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Foreword

In December 2000 the first meeting of the White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports was held in Salt Lake City, Utah. The meeting brought together leaders in athletics, the scientific community, and government to discuss actions to address the use of drugs in sports, especially among young people. This meeting provided Task Force members with an opportunity to examine the challenges facing the worldwide anti-doping effort. The White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports is specifically charged with developing recommendations for U.S. Government initiatives to reduce drug use in sport at all levels—from the elite ranks to youth sports. The meeting also enabled the Task Force to identify measures to consolidate recent progress made in enhancing national and international cooperation and coordination in the fight against drug use in sports.

The presentations were of such high quality we concluded that they should be made available broadly to government officials, coaches, athletes, academic experts, and concerned members of the public. For this reason we have compiled the conference presentations into this document, available both in printed form and on www.playclean.org.

The White House Task Force meeting focused on three key issues:

- How can we help ensure a drug-free games when the world gathers for the 2002 winter games in Salt Lake City?
- How can we most effectively reach out to young people to prevent the use of drugs in sport? And, in particular, how can we use the vehicle of the Salt Lake games and other elite sports to send youth positive, drug-free messages?
- What are the most effective ways the federal government can assist in the fight against doping at all levels?

Because the fight against drug use in sports is such an important initiative, we decided to include in this report several background documents on the anti-doping effort. These documents were compiled in a briefing book that was distributed to all Task Force Meeting participants. We hope that these items, along with the substantive conference presentations that make up the bulk of the report, prove to be useful to readers. We expect that the next meeting of the White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports will be held in March 2001.

Sincerely,

Barry R. McCaffrey
Director
Office of National Drug Control Policy
Warm greetings to everyone gathered for the Salt Lake City field meeting of the White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports.

Over the last few years, we have witnessed disturbing increases in the use of drugs in elite sports -- from the Olympics to the Tour de France to our own pro ranks. Acting with the international community, we made important progress in countering this threat at the Sydney Olympic Games.

However, much remains to be done, both at home and abroad. Just 14 months from now, the world will gather in Salt Lake City for the 2002 Olympic Games. As the next host nation for the Games, we bear a particular responsibility for providing all the world's athletes a level playing field where victory is determined by talent, determination, and training, not by drugs.

We also have a special responsibility to protect our nation's youth. Just as young people emulate a star's batting stance or jump shot, we are now seeing greater drug use in youth sports as well. Our most recent studies show that the use of steroids among young people has increased roughly 50 percent in just the last year alone. There is no sports victory worth the risk of life or health.

In response to this growing threat, I established this task force to develop recommendations for actions that federal agencies can take to address the use of drugs in sports, especially among young people. But, while the federal government has an important role to play in this effort, ultimately it is up to all of us to create an even, drug-free playing field for sports at all levels. That is why I thank all of you gathered at this meeting -- representing sports, youth groups, Olympians, and coaches -- for your participation and support. Your work is critical to safeguarding the important role that athletics play in our national culture and in the development of America's young people, and I look forward to receiving the results of your efforts.

Best wishes for a successful meeting.

Bill Clinton
EXECUTIVE ORDER

CREATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE TASK FORCE ON DRUG USE IN SPORTS AND AUTHORIZATION FOR THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY TO SERVE AS THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT'S REPRESENTATIVE ON THE BOARD OF THE WORLD ANTI-DOPING AGENCY

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Office of National Drug Control Reauthorization Act of 1998, (21 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and in order to develop recommendations for Federal agency actions to address the use of drugs in sports, in particular among young people, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Policy. The use of drugs in sports has reached a level that endangers not just the legitimacy of athletic competition but also the lives and health of athletes -- from the elite ranks to youth leagues. The Monitoring The Future Study issued in 1999 found that in just 1 year's time the rate of steroid use among young people rose roughly 50 percent among both sexes and across all age groups. It is the policy of my Administration to take the steps needed to help eliminate illicit or otherwise banned drug use and doping in sports at the State, national, and international level.

Sec. 2. Establishment of a White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports. (a) There is established a White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports (Task Force). The Task Force shall comprise the co-vice chairs of the White House Olympic Task Force (the "Olympic Task Force Vice Chairs"), and representatives designated by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, the Office of Management and Budget, the National Security Council, the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Education, the Department of Justice, the Department of Transportation, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
(b) The Task Force shall develop recommendations for the President on further executive and legislative actions that can be undertaken to address the problem of doping and drug use in sports. In developing the recommendations, the Task Force shall consider, among other things: (i) the health and safety of America's athletes, in particular our Nation's young people; (ii) the integrity of honest athletic competition; and (iii) the views and recommendations of State and local governments, the private sector, citizens, community groups, and nonprofit organizations, on actions to address this threat. The Task Force, through its Chairs, shall submit its recommendations to the President.

(c) The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (the Director), the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Olympic Task Force Vice Chairs or their designees shall serve as the Task Force Chairs.

(d) To the extent permitted by law and at the request of the Chairs, agencies shall cooperate with and provide information to the Task Force.

Sec. 3. Participation in the World Anti-Doping Agency. (a) As part of my Administration's efforts to address the problem of drug use in sports, the United States has played a leading role in the formation of a World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) by the Olympic and sports community and the nations of the world. Through these efforts, the United States has been selected to serve as a governmental representative on the board of the WADA. This order will authorize the Director to serve as the United States Government's representative on the WADA board.

(b) Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 1701 et seq., the Director, or in his absence his designee, is hereby authorized to take all necessary and proper actions to execute his responsibilities as United States representative to the WADA.

(c) To assist the Director in carrying out these responsibilities as the United States Government representative to the WADA and to the extent permitted by law, Federal employees may serve in their official capacity, inter alia, on WADA Committees or WADA advisory committees, serving as experts to the WADA.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 9, 2000.

# # #
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10:20a.m.-10:30a.m. REMARKS
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“U.S. Olympic Commitment to Drug Free Sport”

10:30a.m.-10:50a.m. BREAK
10:50 a.m. - 11:50 p.m. **SCIENCE AND RESEARCH**
Dr. Gary Wadler, Medical Advisor to ONDCP
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Director Barry R. McCaffrey
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INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Barry R. McCaffrey
Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy
Task Force Co-Chair

Good morning and welcome. Let me begin by thanking Mitt Romney for the invitation to come to Salt Lake City and for his inspirational leadership. Your team put on a superb welcome for all of us last night at the Rotunda. It was just a great start to our deliberations.

The mixture in the room is a special one. We think we have assembled together some of the most knowledgeable people in the country on the issue of doping in sports. We’ve organized you into panels – Sports and Youth; Athletes’ Perspective; Science and Research; and Anti-Doping Efforts in Support of the Salt Lake Games. This is a four-day conference packed into a half a day. We’re committed to establishing a base-line from which to proceed.

Thanks to the Utah National Guard – thank God for the National Guard – we’ll have a digital TV record of today’s meeting, which we will use around the country. As many of you know, they do have a national networking capability, so our comments can be used again should you choose to do so. Secondly, there will be a verbatim transcript of the dialogue this morning. We’re going to put which will include not just a record of what we say here today, but also any documents you submit for the record after the meeting. We’ve got just a couple of weeks to complete these proceedings so I encourage you all submit additional materials quickly so we can have a complete document.

A final thought – we’re going to have to stay organized this morning to ensure we address all issues on the agenda and allow all viewpoints to be heard. You’ll have an opportunity to make comments at the end of each panel after formal remarks by presenters.

Rob Housman – if you’ll wave your hand – will act as our moderator. On that note, perhaps we could begin by me turning over the podium first to Mitt Romney. Then Governor Mike Leavitt will talk to us. Finally, my co-chair Mickey Ibarra, who’s been such a terrific partner over the past years – not just in doping and sports issues – he and Thurgood Marshall have also been the President’s point-men for the upcoming Salt Lake Winter Games.
Mr. Mitt Romney
President of the Salt Lake Organizing Committee

Thank you very much. Thank you, General McCaffrey. I come here to welcome you to be here. We’re delighted that you would make the effort to, as a task force and as a group of individuals, come to talk about this most critical topic.

We very much appreciate the energy and the time that you’re devoting to this effort and want to be part of it in every way we can. I want to thank in particular General McCaffrey, not just for being here at this conference, but for showing a real example of leadership to the entire Olympic movement and to the world. We have all watched leaders who command from the Hill or from behind the lines. This is one who charged the mountain in some respects alone. Many of us watched and said, “Boy, I’m sure we won’t see anything from him in a while,” and we’re surprised to find that he accomplished so many enormous things. We came running behind as quickly as we could. But how much he accomplished and how much has happened in the anti-doping world and the creation of WADA and its bylaws and the operation that it’s pursuing owes a great deal to General McCaffrey, and we all do, those of us who care enormously as we do with regards to anti-doping.

Secondly, I want to thank Mickey Ibarra, Thurgood Marshall, Jr., and also the White House for their support of General McCaffrey when the going got tough. There were a lot of people saying, you know, “Cut General McCaffrey loose. He’s a loose cannon. He’s just speaking on his own.” But the White House stood firmly behind, and that strength and the reinforcements that Mickey and Thurgood Marshall, Jr., and the White House in total provided for the General made a great difference. And we are not where we were two or three years ago. We have stepped forward quite dramatically.

Now I want you to know that we are one hundred percent committed to having clean, drug-free games in Salt Lake City in 2002. We recognize that the Olympics, in many respects, is the example; it sets the standard that youth around the world watch to see what’s fair, what’s right in the world of sports. And in our view, they have to see three things. They have to hear three items loud and clear – three laws, three rules. They are number one, no one is above the rules. Number two, it’s no excuse to say “everybody else does it.” And number three, it’s inexcusable to hide the truth. And if we apply those concepts clearly and distinctly, and if the youth around the world hear them – no one is above the rules. It’s no excuse to say “everybody else does it,” and it’s inexcusable to hide the truth – we will have gone a long way to set a standard that the youth of the world can watch. And they will see games that are clean. They’ll see sport that’s clean and recognize that cheaters do not have a role in the Olympic movement.

Now I’m just going to note, finally, that clean games is not something we can accomplish alone. At the organizing committee level, we are, if you will, the punctuation point for a whole program of anti-doping. We hope that’s an exclamation point in our case that we have done such a good job in the testing which occurs in and around the games, that people say, “Wow, that was fabulous.”

We recognize that for anti-doping to really work for our games and for us to be able to deliver clean games that abide by those rules, that we depend enormously on the international effort, which is
1 being done by WADA. But we also depend upon the efforts in each country where Olympians
2 originate.

3 And in our case, we depend enormously on USADA. The United States Anti-Doping Agency is the
4 place where the rubber hits the road. This is the agency – some five thousand out of competition
5 tests to be done. This is the agency which will be able to assure the American public and those of
6 us in Salt Lake City who are responsible for these games, that the team coming from the United
7 States is drug-free.

8 I look forward to a time when every single country that sends athletes to the Olympics can do what
9 New Zealand and Australia and Norway and the United States and Canada and some other
10 countries are doing. And that is put in place a highly effective program to test and evaluate their
11 own athletes such that that country, that national Olympic committee, can certify to an organizing
12 committee, “We’re sending you a clean team. We know this because we have in place a program
13 and a procedure in our country to test our athletes out of competition.”

14 I hope that we can get that kind of certification someday from all of the national Olympic
15 committees that send teams to the games. So they’re on the line, not just their athletes, not just the
16 MGBs, but every country is on the line.

17 That three-pronged approach where we’re the exclamation point, where the National Olympic
18 Committee, the country, in particular, is the place where the rubber meets the road. And then
19 WADA plays an over-arching role to make sure everyone’s playing by the same rules, as
20 something, which I think is ultimately essential.

21 Well, thank you for being here. We appreciate your work. We will try and do our work as well as
22 we can. Please let us know when we’re off base, how we can correct our actions. But we’re
23 committed to making these clean games that America and the world can be proud of.

24 Thank you.
The Honorable Mike Leavitt  
Governor of Utah

General McCaffrey, a four hour seminar – a four day seminar – four hours requires that my five minute speech be done in a hundred and twenty seconds. I will accomplish that standard.

May I say, first of all, welcome to Utah. We’re grateful that you’re here. We’re enthusiastic about the games. I’d also like to acknowledge that Mickey Ibarra is a Utahan and someone who has blessed this state with his influence and attention over the course of the last four years. And we express appreciation for his ongoing friendship and support.

General McCaffrey, thank you again for being here. May I just say that some time earlier – I think maybe four years ago – I was in Puerto Rico – the first time I had a chance to meet you – where you met with governors and delivered a very clear message.

The message was “attack demand.” Unless we’re able to reduce demand for drugs in this country, the supply will constantly be flowing. That changed the attitude of this state and changed our basic approach, and I think frames today why this is such an important meeting. If athletes – the most admired among our citizens – use drugs or are not drug free, it sends a powerful signal that does not attack demand. In fact, it’s the opposite.

So that’s why this is of such importance not just to the success of the Olympic games, but to the success of our efforts to reduce substance abuse around the world.

Thank you for being here. Thank you for being such a good example. We support this effort with all of our hearts. We are committed that the Olympic games in 2002 will be a shining example of all of the positive things that can come from the Olympic movement, among them being a drug-free America, a drug-free world.

Thank you.
The Honorable Mickey Ibarra  
Assistant to the President; Director of White House Intergovernmental Affairs;  
Task Force Co-Chair  

Thank you very much, Governor Leavitt. I’ll tell you, I’ve had a lot of thoughts running through my mind as we get closer and closer to January 20, exactly noon. It has been my high honor, my privilege, and I certainly will always remain grateful to President Clinton for giving me the opportunity to serve Utahans and the American people at the White House, including the responsibility for the last two years to be a part of the White House Task Force for the Salt Lake Winter Olympic games. I, along with my colleague, Thurgood Marshall, and many others throughout our twenty-six federal departments and agencies that make up our task force.

I work very closely with Mitt Romney, who’s doing such a terrific job leading our effort here to ensure that the United States venue, Utah, Salt Lake, and I guess the other eight venue cities in the state of Utah, are fully prepared to be the host, the international hosts, to the Olympic family. And I’m very, very confident because of our partnership, strong partnership, will be ready in every single way.

Working together, we have made — there’s no doubt about it on this particular subject that we’re to discuss today — a lot of progress. We have helped, as it relates to the Olympics, build security systems, the Olympic village, roads and rails. Now we’re building, I think, a level playing field for the athletes themselves.

Of all of our efforts, we think it is our fight against doping, led by General McCaffrey and others of our Administration, that most directly affect the games themselves. President Clinton is very proud of our progress, to be sure.

We have made progress; we’ve created new, effective anti-doping agencies at home and abroad. We’ve helped develop new tests for doping, drugs like EPO. We’ve put real resources — roughly ten million in federal funds — towards these efforts, including $3.3 million for Salt Lake’s anti-doping efforts that take place right here for the winter Olympics.

I must say that we really — all of us — owe a debt of gratitude to Senator Bennett of Utah, who really was the driving force behind ensuring that we were able to provide Mitt Romney and his folks here in Salt Lake with the funds that they need to do the job in the right way.

And we are committed to doing even a better job. Salt Lake will be the most drug-free winter Olympics games ever held. We think you can bank on that just as you can bank on fresh powder, right, Governor — for the Olympics — the greatest snow on earth.

