprints. Our margins of defeat would at least place us in the second-level final at Sprints.

Our last home race was against fifth-ranked Radcliffe and sixth-ranked BU. The varsity was about 30 seconds out from the other crews, but the margins were enough to predict us to be in the top 12 at Sprints. The lightweights finished four seconds behind Radcliffe.

Sprints have been moved to a full 2000m course in Camden, New Jersey. Once again the windy weather disrupted our race plan. Both the varsity and lightweights had trouble staying on the course because of a stiff crosswind. We left Camden very disappointed that all of the improvements we had made this year were not showcased.

The lightweights had one more chance to show their speed at the IRAs. They stole the show in their first race as they raced through Radcliffe's crab and narrowly defeated Villanova by .56 seconds to qualify directly to the grand final. The grand final was even more exciting than the semi.

Princeton, Wisconsin, Villanova, and  
*(continued on page seven)*

### Friends of MIT Crew Account Information

More than \$1,000,000 has been raised since the founding of the Friends through thousands of individual donations by alumni/ae and friends.

Friends' funds are separately collected and managed by MIT and continue to grow after the date of donation.

To direct donations to the Friends of MIT Crew account, earmark your MIT contribution to Friends of MIT Crew Acct. No. 3855200.

## Squads Develop Character During Bruising Competition

*(continued from page five)*

neers. Desperately fighting to pull out a much-needed victory, MIT held on to win by the narrowest of margins, beating Holy Cross by barely a bow-ball. The winning time was 6:06.20 with Holy Cross finishing in 6:06.25.

The start of the 2V race unfolded in similar fashion, with Holy Cross darting off the line to an early lead. But it wasn't long before MIT reeled Holy Cross back in and began moving through them. By the 500, MIT had established the lead and wasn't about to let it go. MIT continued to move out on Holy Cross in the second 1000 and cruised on to a seven-second victory.

The MIT lightweights returned to the Charles to host Rutgers for the last regular-season race of the spring. Hoping to sustain the momentum from their victory against Holy Cross, they set out to even the score with their rivals. But the river didn't seem to want to cooperate, and neither did the crews from Rutgers.

In the 1V, Rutgers jumped out to an early lead off the start, but the Engineers remained patient and cut back into the Rutgers eight. The Scarlet Knights sat on a four-seat lead for most of the second 500, and just as MIT prepared for its big push before the bridge, Rutgers laid down an impressive move that opened its lead up to what would prove to be insur-

mountable. Both crews struggled with strong gusts of wind in the last 1000, the Tech lightweights suffering just slightly more than their heavier, taller rivals. Rutgers went on to win quite easily, in a time of 6:19.7, with MIT trailing by six lengths. The 2V race unfolded the same way, this time both crews battling strong gusts from wire to wire as the basin began to show its true colors. The Rutgers 2V went on to win as well, about five lengths in front of MIT.

The freshman crews fared even worse than their varsity counterparts. Both Rutgers crews won quite handily, conquering both the river and the Tech lightweights with ease.

Next, the Tech lightweights began gearing up for the season finale: the Eastern Sprints. Realizing that they needed to regroup, both mentally and physically, the Engineers did just that. On a magnificent day with a sizable tailwind, course records were shattered and the league's finest demonstrated some of the nation's best rowing.

The first varsity stumbled a bit in the heats, failing to push past Penn in the second 1000 despite what appeared to be the perfect opportunity. But the following day, Tech put together a race as magnificent as its previous effort on Lake Quinsigamond against Holy Cross, finishing in 6:03.4 in the petite finals. Unfortunately, it

just wasn't enough to put MIT ahead of the field, and the squad finished fifth in the petites, 11th overall. Knowing that they just weren't fast enough to beat their league rivals, the Tech lightweights had to be satisfied with knowing that they had put their best effort on the line when it counted the most.

The 2V fared slightly better in the heats, narrowly missing the Penn crew by just two seconds to finish sixth in the heat. Out for revenge in the petite final, MIT and Penn battled their way down the entire course, trading the advantage until they were dead even with just 20 strokes to go. MIT pushed ahead, gaining a seat over the Quakers, but with five strokes left, Penn pushed past and went on to finish fifth, just 0.26 seconds in front of MIT.

The IRAs would provide just a little more drama for the squad as MIT entered an eight for the first time in a few years. There was great racing all around, as one might expect at the national championships. Having learned from its mistakes at Sprints, MIT raced brilliantly in the heats but narrowly missed the grand final. In the petite final, the Tech eight made a strong showing in the first 500, vying for the lead against Princeton, but ran out of steam in the third 500 and finished fourth. Princeton went on to win the petite final quite convincingly.

## Contending With Changes

*(continued from page six)*

Mercyhurst joined MIT in the grand final. We started off the line in fifth place but settled well and moved to third place by the 500m mark. We traded places with Radcliffe all the way down the course. Radcliffe edged us out of third place in the last five strokes by .44 seconds.

The women's team made a lot of progress this year despite being surrounded by the Division I/Division III controversy. The other crews in the boathouse and alumni/ae supported us all the way.

We would like to express our thanks to Katy Croff, Stephanie Chen, Kathleen Vokes, and Ellen Brown (all from the class of 2000) for coming to our races every weekend no matter where our schedule took us. We also need to thank the Willey and Garg families for fueling our teams at our races in New England.

We don't know what our season will look like for the 2001/2002 season, but the women have been working hard over the summer, and we are looking forward to turning more heads at our races.

Hello, Friends,

Ron Harvey, MIT alumnus, class of '93, was in a serious bicycle accident. His injuries include several broken ribs and a broken back, leaving him paralyzed from the waist down. In an effort to defray some of the costs of Ron's recovery and family travel expenses, one of Ron's business school classmates set up an account at Wilmington Trust in Ron's behalf.

Ron was still rowing and training hard up until the accident. He competed at the 2000 Olympic trials in a lightweight double. The accident occurred while he was on a training ride (cycling). He is currently working at Allied Signal and attending an MBA program at UCLA.

If you would like to make a contribution to help Ron and his family, you can send the check directly to Nicole Sutton, Wilmington Trust, 100 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1230, Santa Monica, CA 90401; 310/899-7024. The check should be made out to Wilmington Trust FBO Ron Harvey Fund.

Feel free to pass this information along to anyone who would know Ron.

Sincerely,  
Kevin McDonnell  
kevinm@mit.edu

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Friends of MIT Crew  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Building W92-280  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
**ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED**

Non-Profit Organization  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
Cambridge, MA  
Permit No. 54016



## **WHAT'S INSIDE THIS ISSUE**

---

### **Highlights Of Contents**

- Report From Managing Committee page 1
- FOMITC Financial Update pages 1-2
- Voices From The Past page 2
- Frequently Asked Questions page 3
- Men's Heavyweight Crew Wrap-up page 4
- Men's Lightweight Crew Wrap-up pages 5, 7
- Women's Crew Wrap-up pages 6-7
- Help An Alumnus page 7