However, our efforts aren’t focused just on the Olympics. As noble and as important as the games are, we all understand that his is a much broader effort beyond the Olympics. And what we are really attempting to do is change a culture. And we must do that by targeting our youth. Research by the Healthy Competition Foundation in 1999 shows that one in four American teens and pre-teens personally know someone who uses performance-enhancing drugs — one in four. When the
world gathers here in Salt Lake, among the millions who will be watching will be the young people of the world. They will thrill certainly at the tremendous acts of athleticism. They’ll cheer the great victories. They’ll marvel at the artistry of skating and be awed by the daring of the downhill.

But as hosts for the games, we bear a particular responsibility in the United States to provide all the world’s athletes a level playing field where victory is determined by talent, determination and training, not through drugs.

While the federal government – we all understand this, those of us here from Washington – understand that the federal government has a very important role to play, ultimately, however, it is up to all of us – all of us – to create a level drug-free playing field for sports at all levels.

For this reason, on behalf of President Clinton, I thank all of you gathered here today representing sports, youth groups, Olympians, coaches. Your participation and support is crucial to our success.

I would like now to present the Co-Chair of our effort here of the White House Task Force, turn it back to my friend and my colleague, Barry McCaffrey.

Let me just add that, as I mentioned at the outset, I’ve had a lot of thoughts, a lot of memories. I’m sure that will continue for the next forty-seven days. However, I think the most outstanding experience and truly an advantage of the last four years is having an opportunity to become acquainted with so many terrific public servants. Public service really is about helping people, helping others be successful.

And I’ll tell you, back in February of 1996, when we were able to convince Barry McCaffrey to join our team at the White House to take on a problem that we all knew was continuing to grow. When the United States Senate unanimously confirmed Barry McCaffrey as the new Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, we knew we had the right person.

As Governor Leavitt has indicated, Barry McCaffrey has done an absolutely outstanding job. We felt that it was the right and really the logical choice to lead our effort as we continue our efforts to eliminate the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sports. So with that, let me present Barry McCaffrey.
KEYNOTE REMARKS

Barry R. McCaffrey
Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy
Task Force Co-Chair

I'll be as brief as the Governor and Mickey in order to save time and get this all under way.

First of all, let me underscore that there ought to be a record – there needs to be some things in print, we need to provide a body of printed background out of this conference. This is step one; you'll get a copy. We're going to reprint it. We'll make sure all four hundred and thirty-five of our congressmen get a copy, the hundred senators, the governors and others who care about doping in sports issues. Our purpose will be to capture a bit of the history that Mickey – in particular – I, and others have lived through. So I put that on the table for you to consider.

There's also a nice letter in here from our President. You know, I am, by law, a non-partisan officer of government. But I am enormously grateful that at the end of the day, we kept the support of the President of the United States. And when the team was focusing on demand reduction and the challenge of doping, the heart and soul of that effort was Donna Shalala and I and Mickey Ibarra and Thurgood Marshall. So we offer that quick note from the President as background.

Another thought – we owe a lot to the National Institute on Drug Abuse. Nancy Pillotte, thanks for being here and representing NIDA. I frequently introduce myself as an unpaid shill for Doctor Alan Leshner, the Director of the National Institute of Drug Abuse. These are important people; this agency is a national treasure. This is a six hundred million dollar a year operation. And I think Gary Wadler and others will allude to the big challenge NIDA will help us with – research.

There's been sort of an undercurrent that this is a hopeless problem dealing with doping in sports. We've heard a lot of reasons we can't succeed – "It's cat and mouse. The cheaters will always be one step ahead of us. There are always new products emerging. The rights of privacy and due process will prevent us from having an effective testing and sanctions regime. Science will not be able to support an accurate and comprehensive testing regime. Nonsense. That's simply not going to be the case.

A real challenge – enunciated recently in Oslo by Johann Olav Koss – is that the necessary science and research base won't be there until young people in science know that there will be a continuing flow of research dollars; that they can get into this field. If we make appropriate investments and demonstrate that this is a viable research discipline, we will see the kinds of results we need to succeed within five years. So I'm going to petition NIDA and others of you to get involved and stay involved in order to ensure that we generate and sustain the requisite resources to develop and deepen the scientific base of knowledge that will underpin our efforts.

Another challenge we must address is the relative lack (to date that is) of coordination and synchronization of existing scientific and research activities. In our consultations with our international partners – the Canadians, Australians, French, British and others – we've learnt that there is a pretty robust body of investigation out there. We've got to bring it together, give it more
coherence. We all know about the good work being done by Don Catlin at UCLA. We are familiar with the contributions of other luminaries in the field. We’re simply going to have to put these efforts together in complementary, as opposed to parallel, scientific lines of endeavor.

Let me also note that some of the folks who are gathered in this room are going to be crucial in the coming eighteen months. The big issue that most of us are concerned about relates to sixty-eight million American children. But I don’t want any of us to lose sight in this conference that we’re trying to deliver the goods, to stand by, Utah, Salt Lake City, Mitt Romney, the USOC, and to try and create conditions under which we can have the most drug-free games possible in 2002.

HHS will be a key part of that. Christine Cichetti – if you will stand up ever so briefly – was sent here by Donna Shalala as her personal representative. Also in the room, are other representatives of the federal team that will support the Salt Lake Games. In addition to HHS and NIDA, we have representatives from the Department of Justice, federal law enforcement agencies, and from the Department of State – represented today by Donna Gigliotti. The individuals here from Washington are mostly high-ranking members of the civil service – they are the career officials that will support the next Administration as they pick up the reins from us. They are here today because we want to ensure this important issue has the requisite visibility to remain a priority issue through the upcoming transition in administrations.

We also have an ONDCP delegation here. Get to know Dr. Don Vereen, my deputy. With any luck, we’ll keep him in government for the coming several years. As most of you in the room who have worked with him know, he’s not only a delightful human being, a psychiatrist, and physician. He’s also a public-health research expert. He’s done a considerable amount of work with formation of youth attitudes and with doping. He came to us from the National Institute on Drug Abuse. Don Vereen will be a point of continuity for all of us.

Also part of the ONDCP team are Donna de Varona and Dr. Gary Wadler. These two distinguished Americans have helped us think our way through the domestic and international challenges that must be addressed in order to eliminate cheating and doping in sports.

I underscore Donna’s role because at the end of the day – you know, people ask you who you work for. You’re supposed to understand that, right? Maybe it’s a board of directors; maybe it’s voters. We think we are all here to work for the athletes. Brandon Slay and his fellow athletes are the ones who should be driving our focus. When ONDCP became involved in this cause several years ago, I sought the counsel of several U.S. gold medallists to ensure we understood what our real purpose should be. Donna was one of them, and she has been a key member of our team ever since then. Donna, we have enormous respect and appreciation for your presence, your leadership, and the focus you’ve brought to our efforts.

Gary Wadler is arguably about as good as we’ve got in the country on understanding the scientific basis of this issue. When Don Vereen was sent to us by NIDA’s Alan Leshner, he brought a simple message: “base what you do on science, not ideology.” And I think, Gary, you have to serve as the voice of the scientific community to make sure ONDCP understands that that’s the bottom line to it. If we ever get beyond the science, particularly in testing, we’ll be in trouble. The athletes must understand – unequivocally – we will protect their rights throughout this entire process by relying
Another key partner is the newly formed U.S. Anti-Doping Agency, headed by Frank Shorter. I think it’s an incredible gift to all of us that Frank’s agreed to take this responsibility on. He’s a smart businessman. He’s obviously still a committed athlete. His son’s an athlete. It was clear to many of us that you can’t have a single entity overseeing potentially conflictive functions. You can’t organize, promote, and benefit from sports, and at the same time act as a credible police person on the effort. And so, I think the USOC and the National Sports Federations agreeing to establishing a U.S. anti-doping agency, and then ensuring that it has determined, high-integrity leadership is a gift to all of us. USADA is going to develop and accomplish its potential – let there be no doubt about that. I’m sure it will take us, as it does when we establish other new institutions, two to five years to get USADA where we want it to be.

But you and Terry Madden and the first-rate team you’ve got, your five thousand tests, your out-of-cycle tests, your no-notice tests are all going to accomplish what we want. And what we want isn’t to catch cheaters; it’s to assure world-class athletes that you compete based on talent and expect to win or lose on that basis.

There are also a lot of scientists in the room, probably too many to go through the list. Certainly we should recognize Alan Kom—we have enormous gratitude to Healthy Competition Foundation for your focus on this great issue. Don Catlin—thanks for being here. It’s a heck of a note to be identified as a guru at your tender age. But you sure bring an enormous reputation to this, which we appreciate.

We’ve got a lot of athletes in the room; some of them now contribute in other fields, as scientists, policy makers, and opinion leaders. Brandon Slay—what a terrific example you are. It’s not just that you’re a gold medal winner wrestler or a terrific athlete. We think you’ve got a huge heart, and you have a lot to offer as an example. You’re also in a position to underscore one of the basic principles we espoused when we got into all this. There will be no statute of limitations on cheating. And it seems to me, whether it’s East German steroid use, which wrecked the lives of hundreds of young girls before being exposed by courts, or whether it’s a test done at the Olympic sites, we need to ensure that competitors are stripped of their honors if they cheated to win. And we’re enormously proud of you being here and being able to speak to us.

Dr. Johann Olav Koss, Sports Illustrated’s 1994 Sportsman of the Year—all of you know of his athletic record. More importantly, he’s here as a member of WADA’s executive committee. We thank you for being present.

Heather Clark—President of OATH. Thank you, Heather, for being here. She was a member of the Canadian Olympic rowing team in the 1988 Seoul games. Again, that organization, we think, in many ways, ought to drive what we’re trying to achieve here: Athletes speaking out, demanding that competition not be based on pharmaceuticals, but instead on talent.

We also have the top leadership of our national sports’ organizations with us today. Scott Blackmun, will be our new USOC president. Craig Masback is here. He’s a good example of an individual and an organization sorting through complex issues: harmonizing standards; replacing intrusive politics with intelligent management. We look forward to your remarks.
We’ve got many of our international teammates here as well. A lot of them have taken strong stands in this issue. Thank God for the French – had it not been for their energy over cheating in the Tour de France, we might not have made the progress we have to date. But it turns out, there’s a lot of people that feel very strongly about doping and sports – New Zealand, Norway, the Brits, the French, the Germans, among others.

I must underscore the important contributions of Canada and Australia. At one point, we were in confrontation with the IOC; in Lausanne about eighteen months ago. But these two nations helped turn confrontation into cooperation during a follow-on summit in Sydney. Six months prior to the recent summer games we had three pretty remarkable public servants, Senator Amanda Vanstone, the Minister of Justice of Australia, Jackie Kelly, their Minister of Sports, and a determined Canadian, Denis Coderre, Minister of Sports, bring together thirty-two nations to focus on the problem of doping and sports. And in three days, it was apparent to all of us that this issue was never going back where it was before.

We maintained the momentum established in Sydney through a governmental oversight group. We had an extremely productive meeting in Montreal earlier this year. Many of us just came from Oslo where we solidified our consensus and efforts. We are truly we’re appreciative that the Canadians are represented today and for the hard work of the Australians and all in the international community who share our commitment to eliminating doping in sports.

I don’t want to belabor the history of it. But if many of you believe as I do that it takes five years to create a new idea and have it penetrate an institution, and as long as fifteen years to create a new institution. It’s unbelievable where we are now compared to where we were a couple of years ago.

If you want to understand the issue of doping in sports, it seems to me the first people you do ask are the athletes; they know all about it, and they will articulate it. It was interesting for me listening to Brandon last night say, “Look, I’ve been wrestling for, what, fourteen years. We don’t use doping techniques as elite athletes in that sport, notwithstanding the astonishing experience in the Olympics. We should not believe that all athletes are involved in this.”

What we should believe is the situation got so bad that two years ago, sports writers who have watched athletic competition, who are the second best source of information on this issue – to include Donna and her role in the media – have watched with dismay as a situation was created where the winners were automatically suspect.

What an outrage. The people who spend most of their adult life, their adolescent years, competing to win, at the end of the day, lack credibility because they are believed to have used illegal drugs and techniques to win and cheat their others competitors. And that’s what we’re going to try and turn around.

That we created a World Anti-Doping Agency in short order is astonishing. From its origins as a house-tethered goat of the IOC, it’s become an institution that in the coming several years looks to be something that will serve our purposes well. We are going to move it out of Lausanne. Dick Pound has done a remarkable job. We ought to be grateful for his leadership in standing this up and getting it going. He has been responsive to those of us who are executive board members.
But I think in the coming years, we're going to see that they will give us a common list of banned substances. They'll give us the most important gift of all—a code of ethics so that we can remind ourselves we're not about catching cheats; we're about publicly expressing our opposition to doping in sports. We've come a long way, and I think Dick Pound's leadership ought to be underscored and congratulated.

We've seen USADA stand up. We've got a modest amount of federal money in there—three million dollars last year and another three million is before the Congress now; more to follow. This is a tiny investment in our children's future to stand behind this new agency.

We've got a President's executive order empowering federal agencies to confront the problem of doping. The order will have force in the coming administration. You will see the next Health and Human Service Secretary, Director of ONDCP, and White House team standing behind your efforts.

We've got a lot of things that are not even addressed on our table: What are we to do about dietary supplements? How do we apply strict liability, which we've got do? We've got to say "young athlete, team doctor, team coach, you tested positive for Nandrolone."

You may claim you got it innocently from a food supplement you got in some store. You may claim you "ingested a legal substance and excreted an illegal substance," a line I borrowed from Dr. Wadler. But at the end of the day, it will be: "we've got a code, we've a list of substances, and you're out."

A second challenge, and I hope Dr. Wadler and others address this, there's got to be an adjudication process. We can't get caught doing things systematically stupid because we have rules. We don't wish to have sick athletes who are prohibited from listening to good medical advice and taking therapeutic agents that will deal with their pain injury, their colds or other health problems.

We've got to have some adjudication process. It can't be a guise to cloak and legitimize cheating, but I don't think we're there yet. Every news media group I talk to asks about the Romanian gymnast and this beautiful young person losing her gold because her team doctor gave her Pseudoephedrine. Many might be skeptical of that.

It's hard to imagine an Olympic team doctor not knowing what substances are prohibited. Very difficult for me to buy that; however, it seems to me we do need to get on the table sensible rules that allow us to deal with those kinds of anomalies.

Where are we going to try and go? First thing we do, it seems to me, is ensure that WADA is the heart and soul of the international response. I know that here in the U.S., Frank Shorter and USADA will require very little encouragement and guidance from any of us. I'm confident the national sport federations will work directly with them. We're going to move this ball forward.

That will happen. All of us, though, have a responsibility to help shape WADA. It's not where we need it to be today. That isn't a shortcoming; that's just a statement of its historical evolution. It's
got to end up someplace else, whether it’s Montreal or Vienna. It ought to be based on a good, analytical model and feature an open-book decision-making process.

We need a new sense of leadership. We need a code of ethics. We need a common list of banned substances. We need all this prior to the Salt Lake games. WADA must become the operational arm of drug testing for the international community. The IOC Medical Commission should migrate to a higher order responsibility of policy and oversight. I think these twin developments would allow not only credibility, but would also allow WADA to achieve what it has to do.

We also need a recognition in this country that we’re not just watching Olympic competitors; we actually care about a fifty percent increase in steroid use, in 1998, among American kids. And we care about the fact that girls had a hundred percent in steroid use in under five years. We’ve got to understand that is common activity now and that you can get these drugs off the Internet, whether you’re in Indiana or Ulan Batur.

We simply have to get out there and educate our pediatricians, our coaches, and our parents that these substances are harmful. That they atrophy testes and enlarge breasts and cause male rage and do permanent liver damage and cause irreversible gender identity damage. We’ve got to educate our kids that the real challenge in sports is not winning, but competing fairly and vigorously. I know Brandon Slay will have some words to say about this later on. We’ve got a problem with our American youngsters, and it’s common around the world.

Finally, we’ve got to deliver the goods for Salt Lake. I know that those of us in government are not supposed to say “blank checks.” But there ought to be an unbounded willingness on the part of all of us to stand behind those of you who will be here for these seventeen glorious days. And part of that expectation is the international community watching these games around the world ought to understand that they’re seeing the best, pure athletic competition; they’re not seeing doping in sports.
SPORTS AND YOUTH

Doctor Alan Korn
The Healthy Competition Foundation

Thanks. Thanks very much. I represent the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association’s Healthy Competition Foundation. Over the past year, we’ve had the great fortune of working with many of you in this room. And we could not have accomplished what we did in the first year without the help of those of you here and numerous others – doctors, Olympians, coaches, and public officials – who joined us for various events, announcements and hearings.

The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, a U.S. Olympic team sponsor since 1988, launched the Healthy Competition Foundation to educate young athletes and the public on the serious health risks associated with performance-enhancing drugs and nutritional supplements. We’ve been doing this for local events, national media relations, a web site and grass roots pledge card campaigns.

Over the past year, we’ve had some highlights and low lights, and I will briefly refer to some of them now so you’ll be up to date.

We begin with the program called the Slugger’s Challenge in which we sent a letter to the top three or four sluggers in each of the major league baseball teams and asked them to sign the pledge. Two responded. That was a low light.

We did, however, have a number of highlights with amateur athletic groups, including the U.S. swim team, who sponsored us at an Olympic trial in San Antonio and at which, Megan Kwan wore a temporary Healthy Competition tattoo when she wore her gold medal, and we were very proud of that.

We have sponsored a public service announcement called “Stumble,” featuring a teen athlete using performance-enhancing drugs who fell. It’s been seen by forty-five million Americans and is now running on a reel sponsored by ONDCP Media Match Program.

In June, we sponsored a congressional baseball team in which thirty members of Congress signed a Healthy Competition pledge, although I don’t think any will be competing in Salt Lake City in two years. But we did have public awareness based on that event.

But you know, we’ve learned some lessons over the past year, and the lessons that we have learned at the Association is that we don’t have relationships with professional athletes or, quite frankly, elite athletes. We have relationships with eighty million Americans, eighty million mothers and fathers all over the country, and with every pediatrician in the United States.

And so as we move into the second year of this Healthy Competition, we are going to focus much more intensively on what we can do the very most good.
We're going to focus initially like a laser on male hormones precursors that are doing terrible damage to our young people. We've partnered now with the American Academy of Pediatrics in a very meaningful way, and with them, will help develop, first of all, the data that we need to help the FDA take decisive action. And secondly, education materials, not only for the pediatricians themselves, but for them to share with the mothers and fathers who bring kids to their offices. We now know that we win or lose at age eight, nine, ten and eleven. By high school, it's too late.

We sponsored a meeting with the DEA and the FDA to explore ways of removing steroid precursor hormones from the over-the-counter market. We are now engaged in data collection with the American Academy of Pediatrics and hope to have success in this effort over the next year.

We have also recently issued a plea through the pediatricians to America's medical community to collect enough anecdotal data because there is no organized scientific study on androstenodine; there never can be. It would be unethical to sponsor a study subjecting children to unknown doses of any kind of hormone without any therapeutic benefit. We are, however, trying to collect the data that will help the FDA make the case to move these substances to at least prescription status, if not controlled status.

We are seeking to encourage healthy choices through positive peer pressure across the country because I do believe that if we have to test athletes for drug use, that we've probably already lost the battle.

The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, the Utah plan in particular, wants to thank you all for the opportunity of joining you today in this very important endeavor. Working together, we can solve this public health problem, not just for the Olympics and its Olympians, but for the millions of young people who look to us to teach them the meaning of healthy competition.

Thank you.
Mr. Frank Shorter
Chair of United States Anti-Doping Agency

I'm here as a representative of a very active and involved board of directors of the new United States Anti-Doping Agency. There are nine members of this board, for those of you who are unaware of our origin.

It really was through the efforts of Barry McCaffrey and the White House in the United States, as the result of having gone to the drug summit in Lausanne eighteen months ago and determining that there needed to be a totally independent drug testing agency in the United States for all Olympic sports, where there would be absolutely no conflict of interest. And its sole focus would be to administer a program of testing, research and education in all Olympic sports in the United States.

The reason I became involved is directly the result of having been with General McCaffrey, seeing and I never thought that I would be someone thinking that government involvement was necessary in much anything in life if you could avoid it. That it really essential in this case; that in order to create this agency, people who truly had the power, ability to create and implement policy become involved.

When that indeed happened, and through Rob Housman's work behind the scenes, the elements of this new agency that we discussed and formulated in Lausanne eighteen months ago, happened to show up in the task force report of the U.S. Olympic Committee in the creating of this agency. I decided I could become involved because for the first time as an athlete and a clean athlete, I felt just a little bit empowered.

And so, I came to this board, and there are two other athletes on the board. They are representatives from the Athletes Advisory Council, and it's a very, very vocal, involved group of former athletes who now endorse our position, our methodology, and hopefully our goals for the future.

Our structure is really in a way not much different from the old United States Olympic Committee testing, except that I feel that we have, in essence, in simple terms, tightened it up. We will tighten up the testing, procedures – that's where Larry Bowers, who was in charge of the Indiana labs, has come on board to be our Director of Research in that area.

We have carried over a certain number of field testers from the old USOC group in this transition, and the people, as were mentioned, where the rubber hits the road. That's what we will be relying on in these people.

But we have introduced an element, I think, when General McCaffrey made reference to the science – the science is all important, not only the tests, but so that you can, in essence, further improve that chain of custody. And so, in our procedures, which I'll describe, the changes that we've made, you'll be able to see that.

But in essence, we're in charge of the testing. We're in charge of the adjudication of positive tests. And we will impose the penalties, and we will be in charge of all appeals through arbitration.
And that is the difference is that all of the national sporting federations in the Olympic movement in the United States have signed on, so we're truly independent. We have no conflict of interest. We rely on the government for funding. We also rely, which wasn't mentioned on the United States Olympic Committee for funding. You have to bring that out because we want the money from them.

But I think the difference, and I hope that Terry Madden, who is the CEO of this new organization, comes back. Because I want him to make a couple of points if he can because he is the person who is truly going to be in charge of achieving the goals that General McCaffrey outlined.

But I view, and I think our board views this new agency, as a group that's finally considering this battle against the legal performance-enhancing drugs a competition. Our goal is to send several messages.

One is to the athlete who may choose to cheat, that the likelihood of their getting caught really is going to increase substantially over the next five years as General McCaffrey mentioned. We will be funding research in that regard. We will be, again, with White House and governmental cooperation, be working, interfacing with the drug companies to try to develop markers before these new performance-enhancing drugs come on line.

And what we want to do is send a message to the person who chooses to cheat that finally the likelihood of their being caught and punished has gone up substantially.

Now if you can accomplish that, then you really reach a critical mass in this because then, finally, the clean athletes once again feel empowered the way I did to a certain degree when General McCaffrey took up the initiative in this fight.

Once the clean athletes feel that they have the advantage back, then they become, perhaps, your biggest resource in this battle.

Then what also happens is, and this gets, from our point of view, to the education of young people. The big reason why many of us got involved was those of us with children realized, and some take issue with this. But as a former athlete whose first experience, first night overseas in a hotel room with a weight man who had just injected himself having a drug reaction and killing me on his way to the bathroom to pass out. The young athletes who emulate these stars, the world realized had gotten to the point where they were feeling hopeless and that they would have no choice but to someday have to go on these drugs.

And I think that's the big part of the message that General McCaffrey was making. But once these young athletes realize that the people who they are emulating are not taking these drugs for whatever reason, then you can start educating them to perhaps.

And this is where the education and changing the attitude comes — perhaps inculcate in them the idea that even if they choose to do, they will then get to a point in their careers where they won't be able to do it anymore.
Now this gets into the psychology of competition, and then I'll stop because I think what you see, what I'm trying to explain is that we view this as a competition as well as a scientific battle. An athlete – and Brandon, I think, and Doctor Koss can attest to this. You see, once you change the culture and the thought process of an athlete as they're getting better and better, if you – even if they're taking drugs at a younger age – hold out the possibility that they will no longer be able to do it. Then psychologically they cannot use these drugs as part of their getting better over time.

And, in essence, what you're doing is you're eliminating that type of athlete from the talent pool. And so, it's much more than simply a goal to create a system that's catching cheaters and protecting innocent people who might inadvertently or for some medical reason want to take these drugs. It's to create an overall environment where, in essence, you've made it impossible for the athlete who is going to come up from a young age to try to become an elite athlete to even enter the system because they won't be the athletes who emerge at the other end.

Now the main way in which we're going to change is that our definition of transparency is, any agency in the world can come and inspect us any time of day anywhere. Our books are open. Our adjudication is different in that we will have arbitrators all the way along in the arbitration process.

The new addition for us is that, before we even have a hearing of an athlete who's tested both A and B positive, we will have a scientific, independent, scientific review panel that will determine whether or not there's a cause of action. Again, to try to protect the clean athletes and determine that there is a cause of action. And we hope, and our goal is, to have all these arbitrations complete within a hundred and twenty days. So that's our new agency. As General McCaffrey said, we're young, we're enthusiastic. And I think the message we're going to send is that finally this is a competition. Thank you.
My thanks to General McCaffrey for calling us together as well, and I want to state at the beginning that USA Track and Field supports all efforts to rid sports of drugs at all age groups and all levels of competence.

I've prepared a fact sheet, which I can hand out during the break. I don't want this to be a focus and my remarks to be a focus on what USA Track and Field as a representative of national governing bodies has or hasn't done other than to say that we've struggled on a limited budget to do the best job we could over an eleven year period. We were a pioneer in drug testing — the very first national governing body to do out of competition testing. Our international federation has been a pioneer in drug testing.

With respect to charges made in Sydney, we have proven through documents and will continue to work with Independent Review Commission that we asked to look at our behaviors to show that the charges made in Sydney were demonstrably false.

The fact sheet addresses as well an issue that I think that this group and USADA and WADA must address — the issue of confidentiality and transparency that Frank has already mentioned.

But the bottom line is that we support externalization and independence. USADA's and WADA's work is important and must have all of our support. If anyone has any questions and wants to deal off line with the issues of Sydney, I'm happy to address those.

Our recommendations and the request that was made of those speaking was to offer recommendations as to how we can fight this battle more effectively leading up to and following the Salt Lake City games are as follows:

First, we must, within our means, increase the number of tests. USA Track and Field working with the USOC increased in competition and out of competition tests in the lead up to the Olympic games, and our athletes were tested some three thousand times by all different authorities in 1999 and 2000.

We admire the fact that USADA will test five thousand times for all sports in the United States, but if the money can be made available, we think even more testing should be done.

We must spread the testing, as Mitt Romney said. It's a fact in our sport, where it is a condition of membership of the International Amateur Athletic Federation, our international body, that you must have an out of competition testing program. Only fifteen of the two hundred and eleven countries in the IAAF have out of competition drug testing programs.

We're proud of what we've done; we know we could've done better, but we wonder what's going on in one hundred and ninety of the two hundred and eleven countries of the IAAF family. And I
should note that forty-three countries won track and field medals in Sydney. That means by
definition, twenty-eight athletes who won medals in Sydney came from countries where there was
no drug testing out of competition in their own country.

We think education of both elite and developing athletes is an absolutely critical part to this entire
endeavor. More than half of our positive tests in 1999 and 2000 were among junior athletes —
athletes aged nineteen and younger — who we don't think were cheating on purpose. They simply
fell into the web of our very wide testing activities.

In fact, I can mention a further problem: nineteen million prescriptions were written last year for
attention deficit disorder. We have two of our ongoing cases which were eighteen-year-old athletes
being treated by physicians under the standard treatment for attention deficit disorder. It fell afoul
of the drug testing rules.

Should we consider them guilty or not? Clearly, we are guilty for not doing a better job at
informing all athletes, including junior athletes, of our rules and of the dangers involved with taking
certain substances. We must take a rational approach to this issue.

We must do more research, as Frank says, to be better able to identify what are the substances that
are harmful to athletes. What are the substances to enhance performance, and we must enhance our
ability to catch those that are cheating.

We must have uniform rules across all sports, as General McCaffrey has said. I'm happy to see
Dennis Curran from the NFL Management Council here. In my mind, of the so-called big four
sports — football, baseball, basketball and hockey — the NFL is the only sport that has taken a
responsible approach to performance-enhancing control. They don't get it perfect, just as the
Olympic world doesn't get it perfect.

But what are the NBA, Major League Baseball and Hockey doing? In my mind, virtually nothing,
and we have a responsibility to speak out about that, hold them to the same standards that we hold
ourselves to in the Olympic world and to get some movement in those sports as well.

We must ultimately be working towards something that's not possible in two years or perhaps even
five years, and that is a single international testing authority for all drug testing. That way we can
be sure that the drug tests will be handled in a uniform fashion around the world, and then that we
turn over any alleged positive cases to a single cast arbitration system.

No more should we have individual sports groups, or frankly, individual countries, handling drug
testing. Even though USADA is a big step forward, the entire system should be internationalized.

At that point, we will have literally a uniform system and a law of sports where we can be confident
that every case and every country will be treated in the same way.

I add my voice of support for new controls over nutritional supplements and their labeling.
Whatever it takes, all of us must be part of this effort to lobby Congress. And to get the rules
changed so that when any American takes any substance that they purchase over the counter, they
can be sure that there is nothing in those substances that would run them afoul of any drug testing
rules or will endanger their health.

And finally, we must work together, not against one another. USA Track and Field was a victim in Sydney. It hurt not only our individual athletes and the integrity of our organization and our sport, but the entire US Olympic team. We believe that we've been a world leader in drug testing, never saying that we've been doing it perfectly.

But I should point out that never once, other than the USOC taking over our actual testing in 1996, did anyone ever offer to help. We were part of a system trying to do the best that it could. But what's clear through the success already of WADA and the potential of USADA, that if we all work together, including outside of Olympic sports and including professional sports, we can do a far better job.

Thank you for inviting me to take part.
Mr. Steve Hill
Coach, Davis County (Utah) School

General McCaffrey, Mr. Ibarra, thank you for allowing local coaches and local athletes to have a voice here today.

I'm pleased to bring good news today. It is that most of the youth are not drug users, that drug use is not the norm among our young people. Most of our young athletes are not using so-called performance-enhancing drugs; however, the use of these readily-available performance-enhancing drugs is becoming increasingly acceptable and tolerated by our young athletes, their parents, and even some coaches.

A decade ago in the area where I coach, we were dealing with the number of athletes who were being supplied with illegal steroids through a local gym. At that time, it was relatively easy to convince parents, athletes and others that these steroids could do long-term damage. We were able to point to dramatic examples of long-term effects and emphasized the illegal implications of continued use.

Materials and resources were available through various athletic organizations. A then popular show, "21 Jump Street," even devoted an extended episode depicting damaging effects of a high school football player's steroid use. This video was made available to show to student athletes and to parent groups, and we felt our efforts in this area helped to decrease drug use among our athletes.

Today, however, we face, and especially in our area, an increasing competitive drive to be number one at any cost. Young men and young women aspire to emulate Olympic and professional athletes. These high-profile athletes' use and their highly-publicized successes serve to confirm the belief that drugs can only help one to achieve. The drug use is acceptable.

In the Internet. Many athletes and their parents believe these are safe drugs and without side affects. After all, they say, andro was legal in some professional sports.

Our experience is that student athletes are increasingly using these performance-enhancing supplements, and that many that are currently banned in professional and Olympic competition, but again readily available to junior high, middle school or high school athletes.

We also see with this an accompanying use and abuse of over-the-counter stimulants, such as caffeine, ephedrine products, et cetera, as well as an increase in the use of illegal drugs to deal with the pressure to excel and to win.

A few months ago, I had in my office as a result of a series of fights, a student that had been involved in several fights in his school. During our interview, I inquired about his drug use. His response was swift and firm, "Drugs are for idiots. They will ruin you." We were still curious, however, about this young man's use. Although he maintained he wanted to be a college athlete and would never do drugs, there was no explanation for his unexplained outbursts, including attacks on his girlfriend and his mother.
No drug use ever? No, none.

Our conversation then turned to his size and his strength and his daily workout regime. He was equally quick to attribute his success to the use of what turned out to be enormous doses of over-the-counter supplements.

Upon hearing this, his mother breathed a sigh of relief and explained that she was so pleased and so happy that he wasn't using anything, quote, "damaging or illegal." As aside, his girlfriend was also using these same drugs to improve her athletic performance and a few months later became involved with illegal drugs.

She said her use was to help her cope with the pressures of school and athletic competition as well as a personal drive combined with family and coach expectations, which she explained were extremely high for her.

Our experience with student athletes that use these drugs and abuse over-the-counter drugs and supplements suggests the following contributing factors: These drugs do work in the way that athletes desire. Sometimes I think we try to convince kids that drugs don't work, and they find that they do.

There's an adolescent perception of invincibility. There is an increasingly apparent perception of acceptance of drugs among athletes, including their peers, as well as highly visible athlete. A perception, real or otherwise, of parent, coach and governing bodies accepting use; a belief that there are low or no serious side effects and extreme pressure to win and to excel.

Athletes this young find more reasons to use versus more reasons not to use. And again, parents and society don't see this group, if you will, of youth as typical drug users.

As Mr. McCaffrey as aptly stated, "Drug use in sports today has reached a level that jeopardizes the integrity and legitimacy of athletics as well the health and safety of athletes and our youth. This problem affects far more than a few elite athletes."

I agree with and I applaud the Office of National Drug Control Policy and their national anti-drug media campaign. I would encourage the continued use of their outlined strategies and urge that they be expanded to include campaigns of providing information directed specifically to parents and to youth coaches.

Thank you again for allowing me to speak.
Open Discussion

Mr. Mickey Ibarra: I wonder if we could open the floor. We've got, fortunately, the time. Everybody's been so disciplined in focusing their initial remarks. Why don't we open the floor and direct any questions at or to our original presenters.

Yes, please.

Question: I'm Angela Schneider from Canada, University of Western Ontario. My perspective is coming from the ethics perspective – ethics in sport perspective. And what I was really happy to hear is the emphasis this morning on education.

A few people have been talking about that in particular. And we've been trying to focus on that in Canada. And my comments are more in the words of suggestion, the challenges with trying to focus on education.

If you don't separate your budgets up front, it won't happen because the money will get pulled into testing and into legal fees, litigation and all these things that drive the system. And so you have to prioritize education at the front and give it its own budget, and it's got to be a systemic education, not just for the athletes, but for the coaches, the parents, the system because it's the system that's sick and needs that help.

In ways that we weren't able to, maybe you can as you start with USADA, make sure up front, make a commitment – fifty-fifty. Fifty percent's going to education, or whatever it is, and that education is going to not just focus on the medical side, but the social science and humanities side, the reasons for dispositions to motivations to use drugs; getting up the demand side from the psychology side and the ethics.

So it's a real challenge to stay focused on trying to get some education out there, and it's the only that's going to do prevention.

Mr. Mickey Ibarra: Comments very well taken. I think you are correct. The front end isn't testing; it's dealing with coaches.

To get back to Coach Hill's comments, early on, Rob Housman and I and others blundered into the sort of intuitively obvious fact that some of the most credible people in our society in formation of youth attitudes are coaches.

They actually spend more time with our children than do the physics teacher, or in many cases, mom. They have greater credibility, and when they tie an anti-drug attitude into athletic performance, it sticks. We put together sort of an ad hoc effort a few years ago on the coaches.

I don't know if you remember seeing that. But it wasn't funded, so you're right on the money. We need to get organized on this in providing materials and resources to U.S. coaches.

Any other thoughts?
Question: I'd like to ask Coach Hill, how can we best help you? What are the things that we can provide to coaches and parents who are coaching to get that message out?

Coach Hill: Well, I think some of the efforts that we see on television, Internet, are very valuable. They are typically targeted toward athletes specifically. And often, parents and coaches don't see their role in that. There aren't specific materials available for, say again, parents, and getting materials in the hands of coaches is often a difficult process. But I think that materials that would specifically target those groups that are extremely helpful.

There is credibility among these elite athletes that sit here today when they say that they don't use drugs to enhance their performance. And certainly, the interdiction efforts, the testing efforts are valuable, again, when combined with those education efforts that oftentimes have parents and coaches pushing young athletes into those situations and allowing it.

Question: Coach Hill, what about the coaches associations here in Utah and just nationally? How engaged are they and what ought they ought to be doing?

Coach Hill: I think there's been a heavy push in this area with regard to the use of illegal drugs. The use of those over-the-counter supplements really opens up a can of worms for us in terms of how do we police it, how do we enforce it.

There has to be a real emphasis on self-policing. Those organizations haven't quite figured out how to do that, so it really falls to individual coaches, individual schools to do that. It's a difficult task, I think.

Question: One of my observations as I've gotten more involved in this is also when you talk about the coaches, there is the implicit pressure combined with what I would call the "who's going to blink first" psychology. And so, here you have coaches who know what's out there and know what works.

And the way they're sending the messages when the steroids started in collegiate football back in the late 60s and early 70s, coaches would simply say, "I want you to come back from summer vacation thirty pounds heavier." So there was this implicit pressure knowing what was out there. So a big part of the education is getting to the coaches. But these are the coaches in professional and Olympic sports at the highest levels, because that same implicit pressure is what is there. You don't have to tell someone to take a drug. You just have to put the pressure on them to perform to a certain level, knowing that the only way that they can achieve that level is to be on that drug.

And that really is an area in which the coaches become involved. And how you get beyond that "who's going to blink first" — I mean, everyone can say, "I don't want my people using these drugs," but it's the old, as General McCaffrey said, "Everyone else is doing it, so I have no choice."

And so I think one of our major goals is how do we somehow — and the only way I can see is the certainty of getting caught. But beyond that, how do you attack that psychology at the coaching
level, which puts the implicit pressure on the athlete because the coach has somehow found a way to rationalize, influencing the child without actually stating it.

Mr. Mickey Ibarra: Doctor Nash, please.

Dr. Nash: One of the things that the National Institute on Drug Abuse has been particularly pleased to support in recent years has been the ATLAS Program that was initiated by Doctors Lynn Goldberg and Diane Elliott. ATLAS is an acronym that stands for "Athletic Training and Learning to Avoid Steroids."

It is, has been piloted in Portland, Oregon in thirty-one schools. And the result of its pilot test has shown that it's reduced somewhat, not only anabolic steroid use, but also reduced other illicit drug use, such as other marijuana, and it has been able to reduce other inadvisable behaviors, such as driving while drinking.

I'm happy to say that Salt Lake City is going to be the next place where this is going to be implemented. And [inaudible], of course, is happy to support the evaluation process on this program.

What this is, is a training and nutrition program that's sort of given by coaches to their athletes. They also use pure trainers – kids that are the age of the adolescents that are being trained here.

And so they get advice on the proper techniques for training and athletes. They get advice on proper nutrition. They do get a message over the course of several on how to avoid illicit and licit drug use. And they also have parental involvement. It lasts anywhere from seven to fourteen weeks, depending on how it's implemented.

And within two years, a similar program called the Athena Program will be directed at teenage girls.

Question: If I can comment on an issue that, I think, faces all of us who address this educational issue, and it's how to approach the message and what to say as a predicate to introducing a program. And I think there's been some reference to it, but it's very important. That is, if the predicate that everyone is doing it, and we've got to stop it, that you can't be an Olympic athlete unless you cheat, we send absolutely the wrong message. And yet there are many in this movement who have made that the predicate.

That's the reason for having programs. There is no evidence that that's true. I can only speak from my personal experience, admittedly, a little bit outdated at this point, that no one in my event when I was competing was cheating in any way.

So there was at least one event, the men's mile or fifteen hundred meters, where the athletes were clean and were not using performance-enhancing drugs. It's not necessary. We have athletes at this table who are proof of that.

And so we can't begin with that as the rationale or the predicate for the programs because that in
itself influences the coaches as Frank was saying.

On the other hand, we as a society have a larger issue that affects our ability to have a credible message here, and I often tell the story about my own personal case.

When I was the fastest kid on the block, encouraged to run in July 4th race, my parents would say, "Well, why don't you eat a candy bar before the race because that will give you energy for the race?"

In high school, I had a coach completely above board. His interests were that I succeed in the most appropriate way possible. But he suggested once or twice that I eat raisins or dextrose tablets or something of that sort. [Inaudible], someone who we might have questions about with respect to how he won his gold medals, won his gold medals in Munich. He said that he took Bee pollen, and everyone on my college track team started Bee pollen.

And thank goodness when he won four years later and said that it was reindeer milk, there was no reindeer milk available in central New Jersey because we would've bankrupted ourselves looking for it.

But you can see the point, which is most, if not all, of the things I just mentioned are acceptable performance enhancers or psychological performance enhancers. And every athlete today probably does something, whether it's merely vitamins or milk or whatever they might drink that is perceived by them and their coaches as helping their performance and training.

And it's that line that has to be drawn, and firmly drawn, as to what's legal and not legal that is critical. And it's our job to make sure that society helps us draw that line very, very clearly so there's no doubt about it at all.

Question: I would like to comment that in the United States, we really do not have a systemic system of coach certification. It's basically "teach yourself." It's the mom, the pop goes out as the coach. I sort of like to ask Angela because it's different for neighbors in the north as to how you deal with that in Canada and what impact that has on coaching attitudes and knowledge.

Dr. Angela Schneider: We do have a level of coaching certification that runs from level. I think we're now up to five. It used to focus just on technical certification that they were able to do just that part. But now in recent years, there's been a focus on the psychological, nutritional, and now ethics, too.

So there is in place a system to put them through an educational process. The assessment is not very accurate. It's a "pass/fail" if you show and get through the thing, and that needs to be improved. But at least we're getting people to come and participate, and there is a recognition of that level of certification.

Question: If I might, I think our local association has had a great influence on the American coaching effectiveness training program, asking our local coaches to be certified. And there's been a good effort in that respect. I think our universities do some excellent training, and I see a couple
of people here from University of Utah.

I think, again, our difficulty at the younger level is apparent perception that these drugs are acceptable and that they do no long-term damage. If they did, why would those professional athletes be using them? So there is a heavy perception in that parent group, and again, among some coaches, that it is perfectly acceptable; that is absolutely legal to use.

And then again, for those young athletes, if one is good, two is better, and if two is better, then three is really best. And so there's a tendency to not only use, but to heavily overuse those supplements.

Question: Part of my view in this in how the coaches, the parents and everyone views this – and to speak a little bit not so much in response to Craig but maybe to elaborate – a lot of this has to do with just at what point you place your own personal denial in this. And one of the beauties of working with General McCaffrey – as you know, mention was made of his storming the Hill and mention was made of being a loose cannon.

I think he's sort of stormed the Hill dragging his loose cannon behind him. That's my image of General McCaffrey. But there is a method to his perceived lack of self-control, which anyone who's spent any time around him can tell you works very effectively for him.

But I think I personally in this problem would rather err on the side of being pessimistic about the numbers and being pessimistic about the extent of the use. Because America is – and we're going through this right now – we're a nation that in a sense expects crises from time to time as we have in the election right now. And then we resolve those crises and go on in a period of equanimity.

But in order for the American public to react, they have to truly perceive a crisis, and in this case, we have to get over our denial. As much as it's wonderful to see professional sports represented here, all of us who are next Sunday going to lie on the couch and watch the football game are to a certain degree practicing a certain amount of denial.

So I think as we pursue this along with the "who's going to blink" attitude that we have to have. I think we also have to always – as we're evaluating every aspect of what we're doing – consider the denial factor in the same way that the parents of these children are in denial. They want to be convinced that there is no harm. Many people would like to think that the use is not as pervasive as it is.

A big part of this education and what we need to do is to educate the coaches and the parents because a big part of this is these young kids know. They know what they need to use; they know where they can get it. As they reach a certain level, then their coaches kind of learn from the athletes, not vice versa. They become involved in that process.

And all the way along there up until now, all of us parents lying on the couch watching sports on television have been practicing a certain amount of denial. And so I think that's what we really also have to consider as we go through today.

Don Johnson: I'm with the FBI, but my comments would probably be more appropriately from me
1 as a parent and as a grandfather.

3 I applaud what you're doing. I am impressed with what I've heard here today. I was raised by 4 parents who taught me that it's not whether you win or lose, but it's how you play the game. It's not 5 whether you win or lose, but it's how you play the game. And what I'm hearing you say today, and 6 what I've experienced with my grandchildren, it's win. We're focusing on winning.

8 Now you're shifting the effort to how you play the game. And that's where I applaud you because 9 our youth have to understand if they don't play fair, if they cheat, if we set the parameters and tell 10 them what they can and cannot use in athletic events, and if they don't play by the rules, they lose. 11 It's okay for them to focus on winning, but they got to play fair.

13 So I applaud what you're doing. I think it's a great effort.

15 Question: I want to pick up on what our coach told us, and that is that our coaches are focusing on 16 legal drugs and what we consider these legal drugs are sneaking up on them.

18 I was privileged to be invited by the Senate of New Hampshire annual meeting of athletic directors 19 and gave them what I thought to be a very low-key talk about some of these dangers. And an 20 interesting thing happened: Many high schools have Sobee — that's a creatin-laced soft drink — on 21 the shelf in the cafeteria next to the milk and next to the Coke.

23 A couple of coaches called me as recently as last week and said, "They're off our shelves." Creatin 24 is not harmless, especially when taken in combination with ephedrine and other stimulants. It can 25 lead to sudden death or kidney failure and lifetime dialysis. And they're not going to get enough in 26 one bottle of Sobee to do it. When they go home, they buy more on the Internet.

28 And you know, Doctor Garrett, who is someone known to many of you at this table, who's involved 29 with the pediatrician said the most common complaint that his kids — eight, nine, ten and eleven 30 year olds — tell him about the creatin they take is that their acne gets worse.

32 Now the skin is not a target organ for creatin; it's a target organ for testosterone. So when they go 33 to the web and they buy creatin, it's more likely than not laced with testosterone.

35 So just sharing with the athletic directors in New Hampshire was an epiphany, and I can't tell you 36 what a pleasure it was to do. And it's the kind of thing we want to do a lot more of. Just call.

38 Thank you.

40 Question: Can I ask Terry Madden — Terry, the charge to our chairs of this task force is to figure 41 out what the federal government can do to help. One of the important questions is as you go, and 42 Frank also, to move USADA ahead, what do you need from us?

44 Terry Madden: The last part of the puzzle I'm putting together with our organization is education. 45 We've already met with Blue Cross Blue Shield many months ago. Education is a key element the 46 government can help us with, but we need more money for research. We need to catch up and get
even with the athletes who have decided to cheat.

But then we need to get ahead of them. So research funding would be great. We, like everybody else, are non-profit, but we’re moving down the road. Our budget’s about seven million annually, but we’ve committed two million per year out of our funding to research. The experts have told me in the areas of anti-doping and sport, and I’m not an expert in this area, but you need funding of six to ten million dollars per year to conduct adequate research.

So with WADA’s program, other countries’ programs, we’re probably up at about the sixth level, but if we could get up to the ten level and coordinate them – all the countries, WADA, USADA, and all the international drug agencies – we’d be well down the road.

**Question**: And in terms of your long-term planning purposes, what’s your time frame on that would you like to see us adopt? Year by year?

**Terry Madden**: I need two things. First of all, I need quadrennium (sp?) funding for USADA. Right now, we’re on a year-to-year basis for the government. Our arms length contract with the United States Olympic Committee to conduct the testing and the adjudication processes for the athletes – that’ll be quadrennial funding.

We would like the Congress to move forward. So I can budget for four years, I need to know where our money is coming from. We’re going to do five thousand tests this year, or in 2001. Our first quarter will be low in testing because we’re installing new databases. Where we want to be in the year 2004, the year of the Athens games – eight thousand tests and fifty percent no notice or out of cop, however you wish to refer to them. So I’m going to need more funding to go from five to eight thousand tests, also.

**Question**: You want to speak about imprimatur also?

**Terry Madden**: The other – imprimata or imprimitur – it depends which Jesuit school you went to. We need from the federal government some type of one line designation that says “The United States Anti-Doping Agency is the official drug testing agency for the Olympic movement in the United States.” And why do we need that? Because right now, we’re not invited to the table of the Council of Europe, and we still might not be with that.

We’re not invited to the table with IATA, which is the International Anti-Doping Agencies. They want us to sit there with ONDCP. We are forming currently a Council of Americas, which will be strikingly similar to the Council of Europe. Ole Sorensen is leading that effort.

The United States Anti-Doping Agency is in that working group. And now we’ll have to call in ONDCP for the February meeting because I believe – Rob, is it OAS that will host this and sign this in April possibly, and we’ll either have our Secretary of State or some equivalent signing that.

But I need a government imprimatur that says we’re official. And I don’t know if that’s one line – we’ve discussed this – attached to some obscure bill, however it gets done. But we need it done. And the quicker, the better for us.
Frank Shorter: And the other thing long-term is our independence because we know we are independent. We know we have no conflict of interest. But it's also the perception that's very important. And it's the perception worldwide as well as in the United States because everyone from a foreign country here knows, but maybe Americans aren't aware, that all the wood that's been piled on us, as Rob said recently, has been deserved to a certain degree. And we have to, as we go on, be able to create a way of funding ourselves, that more and more shows that we are truly independent.

So we are now relying on government funding; we're relying on USOC's funding. We would hope that in the future, a big part of the education process would come from the private sector. We also acknowledge that getting Blue Cross and Blue Shield to fund testing to try to catch cheats isn't really the kind of things you'd like to be involved in.

And so, we do have to figure out where the money's going to come from. But the jump start that General McCaffrey gave us is tremendous, but again, we understand that appearance and reality have to be blended together here. And we are truly independent.

And what I'd like to point out here is that the board — Terry, for instance — very, very successful in other areas, and I won't go into it. But our entire board is made up of people who essentially have in essence already had their success.

So we're not looking for this to take us anywhere else than where we are. And I think Donna de Varona is someone who works in the same fashion. And so I think I just want to let you all know that. Arturo, I told them about transparency, and you might want to repeat what your definition of transparency is.

Comment: Well, I spoke to the Council of Europe in the last thirty days — IADA, IKADS, which is all they could help me with. Our definition of "transparency" — it's very simple: we'll invite any other drug testing agency, any member of the Council of Europe, WADA, the IOC can show up any day of the year on our doorstep and come in and audit us. We have nothing to hide. No longer do we expect our NGOs or national federations to ever be accused — or they're out of the game — of delayed testing, hiding testing, or whatever.

It's USADA now. We invite them in. We've invited the international federations into our adjudication process. They can appear as party or observer. We want buy-in from them. Our adjudication hearings are only case arbitrators — the highest tribunal in sport. We expect to finish every hearing within a hundred and twenty days; that's our goal.

There's no more delays. We're in this for real. Our national federations should never be accused of anything again. If there's a screw up from right now, it's me from here on. You can come to my doorstep. We're the people; we're in charge; we have complete jurisdiction.

Comment: And we're replaceable on a daily basis.

Comment: I just want to support what has just been said because I think that many people in this
do not know that the perception of us in the United States is very negative. Most of the world
thinks we pre-tested our athletes before the Olympics so they’d go clean, and we taught them how
to cheat. This is not true, but that’s the perception.

And when Terry talks about the fact that we need to be designated or USADA needs to be
designated as an independent agency, that mechanism will give the United States standing in an
international world where we’ve had none until General McCaffrey charged the Hill and put us in
play.

But when the General leaves – and I’m basically giving what I was going to say during my speech –
we have no guarantee that we have access on the protocol level where WADA has been set up. We
have individuals, like Doctor Vereen and myself and Doctor Wadler that are some committees.
But as far as a presence in a way that gives us the credibility and the protocol we need
internationally, we don’t have that, and we desperately need that. By force of personality, General
McCaffrey and the President and the White House and Rob and Mr. Ibarra, we’ve had great
influence, but the next step is critical that we move forward.

Most countries have sports minister; they have a sports ministry in their country, which gives them
the protocol basis to be present at these meetings. WADA is made up of sports ministers of
Europe. Maybe the creativity around that is what we’re doing now, which is the American Council,
like the European Council. So we had the leverage and leadership.

I’m not pessimistic because I’m always full of hope, and that’s why I’m back at the table. But
we’re at a very critical step, a watershed moment with the Olympics in Salt Lake. In order for us to
move over, we have to give USADA the teeth, the guts, the money, the presence, the description
that we need, and internationally through the White House and through our efforts after this
Administration changes.

We need to designate a sports ambassador, a sports minister or something that’s definite rather than
the force of personality and someone as visionary as General McCaffrey placing this issue in the
White House. And I want to include Rob Housman, too. But the more you travel internationally,
the more you understand that we don’t have credibility and have incredible people now that are
independent, that have devoted their lives to making a difference in this area.

So thank you for letting me have my intervention.

Mr. Mickey Ibarra: We are going to have to reset, recock and move on. Gary, perhaps one
further comment?

Question: One quick question for Frank. Five years down the road – what do you see as the inter-
relationship between USADA and WADA?

Frank Shorter: Obviously, I haven’t talked to the board about this, and I’m not begging off the
question. So personally, I would like to see USADA – well, Terry talked about the audit. We want
to report to someone. We don’t want to be independent.
We don’t want to be totally out there with no oversight. And so I foresee more and more oversight by WADA, and my feeling would be as long as the United States interests could be represented on WADA, the way it is with General McCaffrey, yes – more and more influence there.

And the way WADA works now, as I understand it, they contract out most of their testing anyway. So I think it’s not so much a goal that you would strive. I think it’s just going to evolve. I think eventually the two agencies will almost blend together, and that’s the goal because I do agree with Craig on this that eventually worldwide, from the athlete’s perspective – and again, as the General said – we’re here for the athletes. And what you want is for every clean athlete to go into any training session as a youngster or any competition as an adult knowing that this system of testing is to their benefit, and they have security in that system and confidence in the system.

And the best way to have confidence in a system is an athlete to know that it’s consistent wherever they go worldwide. It’s something they never have to think about. So it’s logical that you would want WADA to eventually be totally in charge, but then all of a sudden, you’ve gone back into politics.

And so, that’s the goal is to have WADA be as independent as I feel USADA is right now. Then I could go back to my cave, and I would be perfectly happy to have that happen because my goal in this is to have every athlete feel that being clean – that the thought never enters their head to be dirty.

Mr. Mickey Ibarra: Can we take the questions, two comments quickly from the floor, and then go to Johann?

Colonel Jeanne Picariello: Thank you, sir. Colonel Picarello, U.S. Army, World Class Athlete Program, and thank you for including all of us in this conference today. I wanted to support what Terry had said earlier.

I did a quick teleconference poll of my bob sledders and bi-athletes yesterday. The majority of the U.S. team is from Army National Guard, so they’re getting ready for 2002. And they, without question, said they wanted more research. They wanted me to bring anything for it, and ma’am, this goes into what you were saying – the spinoff.

More research on mental and psychological effects of doping and to promote that in the education instead of the old man syndrome, “Hey, your liver may fall out in twenty years.” If you’ve got the gold medal, you’re set for twenty years.

You worry about that later, so they want to show a theme of there’s something wrong with your moral fiber. Your self-confidence is unraveling if you now need to rely on drugs. So I just wanted to throw that out on the table.

Mr. Mickey Ibarra: Let me just add by way of background. Jeannie Picarello is not only a great Army officer and a leader, but we sent her down to Fort Benning, Georgia to take charge of the Army physical fitness training center. She’s upgraded the standards of the infantry for us considerably. I welcome her intervention.
General Jeff Arbogast: General Jeff Arbogast. I represent the National Federation of Coaches and their governing board. That is eighteen thousand high schools across the United States representing all fifty of our states.

We, three years ago, instituted a coaches training program, which is now active in thirty-seven of our fifty states. I also work on the publications committee with that organization, and I've noticed over the last three years a very basic lack of information regarding both legal, over-the-counter, all types of supplementation drug usage, all of that information, in our publications of the National Federation.

Our coaches federation, which does represent all of those high school and youth programs all the way up the elite level athletes, would love to have more information, more tie-in, with what is going on from this task force.

I believe that could be at least one of our points of entry that’ll hit every single athletic director, every high school coach that receives all of our publications and information as the national governing body of high school and youth athletics.

And so we do need to do something to grease those wheels, so to speak, to get this operation moving because there are some programs there. There are some programs nationally that would be effective if we get the information.

I don’t think that’s a problem right now with any individual entity. I do think that there needs to be some cooperation between the two because we do have a form out there to get information, current information, to all high school and youth coaches. We just have to get that ball rolling.

Mr. Mickey Ibarra: What a hopeful reminder that many of the people in the room have much larger audiences. I know we have a boy scout publication represented here, too. So we welcome your participation.

General McCaffrey: We’re going to have move forward I know. But let me, if I can, thank that panel on sports and youth, Alan Korn, Frank Shorter, Craig Masbach, Steve Hill in particular.

At the end of the day, it’s the coaches and these thousands of communities at the end of the day that have probably one of the dominant roles in shaping youth attitudes in America.

Steve, we thank you for your interjections.

I also promised USADA – Terry Madden and at Chairman, Frank Shorter – we’ll sort this out. We’d better do it in the next twenty-one days in trying to regularize. We’ve been screwing around with this for a long time. God, it’s almost impossible to have anything happen in a democracy.

I’ve taught American Government for four years. We purposely created a system where nobody’s in charge, and we actually like it this way apparently.
But we do need to provide some instrumentality in the United States standing to USADA. We need to make sure there is a membership. I think at the end of the day, Donna, the next Secretary of Health and Human Services, the next Director of Office of National Drug Control Policy, using this executive order as a regulatory basis, will continue to implement.

We do have a U.S. national doping in sports strategy, we've now got a body. We've got money flowing into it, and it's broader than the executive branch. We're going to have continuing oversight out of Orrin Hatch, Bill Bennett, Senator Stevens and others. So I'm very hopeful that the next team will pick this up.

A final comment on youth attitudes. It's always a sensitive point, you know. I don't for a moment believe that the majority of athletes are doping. I never did find that. I thought it was nonsense. There was also inescapably — you know, America is a good target.

Why not? We're self critical in public. There's too many of us. We've got too much money. We talk all the time. So we were taking a few hits there, a lot of it undeserved. We ought to shrug that off, though, and keep our eyes on what we're trying to achieve. We did write up a list of objectives for this conference to remind ourselves of our purpose.

I also think one of the problems — and Steve probably best postured to address this — I talk to youth audiences all the time about illegal drug abuse. And let me just tell you that the standard interjection I have, I know from solid science that most young Americans are not using illegal drugs. You take the twelve to seventeen year old age group as a cohort. Eighty percent of them or greater have never touched an illegal drug period.

Now you move the ball around and you get different assertions. Seniors in high school — one out of four probably currently [inaudible] drug use. Maybe half of them have been exposed. But basically, if you look at the four thousand students of a huge high school, they're not using drugs. But they think everybody's doing it but them.

So when I walk in the door, and the class president's there and the head of the cheerleaders and the this and the that, when I ask them how many kids in this school use drugs, they'll tell me, "You're looking at the only people in school who aren't." And that's something that we've got to surmount because until all of us who deal with young people can beat that publicly expressed ethic, we've got a problem.

And I think the same thing is happening in athletic competition. The winners are being impugned because it's widely perceived by many people that they couldn't have gotten there without cheating.

All of that panel — we welcome your intervention. I remind you we would also look forward to any of your written documents you submit to make sure we can include them in the record. Let me ask Rob to move us ahead now.

Mr. Mickey Ibarra: Before we do that, let me just add my thanks to the panel as well, and in particular, to Coach Hill. As a former classroom teacher in Utah, for five years working with at-
risk high school students, I understand, Coach, the important role that you play each and every day with our youth. And I want to thank you for being here with us.

Can I add one footnote, which I promised Johann would help him because Johann and I have had a lot of discussion about transparency? And Rob asked a specific question as to what the government could do to help this effort. And I'm going to give an answer which is a personal answer because it's politically incorrect, and I don't want Terry or Frank or Scott Blackman or actually USA Track and Field to be associated with it. And I think one of the things.

The Amateur Sports Act, which says you may not suspend or remove someone from competition someone who hasn't had a hearing, ultimately undermines the overall effort that we have here. It's at the core of the challenges USADA will face just as we as the national governing body faced and that the USOC has been facing.

It is not politically correct to say that we should get rid of that or alter it in some way, maybe just in the drug context, given the history of the Amateur Sports Act.

But I think the issue of transparency, and I'd like the USADA definition of transparency. The issue of transparency is very heavily implicated by this. What we all care about is a level playing field.

If the most important thing is the level playing field. Then knowing that an athlete who's tested positive in the USADA and an A and a B positive in a medical review of that to confirm that it's a positive, removing an athlete from competition at that point helps level the playing.

If at some point they are put back because they win the adjudication, fine. That's okay. But let's get that athlete off the playing field, and right now the law of the United States prevents that. And if the government wants to help, that's something the government could do.

Now there's a second issue that General McCaffrey asked me to mention. And I'll only mention it - which is I happen to believe that if you are successful in doing that - in other words, removing the athlete from competition - the confidentiality of the process should be maintained until the end of the adjudication.

But I'll stop; I won't argue that, and I'll pass it over to Rob and Johann.
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I will first start with thanking very much for being invited to this incredible meeting, I will say, and the initiative made by General McCaffrey. I think as someone coming from outside the United States – I am a Norwegian currently living in Canada – looking at what’s needed possibly in the United States to improve the perception of what has been done in the United States by the fight against drug use in sports.

I will dwell two seconds on that because it has been raised already. The perception internally is bad about the USA, and about what the USOC or other national governing bodies have done to protect their athletes in participating and helping them cheat to compete against international and other athletes in other worlds.

This is the perception; we put it on the floor and lay it down to you. There is no way you ask anyone outside the United States to believe that American athletes have not been cheating in the past. This is the truth, the perception of it.

I’m extremely glad to hear, though, that initiatives, especially with USADA and the independence of USADA and the work you are willing to do in the future, especially led by you, General, and other very key, important people, is here now to improve that perception and stands for the transparency of this process.

My first comment will be to the USADA. I reflect on this, this is my reflection, and it’s a personal reflection. It’s the criticism came from the United States to the IOC in the building of the WADA, where WADA was seen to be an IOC agency done by the sports, and governments at the launch in Lausanne eighteen months ago.

My reflection is that I don’t see the American government’s involvement on the board of USADA today. I’m not criticizing the members; the members are incredible personalities. But I don’t see the government’s involvement in USADA, and I would like to see that they are more involved on the board of directors.

I have to say that because it, again, goes back to the perception of how independent it is in reflection of the composition of the board. Certainly with the leadership that has been done for yourself, General, and your office, has proven the independence and, from an athlete’s point of view, has pushed this through the WADA and gives athletes more trust in WADA itself; that I totally trust the people in USADA.

It’s not a criticism of what they, but the perception can be that this is just another USOC. I have said that even though they are open and independent and controlled it is.
We would hope, certainly with the commitment that the American government has been shown, that they will go in and take a leadership position on the board to help all the issues Terry and Frank have shown, which is important because then we can have the funding available. I won't go in to that because I think the most simple thing is to say here, as Terry Madden said, we need money.

I think USADA needs money, and I hear that you're going to have five thousand tests in 2001. And I just want to reflect on that, that Norway tests almost three thousand tests, and we have ten thousand athletes compared to your eight hundred thousand athletes. I believe that in comparison, we also do more up to eighty percent of tests out of competition [inaudible] testing for our athletes in Norway.

And I'm saying that just to show you that the dedication from other countries, though I agree with Craig that there's a look [inaudible] world that shows a fight against drugs, like Canada, Norway, Australia and others how much more numbers of testing in comparison to the numbers of athletes.

I want to go into a couple of other roles of WADA kind of very quickly. I think one of the key things that came out of the meeting was the harmonization of the rules, the harmonization of the lists, and that they will have one list across all sports and across all national and international federations. But not only the lists, but the rules and the legislation, the sanctions and the procedures. I think that was one of the keys.

The other key we came up with, of course, which has to be fulfilled is research. This research, I understand also from the discussion we had so far here today, is research on three levels:

It's research for the protection of the undetectable substances. There are still substances out there we can't detect. We need to find research for that because we know there are uses of it.

Secondly, I believe it's important to do social research. We sitting around here as experts, we have only a sitting perception of the use of illegal substances in sports today. We don't know. I think for me, it's incredible because we should know the uses of them.

I believe, like McCaffrey says, I believe that it is a minimum number of athletes who are using drugs, though the stigmatization of the winner who wins something is huge. This is totally unfair to the athletes. I believe in the same mechanisms as McCaffrey refers to when he refers to a school, when you go into illegal substance abuse that, "Okay, we are not using it, but of course, the rest of the world is using it." The same perception is in sports, and we have to combat that. And I think we can combat it by social research to find out where we are today.

I hear also from athletes that they want to know about the harm that substances are actually are doing. There is a lot of research on that. I think it's basically – steroid we know. We know also these other supplements, which we can put in the ethical gray area of use. And I think we need to focus on that. And I will use this opportunity while sitting in Utah to look at the nutritional supplements.

I think when I reflect on what Coach Hill says earlier with the special use of these nutritional
supplements and the legal stand here in the United States that you don’t necessarily need to declare what’s contained in these supplements.

I believe it’s not only affecting American youth. This affects youth and athletes all around the world. We know that lots of those supplements are produced here in Utah basically, but there are also other places all around the world.

I have stories similar to Coach Hill that says of athletes coming from eastern bloc countries using, saying, “I’ll only use this substance, and it’s legal, and it’s actually produced in the United States,” and, of course, it’s not labeled. The declaration is in Russia of what’s supposed to be in there, but it’s never containing any of the illegal substances.

Of course, athletes become victims, and it becomes an incredible problem to protect themselves to what they want to use. I wonder sometimes; I think we all see [inaudible] as Craig and Coach Hill, and we know that we want to take something if someone else takes it, and they believe it’s legal and it’s performance enhancing.

I don’t believe, as Coach Hill said, that all these supplements are healthy. I hope they aren’t, and I know they aren’t, and I think it’s more of a perception. It certainly can give sort of a psychological edge to it. But we have to prevent this, and the only way to prevent this is through education, through important peers of the athletes, through the coaches, through the parents, and especially through the athletes themselves.

And we need to focus, and I kind of agree with what Angela said earlier that we need to focus funds on education, on the moral stance of what we want to do. And our representative from FBI, I also will applaud you because how do you want to stand on the podium knowing that you have cheated? I mean, if I knew that I was cheating and standing there receiving my gold medals, I will never, ever be proud of those medals. I know that that has come to me through my coach, which I had when I was younger kid who said, “You should always, always play fair. One day, it will be your time.” That’s all this pushing on the fairness of the competition. It comes from peer people, which should be important for you all the time.

I also have been evaluating a long time your own recommendation of the storage of samples for the non-detectable substances through research at the [inaudible] stage. And everyone comes up with a reasoning that it’s logistically impossible and it’s medically research impossible and you can’t detect it. I think prevention-wise, to use some of the undetectable substances is the key element.

I don’t say that we should store thousands and thousands of urine samples that Terry Madden is going to collect. But you should have the opportunity that some athletes know that they may be stored and it will tarnish their reputation – not in twenty years when their liver is damaged, but actually two years down the road. And they will get all the problems in two or three years. It has to be a certain limitation when these possible tests can be done.

I would like to use this opportunity, again, to open up for the ISO nine thousand and two quality system. And that’s implemented in the control testing system by USADA. And I see Terry is
nodding his head and feeling that he’s kind of left outside of the IATA countries, but I do know that it is just a financial contribution.

And you will be part of that, at implementing that, as part of a very important quality control testing mechanism, which will create that consistent system where athletes are searching, where we see that we can have everywhere in the world. And I challenge you to go into that because I think it’s extremely important.

I do want to reflect, as Craig says, I’m probably one of the vocal outside the United States who reflects on the differences between the Amateur Act in regards to the confidentiality and the temporary suspension of athletes in regards to positive tests and a full proceeds hearing and appeal. The role today, and I will show an example — when WADA did test out of competition testing before Sydney, there was only testing nine weeks before the games. There were several positive samples where they followed up by only analytical examples.

One incident was in track and field, as you know. It was an athlete on the field warming up for the competition realizing that this athlete has tested positive out of competition. He was taken off the field and not able to compete in Sydney as a temporary suspension because there was a analytical A positive.

And I realize that this is not happening in the United States. It needs to happen to co-exist with all the worlds’ leading agencies and policies on this. I mean, I understand it’s a hundred and twenty days from an A sample to the hearing process and the appeal is finished as proposed from USADA.

I believe it should be much shorter. I proposed thirty days for that. I believe that it should be only two weeks between an A and a B sample tested. Our question sometimes is that — and I see [inaudible] has left the room now — but she can confirm that B samples always come from A samples in a lot of cases as long as they are tested in a similar time between each other.

Sometimes the B samples are tested three and six and ten months down the road. And of course, because of the consistency of the substance in the urine sample, it changes the lab results will be different than what they had ten months earlier. And I wanted to reflect on that because I think this is extremely important, again, to improve the perception of what you’re doing in the United States to the world and that they are following the same rules as the international.

Just two comments about what we hope could be happening in Salt Lake City and what’s happening here. I believe that Sydney was a leading and the Australian government showed a leading force to prevent doping use. They both involved the out of competition testing before the games from the Sydney organizing committee to get it to the [inaudible], but also the involvement of the independent observer during the process. I mean, an independent observer is extremely important to build trust from the athletes to the process of what’s happening. I believe that is extremely important for Salt Lake City.

I also see from the report, and I would like to share. And all of you in the room should go on WADA’s Internet site, which is wada/ama.org, which has an independent observer report because that is a very important document to see how this process within competition should be done.
There should certainly be guidelines for Salt Lake City. I believe that is a key for us.

We talked about education campaign and that the funds need to donated based on the [inaudible]. I would like one minute to talk about the volunteer anti-doping passbook, which is an athlete initiative to try to show proof that athletes are free of drugs.

You want to have volunteer proof to show and stand up. It’s a similar thing to the health card, which the Blue Cross is showing, but this is even more in depth, and I’ve shared with you all a document here which is based on the concept. But it basically builds on a proven record of all the tests you’ve done so the athletes know what the labs know.

Today that is not happening. And it’s a big weakness of the whole system that actually people in the system know more than what we know when we have been tested. And we should know; we should have rights to the results, even though they’re negative. We should know what the numbers are.

Also, but sad to say, during the IOC’s hearing, the athletes came to the hearing not knowing what they were tested positive in, and then they’re unable to defend themselves, which is sad. This will hopefully change in Salt Lake.

And then the educational component with the athletes passport is an ongoing educational campaign for them to have an ethical stand on drug-free sports. And I believe you should strengthen this initiative by having USADA enrolled as well as the United States Government. So thank you so much.
First of all, I'd like to let you all know, thank you, very much, for giving me the opportunity to be here today. This is extremely exciting for me. I just finished wrestling the Olympic finals 67 days ago.

So, my life has changed drastically in the last two months. And, I'd have to say, I've learned more lessons in life over the last two months than through the rest of my 24 years. I just turned 25 years old.

And, for many of you who don't know already, I got a silver in Sydney. And, the German received the gold. A lot of people say the German won, I say, he received the gold. And, about three weeks after the Olympics when I finally come to peace with that silver medal, I was extremely pleased to be a silver medalist.

I was going around to elementary schools and I was telling kids that there was more to life than gold medals. I've come to find out that one of the eight freestyle Olympic gold medalists in wrestling had tested positive for steroids.

And, so, initially, like I got the chance, it's a wonderful opportunity to tell many people about it last night. Initially, I felt, well, I have 1/8th of a chance to be an Olympic champion because there is eight different weight classes. And, the United States has a 25% chance of having an Olympic champion because we had another gentleman receive a silver.

And, I passed it on and thought, well, it probably wasn't the German who won. It probably wasn't him because this was his fourth Olympics, he's been wrestling for many years, he was 33 years old. Why would he choose to take steroids? I'm sure he's been dreaming his whole life of being an Olympic champion. Why would he choose to flush his dream down the toilet by rolling the dice, breaking the rules, breaking the law, cheating and taking drugs?

So, I continue to live my life as a silver medalist, I continue to tell people that there is more to life than gold medals. Then, we come to find out that it was the German in my weight class, that they had given me the gold medal. And, I was, you know, thank God, I was extremely blessed to receive that gold medal.

And, what worked out extremely well is, many people said, you know, Brandon, is that, is that gold medal tainted, I bet you really wished you would have won it over in Sydney in front of all your friends and family over there and done it the right way.

And, now, looking back on it, I'm extremely blessed and extremely fortunate that it's happened this way because it has opened up a forum for me to speak on this drug issue. And, it was a wonderful opportunity because they have the gold medal ceremony on the Today Show in New York City in Rockefeller Square in front of, I think they said, four or five million people were able to see that. And I know all the children back in my hometown and the whole area of North Texas in Amarillo,
Texas, they stopped school, they brought all the TV’s in and showed this gold medal ceremony to all these children. In which I got a chance to elaborate on the fact that it means so much to me because it has opened up the forum.

And I challenged those kids, you know, on the Today Show, I said that drugs, not only can you lose your life, but, you can lose your lifelong dream, and, like the German did. And these kids have read the articles. They know the story. It has put a story in their mind, a factual example of where they know that if they chose drugs that they could lose their life and lose their dream.

So, the medal is not tainted to me at all. And it means so much to me that it has happened this way because if I’d have won the gold medal over in Sydney, it would have come on at about 1:00 in the morning because wrestling doesn’t come on primetime, unfortunately. And not as many people would have got an opportunity to see that. So, the Today Show and the way it has happened means so much to me.

But, as far as me being here, I’d have to say, arriving here, I do not know tons about these organizations. I’m definitely willing to learn. I want to be involved. And I’m ready to read and listen to what anybody has to say, you know, about WADA and about the USADA.

Just to tell you a little bit about what my views on how to change the drug policy are and what, you know, I’ve been doing and what we’ve been doing, my group, is that, personally, I think, to turn people away from drugs you have to change their values. Because, me, as an athlete, the reason I would never chose to do drugs, just like Johan was saying is, he was speaking of that guilt mentality.

If you do drugs and you end up winning, you are going to have to live with that guilt for the rest of your life. And that is your internal thing, that’s a value-based thing, and that’s what turns people away from drugs. And that is why 80% of our school children choose not to do drugs is because they have strong values, they’ve been raised right. Their coaches teach them right and they have that strong internal value that keeps them from doing drugs.

As far as combating that on the nation, our children, we have to, the ones that are having problems, we have to try to change their values. And that’s what we’ve been doing. Since the Olympics, I’ve probably spoken to 40 schools so far. It is really neat. They show the Today Show gold medal ceremony before I walk out there to speak to these kids so they are already fired up about what is happening.

And, my best friend and I, we started a company, it’s called Greater Gold. And, what Greater Gold means is, I tell kids how wonderful the gold means to me. And, how blessed I am to have it. And, how I’ve been working for the last 19 years and putting the time and commitment in, working hard, believing in myself, doing it day-to-day, year round.

And, using the strength God has blessed me with to the best of my ability. And how that means, that gold medal means so much to me. But then I leave a pause. And I tell the kids, but, there is a Greater Gold to life. And, there is four things that I elaborate on in that Greater Gold, and this is where, when I start talking about changing kids values, I think this is where it takes place.
The four things to me are, number one, I tell them there is a Greater Gold to life because I think the greatest gold you can have in life is having God in your heart. And I tell that to them at the schools because I'm not scared.

Number two, I think there is a Greater Gold to life, and this is where it means so much to me that the FBI gentleman stood up and, talking about, it's not all about winning. There is a Greater Gold to life because it is not about the gold medals and the first place trophies and the blue ribbons and the A+'s, every single time we do something in life. It is about having a dream, having a goal, and enjoying what you do.

And when it comes time to shine, and it comes time for the moment of truth, as long as you give your best, full and complete effort, that's what makes you a winner. That's what makes you champions, not the gold medal, because there are gold medalists that aren't necessarily winners in life.

There are professional athletes who aren't necessarily winners in life. But there are millions of people in this world that are winners that aren't necessarily gold medalists. And so I challenge the kids that that's where the Greater Gold comes from, is their best effort. That's the second thing. So, I talk to them about God, I talk to them about their best effort, that's the true gold.

And, the third thing, I tell them that there is a Greater Gold to life because life is not about that one defining moment, whether we fail or whether we succeed. I challenge them to focus on the journey.

For me, my gold medal is special, but it is about the 19 years, the family support I've had, the friends, the coaches that I've had, the elementary school, the junior high, the high school, the college, the camaraderie I've built between my team mates. That's what makes me branded.

It's not the gold medal. The gold medal is not making me who I am. It's the journey that I've been on. It wasn't one defining moment. And I challenge them to focus on the journey.

And the fourth thing is, I think it's really important, and, I think, it's correlated to drug use because they see it on TV, is, I tell them that there is a Greater Gold, it's not about, necessarily, gold and money. And, I tell them that I've been blessed with the fact that I've know, and when I say blessed, because I've learned lessons from it, I have friends that are millionaires and billionaires.

I've lived that lifestyle. I've been with them in the $10M homes. I've done all that stuff and that didn't make me happy. And I know that's not necessarily what make those men happy. Because they don't lay in bed each night thinking, I'm so happy, I have this $10M home, that's just, my life is grand. They are not thinking about that. Those guys are laying in bed saying, I'm 10 pounds overweight. My kid's not listening to me. My wife is scrapping at me. The business is growing at unbelievable rates.

And how are we going to keep up with this? That's what those millionaires and billionaires are thinking. They are not, the money doesn't make them happy. And that is where I challenge the
kids. I said, I tell them, I said, get in the nicest car in school and just thinking about being professional football players, basketball player, whatever it may be, that's an awesome dream and I want you to hand on to it.

But, realize, that gaining lots of money is not going to make you happy. I challenge them to find something that they truly love and enjoy and, at the end of the night, knowing they are affecting others life. End of the day knowing they are affecting others lives, that's what's surely going to make them happy.

So that is the four things I talk about with this Greater Gold mentality. And that's what I've been doing at schools as of late. And then at the end of my speech I tell them, I challenge them. I challenge them to spread the gold. I give them a challenge. I just don't talk to them and walk off the stage and say see you later. I challenge them to spread that gold that I talked about. And then to email me back and let me know how it goes, off my website, brandonslay.com.

It's amazing, because I get back, I was in Cincinnati, Ohio, I got back from the hotel the other night, I gave this speech, I got 20 emails, immediately, from kids. Saying, Brandon, I loved your talk. I love the Greater Gold mentality. I'm going to spread the gold at my school. All my buddies and friends are already talking about it.

And that's from one talk. Challenge them to spread the gold, giving them a place to communicate with the person that they look up to. And this whole mentality that we are talking about today, I think that you can change the children by inspiring those values in them and tell them that drug-free athletes are the real heroes in life. The drug-free athletes are the real heroes.

And that's what we've been doing, and that's what, to me, and to many others around me, think is going to change the children's viewpoints. You know, we can give them a lot of reading paraphernalia. We can tell them, show them, videos where eggs are frying on pans and that's what, you know, the brain, this will happen to your brains when you do drugs. You know, they see all that, but, you got to train, you got to change their values.

I have a couple of things, I wasn't necessarily thinking about talking about these things, but they are just four quick issues that are, kind of, on my mind that I might get some feedback from, from you all. Is, a lot of kids, when I'm talking to them a lot, especially the younger ones, they say, well, you know, I have asthma and I take drugs, is that wrong?

A lot of kids are having to take drugs because of their illness and that is something that we need to educate children on too. Because their friends know that this kid is taking an inhaler and they think that he is doing drugs. Or, he is taking a drug for attention deficit disorder, whatever he may have, his sickness, and they think that kid is a druggie, and he is on drugs.

That is something that we need to work on in educating children because a lot of them ask me that question all the time. And, as an asthmatic, you know, I've taken medicine my whole life and allergy shots my whole life, just to be able to compete, so it is really close to my heart.

I think one thing that is really important too is to supplement education. And, you know, I'm not
going to lie, I take supplements. I take vitamins. I take things, drinks. I drink protein drinks after practice because I think they help me recover from practice better.

Maybe they do, maybe they don’t, maybe it is the placebo effect. Maybe that’s something that I need to learn more about.

But I think that supplement education is extremely important and where we can do that. Because I know in health class, if there is health class in school, and kids don’t know about supplements in school. But, you can educate them on what are the good supplements and what are the bad supplements.

And, to me, I think it would actually be positive if there was one supplement company that the Government knew was a very solid supplement company, that every single thing they sold was positive, was beneficial. The vitamins, minerals, whatever they are selling, was beneficial and the Government could say, this supplement company is okay. It is okay to take these supplements if you want to take supplements. But these, this, this and this, these are wrong. And I think that may help, as well.

Another question I had a lot of people ask me that I’d like to come, maybe get some feedback on, is, a lot of people ask me, well, how come they didn’t test that German before he went out there on the mat? A lot of people wonder that. They wonder why they don’t test the athletes before they go into the Olympics. How come you just test them after the Olympics? And, that is something that I’d like to learn more about.

And, let’s see, that is pretty much what is all in my heart. That is what’s on my mind. And, that is what I’m going to, I plan on continue doing, is to spread the Greater Gold to challenge kids to spread the gold and to stay in touch with them. I stay up until about 2:00 in the morning, every night. Just, 15, 20, 30, 40 emails from kids and tell them, I have kids email me saying, Brandon, I’m just a, pardon my French, but, Brandon, this guy called my girlfriend a whore and I’m going to beat him up tomorrow and what do you think I should do?

I mean, that’s really what I’ve been doing lately, is, I sit there and I say, well, I say, I tell him, your girlfriend is not a whore, you know her better than anybody. Do not listen to what other kids say. It doesn’t matter what other kids say. And you going to fight that child, that kid, is not going to do, prove anything.

All it is going to do is get you in trouble. And, I think, that type of mentality is not listening to what other kids say. It is extremely important because that’s why kids do drugs. That is where the peer pressure comes from. And if we can teach kids that it doesn’t matter what their friends are saying at school, all that matters is what they feel in their heart and what they feel in their mind.

That’s all that matters. It doesn’t matter what their friends are saying. It doesn’t matter if their friends want them to do drugs, want them to do steroids, want them to do this, want them to do that. They need to do what they want to do and feel like a winner at the end of the day because they know that they gave their best, full and complete effort.
Ms. Donna de Varona
U.S. Olympic Gold Medalist, Swimming
Advisor to ONDCP

Thank you. I am going to wander about from subject to subject because I think that my colleagues here have really covered a lot of ground that I had listed. But, I would like to point out that we have two, we've had many great interventions, but I'd like to point to this idea of transparency and role modeling in education.

I think it is incredibly important that we've used this crisis in the Salt Lake instance and this drug issue in a positive way because out of it has come a synergism worldwide that's brought back, brought out incredible leadership.

One of the things that I felt after I quit my competition at 17 and there was no where to go because there was no Title IX and no women sports scholarships and no athletes had a voice, I felt that I wanted to make a difference for athletes. And, the fact that we have Johan Olav Koss, Dr. Koss here, interfacing with us, and talking to us. And, giving us his perception of how we are seen, and the fact that he is going to benefit from learning about USADA and taking that information back to the international world is very important.

So, it says a lot about communication. It says a lot about giving athletes a chance to participate because we do come from passion and from the field of play. We know what is going on. But, again, like all of us, we cannot make a difference alone. We need resources. We need government support. We need government support, and I think this is why people hesitated to use the Olympics for political ends like boycotts, but we need the instruments of the government to implement worldwide programs that deal with testing and intervention and better rules. As my friend Craig Masbach brought out about this issue about the Amateur Sports Act in due process. So, we need to communicate.

We need to bottle Brandon Slay and send him to every high school in America. And, I'm not kidding about this. I have a young son who is an athlete. He wants to go to the Olympics. And, he doesn't like me to be away, neither does my daughter.

And, I've been away a lot, because I believe in this, this synergism has given me hope where I'd almost lost hope that we were ever going to deal with this insidious issue, this cancer, that threatens not only sport, but our young people. And, he said to me, it's okay if you go because I want you to make it possible that I can compete clean and healthy.

I remember earlier looking at my daughter who is built with great shoulders and a great athletic body, watching her swim one day, and saying, I don't want her to swim. I don't want her to go into an environment where the only way she can win is to take drugs and where winning is everything. And, I know we've touched on these purposes, these themes.

I'm incredibly dedicated, yes, because General McCaffrey did bring up, my father was an All-American football player who played at Cal and that was his way out.
And we look at young kids now that use sport to win to get scholarships, that is their way out. They may have two way outs, one is to use drugs and to sell it on the street, another one is to put it in their body to win. Because, we do, we are in denial.

Frank talked about it. He’s been a shotgun guy too. About, how we look at football games on the weekend and we are in denial about it. And, I will say I know that from experience because my brother was a football player. He wanted to be like my Dad. He was an All-American. He wanted to live up to my Dad and get his attention. And, the coach did nod to him one day and say, if you want to play center for the team, you better come back a little heavier.

This was in the 1960’s. So, one day, in the mail, a package came. And, my Dad said, what’s in the package, because my Dad was totally observant. And, in the package was dianabol. And, my Dad said, well, what’s that for? He says, well, you know, the coach said I had to get bigger and I went to another teammate, and, you know, then the trainer, and I found out where to get it. And my Dad said, well, you know, you are going to flush that down the toilet and if I ever catch you doing that again, you’ll never play ball again.

I had a little son, and this gets back into education. I had my son, we had a little project. And, this, this is a way of getting around to my idea of synergism working together with the NFL, with the Pro’s, with, you know, confronting our Pro’s to deal with this issue, and, those that have the money to fund programs.

I had a little guy that goes to school, in our community we have something called Project Charlie. Project Charlie teaches our kids about drugs, the use of illegal drugs, what to watch out for if somebody wants to give you a cigarette or alcohol or whatever. And, my little guy and my little daughter have learned about that program. It is volunteer. It is taught by parents in the school.

One day we all went out on vacation and my little guy was invited to go with this little kid on a ranch. And, after this big party in Wyoming, you know, here we are in the country, in the mountains, we were on our way home. And, I said, did you have a good time? And, John David said to me, yeah, Mom, he said, but, I went in that barn and that guy, he said, he asked me if I wanted to have a drink.

And, I said, well, what did you do? And, my little guy, at 6 years of age said, well, I asked him what was in it. I asked him if alcohol was in it. And this kid said, yeah, grain alcohol. I said, well, what did you do? He said, well, Mom, I don’t want to be an alcoholic, so, I didn’t take it. And then he offered me a cigarette. I said, what did you do? He said, oh, I don’t want to wind up like your Mom and Dad, I don’t want to die early, so, I’m not going to have a cigarette.

Then he looked at me and he said, but Mom, what’s chew? I said, did you like that? He said, no, I hated it. I had left it out. I had left it out. But he knows about performance enhancing drugs and he understood education and you can’t get to them too early. And he has a standard now. He wants to compete clean, but he wants the landscape to be clean.

And that is why we are all here at this table. And, a lot of us have waited 25 years for this moment,
this crisis. We’ve been hanging out, waving the red flag, getting in trouble, keep your mouth shut, been compromised in our jobs. Edwin Moses was a great speaker for this. And he finally had to give it up because it overtook his life and he made his statement.

And, thank God he was there. But we have an obligation in our Pro leagues, in our institutions, in our State department, in our Government, to keep this momentum going and to use Salt Lake as a watershed moment, to come up with the tests, to work together and to communicate.

From WADA to USADA to the Amateur Sports Act to revisiting the Coach’s Association to using this newly formed wonderful leadership at the U.S. Olympic Committee to host conferences, to come up with the educational materials, and please use people like Brandon Slay. Pay him to go out there and talk to our kids with the tape.

One of the most important things about his story is that it is a success in a sea of frustration. And it is a success for journalists, like myself, who felt compromised by having to cover lies. By the deceit that have created this pessimism and this idea that you have to prove you are clean, you know, you are guilty before you even start as an athlete, which is the passbook idea.

But we need to bottle our athletes that are clean, put them out on the road, have them talk to our kids. You know, if they are e-mailing Brandon, they want to communicate, and that is one of the roles that we can use with USADA and WADA, to reach everyone.

And, it is a privilege for me to be here and I want to thank all of you because I know all of you are giving your time. And, it is going to take a lot more time and effort in the future. So, thank you.
Ms. Heather Clarke
Canadian Olympic Rower, President of OATH

Hello, it’s a pleasure to be here. I was thinking about the gentleman who talked about the skin. Who was talking about the skin over here? Somebody was. Was talking about the Creatin. And, I was thinking it was a great analogy. I was thinking about our bodies and how our skin is just one of our organs, but it is our most visible organ.

And, how, if we have acne, which, I, unfortunately suffered from, so I know it well, you know we can put makeup on it or we can scrub and scrub and try to get it clean. Oh, we can do all sorts of things and it can still be there because, in fact, we can actually make it worse. We can make it worse by covering it up with the makeup. We can make it worse by scrubbing and disrupting and causing more scarring. And, we can make it better by discovering what it is that causes it. And, sometimes it might take a little while to heal.

And, I was thinking about our body as a system, and our skin as the most visible organ in it. And, it occurred to me that really our athletes are like our skin. That’s the image we present to the world. And, we want it to be sparkling clean and healthy. And, when it is not, it is distressing to us. And, if we were to get mad at the skin, you know, come on, well, it causes more stress, doesn’t it? And our skin, we break out more when we are stressed.

And, if we don’t get at what the heart of it is, then we are not going to clean out that skin. It doesn’t mean that we can’t clean it up. It doesn’t mean that sometimes makeup can’t enhance it. It doesn’t mean we can’t reduce our stress. But, we have to have a comprehensive approach. We have to have a holistic approach.

And, I think, when we look at the sports system and we look at how sport plays a role in our culture, and, now, in our global culture, I think it is really important to understand the role the athlete plays. I think it is important to understand that really our athletes are like our skin. And, they are our image, but they are not the whole story. And, I think when we then intervene and we try to make a difference for athletes, we can bear that in mind.

But, I think the wonderful thing is that, really, the athletes aren’t just the skin because the skin is really something that responds to everything around. And, it doesn’t really have much choice of its own. And, the difference is that, you know, we each have a choice of our own and we are able to not just react to the stresses, but we each have an imagination and we each have an ability to respond and to act responsively, the ability to respond. But, we don’t always know that.

And, I think one of the wonderful things about being an athlete is that on some level you are believing that you can do something. You know, you are not passively accepting life, you are actually believing that you can do something.

And that’s a myth, and, I mean myth in the most positive sense, and symbolism, that we buy into. That, you know, in this race, I was a racer, not a game player, but, in this race, we are overcoming things that we, you know, our fears about ourselves.
Are we good enough? Do we have a place? And, I think that it is really important that we remember that we have an ability to respond. But, we also need to remember what it is that we are responding to. And, sometimes athletes start giving up. And they really believe, they start believing, that, in fact, they are a victim. And they really have no choice and all they can do is react. And that is really the starting of the dying of the dream, inside.

And, for some, they close their eyes, or, we close our eyes, and we say, well, I'm not really going to look at that. And, certainly, that was the case, for me, in many ways. I mean, you know, there was, a very strong eastern block of rowers who were definitely doping. And we would get, I won't use the phrase we used, we got fourth a lot.

And, it was quite distressing. And, on some level, I, I personally, put blinders on and I just said, you know, I'm not going to think about that. Because, you know what, I have to believe that I can do it. I have to believe that I can be the best. And, in fact, when one of our team mates, Angie was one of my team mates, and I was, it was a thrill, and it is a thrill to see Angie now in the role that she plays, but, I had a very strong team.

We had a very strong subculture in our team. And, we would never, have occurred to us to cheat. I just can’t imagine us cheating. But, I laughed at the bee pollen story, you know, because, I thought, yeah, I remember when my coach told us we had to take salt tablets. I mean, this really dates me in the '70's right? We weren’t allowed to drink in our two-hour practices because in our 3-minute race, we wouldn’t be able to stop and have a drink of water.

So, you were supposed to take salt tablets. Yes, sir, the coach, you know, the authority. You know, we are not thinking for ourselves. And, then I remember, one day, Angie and I and a few other people talking about bicarbonate. We got to use baking soda and we could cover up the lactic acid. Well, you know, lactic acid is a big enemy for athletes, for rowers. I mean, we have the highest lactic acid tolerance.

So, we are always looking for a way to get over that lactic acid. So, we could, you know, we can have this baking soda. Well, baking soda is innocuous. I mean, seriously, did you ever think that it would be a banned substance? But, that was from latest research and, let’s give it a try. It never occurred to us that that would be cheating.

But, I did remember Angie saying, well, the problem with that is that you can get diarrhea. And, I thought, well, you know, hmm, you know, on the rowing odometer, which was the test that was coming up, that might, you could maybe get around that. But, in a boat, you know, warming off your rays, what are you going to do? So, I thought, you know, not practical.

But, our physiotherapist whose house I lived in, overheard us and she was just horrified.

Absolutely horrified.

So, I see how, you know, it was, we were naïve. But, I also see how insidious it is. I mean, how, you know, you are so focused on the technical. You are so focused on overcoming. And, I think that, one of the things that Johan said to me yesterday when we were talking about integrity in and
through sport and we were talking about the role of integrity. He was saying, you know, when you
speak about that, it is very, he said, it is very easy to feel that you are judging.

It is very easy to feel that you are rejecting. And, you know, it sort of puts people off. And, I
thought, yeah.

And then, Angie was saying that when you talk to people you really have to be, it is really important
that you meet them where they are. And, I thought, when we talk to athletes, do we meet them
where they are? Do we really understand the pressures that they are under? Do we understand that
they are like our skin? Do we understand that?

And, what’s, just like Brandon has an incredible role with kids, what’s the role of, we old folks,
with the 20-year old athletes? What is our role? We may not have the exact experiences. I mean, I
didn’t have the pressures that they had. But, I understood what it was to want to be the best, not my
best, the best.

And when one of my teammates wanted to be her best, we all turned on her. We said, what do you
mean, we did not trust her. We did not trust her because she only wanted to be her best. Well,
could she be in our crew? I mean, I was very, very concerned about that.

So, I think the thing about being your best and how to make this so different from being the best,
when you are your best you may very well be the best as well. But it has got to come first. It’s got
to come first in your own self. And, the thing about being the best, it sets up all this, sort of, ego
and fear and running away and a negative cycle.

And the thing about being one’s best is that there is room for everybody to be their best. There is
absolutely room for everybody to be your best. And I don’t think we have that enough in our public
discourse. I don’t think we meet people where they are. And, I think it’s, in people being honest
and open with each other that we can meet each other where we are.

Whether it was Johan meeting me where I was yesterday, or Angie meeting me where I was
yesterday, and seeing how quickly, even when you read about it and you think about it, how quickly
it can turn, how quickly it can turn to judgment.

And I think we are in real danger of that. And I think that if we really want to heal this, we have to
really see it as a sickness and we have to really come in with support. And, that’s all I need to say.
Mr. Ole Sorensen
Representative of Canada

Thank you, Sir. I bring sincere and warm greetings from our Federal sport minister. We have a dynamic in Canada where there is indeed a Department of Sport. His name is The Honorable Denny Coderre and he has, to some degree, shaken the international scene in terms of amateur sport and doping. He’s a 39-year old minister that has taken on the European leadership in this area, is winning at this point, and, has recently re-defended his election status in the Federal election in Canada.

So, if you thought Denny Coderre was bravado in his former life, wait until you see him now. I have made a commitment as well, to the, General McCaffrey that I would not exploit this opportunity to draw any references to the efficient and conclusive Federal elections we’ve just conducted in Canada. And, those here, I will rise above that, and not even make reference to it.

I recall with great humor the entry on the scene of General McCaffrey and his very competent colleagues and staff on the occasion of the World Conference in 1999. The International sport community were not ready for this visitation. I recall that General McCaffrey was banned from the pool deck in Australia by the President of the Australian Olympic Committee.

I recall the bookies were having bets on a 10-rounder between McCaffrey and Richard Pound, etc., etc. And things have all quieted down. To the credit of the ONDCP and the leadership by McCaffrey, the world is a much calmer place now. The integrity and the patience and the insight brought to the international scene by the United States entry and to the anti-doping scene has been profound.

I would add, as well, compliments to the recently formed United States anti-doping agency USADA and Terry Madden’s relentless pursuit to hire the best talent in the world, which has caused us to increase the salaries of all of our staff and retain them within the country.

The initiative to use Salt Lake City as a benchmark or reference point, to ratchet up a domestic and international anti-doping is a right decision, is clearly the right decision. The Sydney Olympics chose the same general strategy or tactic and found it to be a double-edged sword.

A quick reflection on the Sydney experience of the same nature as we are undertaking here will reveal the following: Australia hosted a magnificent drugs and sports summit on the November prior to the Olympic games, a gathering of 37 international countries, great progress, great cooperation. An announcement was made in the Australian newspaper that Sydney would be the drug-free games, not unlike the statement made last night in the State, magnificent State House here.

The WADA involvement in the Sydney Olympics was magnificent. The World Anti-Doping Agency committed and delivered on the no-notice testing of most of our federations, committed and delivered on an independent observer project, rewrote the results management protocol for the Olympics, massive advancements were made in the context of using Sydney as the catalyst and...
1 reference point.

2 The newspaper, however, shared the following things with the Sydney Olympics: the Australian
3 Sport Drug Agency was under massive attack from a publication that came out just prior to the
4 games challenging their credibility and the heightened awareness of the Sydney Olympics and their
5 commitment to have the cleanest games, escalated this challenge.

6 We all know about C.J. Hunter. We know about the Bulgarian weightlifters who were on again
7 then off again then on again. We know the Romanian gymnast tragedy. And, Brandon has just told
8 us about the great, former great German wrestler.

9 If you asked the individual on the net impact of the Australian games in terms of the perception of
10 the public on doping and sport, it may be a net negative that the Sydney exposure may indeed be a
11 net negative on the confidence our public have in clean sport. That is the challenge we are into
12 here.

13 Back to the Salt Lake City and the plan of action for here. Let me offer two categories of
14 suggestions. In the category of more of the same and let’s get it right this time, let me offer the
15 following: detection methodology has to advance.

16 The frontiers we have been told by the experts in laboratories are EPO erythropoietin and human
17 growth hormone, maybe genetic engineering and manipulation. They have to advance, be
18 conclusive and confident in time for Salt Lake.

19 In fact, I would echo the sentiments made this morning that the white hats have to get ahead of the
20 game. We can no longer be playing catch-up. We have to get ahead of the game, anticipate the
21 next areas of abuse and get up front and get ahead and give Madden the money.

22 Also in the area of more and let’s get it perfect is the pre-Olympic testing which was magnificent in
23 Sydney. And, I would urge you to continue the same thing, to work with WADA to ensure that no-
24 notice testing is conducted by every single federation that is competing at the Olympic games in
25 Salt Lake City, put pressure on and make it happen.

26 The Independent Observer Program, of which Rob Housman was an observer, which was a bit of
27 an anomaly because if you view the image of the Independent Observer, you have the host
28 organization conducting the testing. You have the International Olympic Committee Medical
29 Commission observing the host organization. And, you have WADA observing the International
30 Olympic Committee.

31 So there is clearly a height requirement to see over the procession, there. So, the fact that Rob
32 Housman got in is quite amazing, unless he brought a stool along for the occasion.

33 I would echo General McCaffrey’s comment. That, perhaps the biggest discussion in doing a little
34 bit more and doing it better is the discussion on the transition of the authority and the power of the
35 International Olympic Committee’s Medical Commission and the transfer of that authority mandate
36 to that of WADA’s. That may be the most sensitive, most strategic discussion we should have.
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At what point do the responsibilities of Medical Commission, divest to WADA, and the Medical Commission indeed becomes the overseer and the ultimate observer.

In the category, quickly, Sir, of new and totally excellent ideas for Salt Lake City, I offer the following: professional sport challenge. It is imperative that we meet and greet those that are committed in the professional sport community in an alliance of addressing the doping problem.

Those of us travelling to Europe are confronted, constantly, by the Europeans on and what have you done lately with the Commission’s of professional sport in your country. We need, at a minimal, a dialogue or a correspondence going so we can answer those challenges that yes, we have spoken to the Commission’s and dialogue is underway.

In the category of nutritional supplements, can you imagine a product called Bark with the Big Dogs, can challenge the integrity of the massive amount of anti-doping initiative going on in the world. There is a product called Bark with the Big Dogs, freeze dried protein, which is calling into question the integrity of doping activities in the world.

We must cooperate, certainly Canada is prepared to do so, in legislation, manufacturing, distribution, importation of food supplements to insure the contents in those packages are consistent with the labeling. So that we no longer have individuals, either allegedly or justifiably, claiming that [inaudible] came from Bark with the Big Dogs.

The Euro-centric theme is a defensive mechanism that many of us have been using to challenge the fact that downtown Europe seems to be running the sport community. That headquarters for the IOC in Europe, the International Federation’s are principally staged in Europe, housed in Europe, that the European Union and the Council of Europe are driving the agenda so, we become defensive and use the term Euro-centric.

Let’s get off that and develop what we have in the embryo stage of a strong America’s cooperation. America’s 47 countries, cooperating on legislation, on harmonization, on education. Let’s drive the agenda and get the America’s strong as a geopolitical region and get off the defense with the Euro-centric squeals.

I feel, as has been mentioned today, that the United States has to be plugged into the mainframe of many of the International anti-doping initiatives. It is the same theme that Mr. Madden and Mr. Shorter and Donna de Varona have been advocating.

The United States must be plugged in to the mainframe of the International anti-doping agreement. Not an observer, not brought in there as a guest, one-hour guest observer on the process, must be plugged in to the Council of Europe’s anti-doping initiative.

These are the strongest, fastest running Government initiatives in the world. United States must not be an observer, must have full voting participatory privileges. And, whatever mechanisms you can do in your country to expedite that would be to your advantage.
The last theme I would leave with you is that I would challenge that we need a dramatically higher athlete profile in this initiative. Dramatically higher athlete profile in this initiative. I see the wonderful representation from the Shorter’s and the de Varona’s, and the Canadians that are here, they are athletes. But, quite frankly, we become a bit in the “folkie” category.

The raw passion that we saw today with Brandon Slay, the unhomogenized, the straight shooting from the heart passion, we need more of that and less the sophisticated intellectual ex-jocks that many of us represent these days. So, I would urge that a much higher profile comes straight from the heart and advocacy movement at that level of athlete should be promoted in the context of Salt Lake City.

Finally, we need somebody to wrap this whole initiative into a philosophical framework. It is still perceived as remedies, a legal remedy, and scientific remedy, an organization remedy. It is a fragmented initiative we are taking here. We need a philosophical framework to wrap the Salt Lake City project into one cohesive philosophy.

And it might be as simple as this, that the Salt Lake City objective will develop an environment where doping is rejected by all participants in the activity or enterprise of sport. As simple as that, that athletes and parents and media and press, etc., are rejecting the fundamental principle of cheating. Kind of idealistic, but maybe that is the foundation of it.

And, number two, that the umbrella philosophical framework for Salt Lake City should also encompass the theme that it is fundamentally here to protect the clean and those that are competing fairly.

It is not a detection. It is not an enforcement mentality. It is fundamentally motivated to protect individuals who compete fairly and cleanly. Simple as that. That may be the framework that we could offer as an umbrella for the various remedies that we are pursuing.
Mr. Scott Blackmun  
President of the United States Olympic Committee

It is a great honor and pleasure to be here on behalf of the USOC. I’d like to start by addressing a comment that Craig Masback made earlier because I think it is a comment really at the forefront of where we go with doping and sports in the United States.

Craig referred to the Amateur Sports Act and the fact that we do not suspend an athlete’s right to compete without first having a hearing. And we do that because the United States is a country with fundamental notions of due process. And I think the question that Craig is raising is, should those fundamental notions of due process really have application in sport and in doping?

And I think that is a question, at the end of the day that I think we should look to the athletes to answer. Right now we have a very strong athletes advocacy group. And, they firmly believe that it is unfair for the athletes to have the right to compete suspended without a hearing.

We also have a group of athletes who feel very strongly that their opportunity to compete fairly is impaired by the athletes who are doping. And, I submit to you that the question of whether the U.S. athletes would prefer one system versus another is open.

And, so, I would challenge the U.S. athletes, all of the U.S. athletes, to answer the question of, should the fundamental notions of due process, which are imbedded in our system, have application to doping issues?

But I firmly believe that is a question that our athletes should answer first and foremost, but, all of our athletes.

Dr. Koss referred to the fact that the perception of America’s efforts in the anti-doping war are not positive and, I think, I would concur and agree with that perception. I think if you look back at the old system, it had a number of problems. It was left for the NGB’s to enforce. A lot of our NGB’s did not have the resources or the expertise or the experience or the background to enforce the anti-doping rules in a way that was going to be effective. I don’t think we devoted enough resources to our anti-doping efforts, historically.

And, I don’t think that our efforts from the staff side were as effective and efficient as they could have been. I think we, as an NOC, recognize that. And we are one of the main drivers in the process establishing the United States anti-doping agency.

I think our effectiveness in fighting doping needs to be differentiated from our intent. And, where I’m going with this is that the doping that is going on has greater impact and greater significance for the Olympic movement than it does for any other sports in the world. It does because, one of the core things that we are really talking about with the Olympic movement, and we are not just talking about competition or entertainment or winning or turning a profit on a franchise, what we are really talking about is the achievement of human potential.
We are talking about peace through sport. We are talking about fair play. We are talking about the joy and effort. We are talking about competing to the best of your ability. And doping undermines that very, very core mission that we stand for. It taints what we are selling to our sponsors. It taints what we are presenting to the American public.

And, so, if we don't deliver on that mission because of what is happening with doping and sport, we are really threatening our very future.

The Miracle on Ice in 1980 is not remembered as one of our greatest sport moments because it was a great hockey game. It's remembered because it was, you know, really a microcosm of human achievement. The same is true of Dan Jansen and what he accomplished. Yes, the USOC definitely wants to win medals. And, we want to allocate our resources in a way that maximizes that. But, clearly, not at the expense of our core mission, as an Olympic movement.

And the U.S. role in that mission, which is, that we've got to compete on a level playing field, we've got to compete to the best of our ability, but, to compete fairly.

We helped to create the new agency. We have committed significant resources to its success. And, I would add, for those of you who know the USOC, that consensus is not something that we come to regularly, particularly when it comes to budget issues. But, with respect to this issue, and our commitment to USADA and its success, I have not heard a single person challenge our significant allocation of resources to USADA.

So, I think the U.S. Olympic Committee is firmly committed to the mission that General McCaffrey has laid out. We are firmly committed to the success of USADA. We are firmly committed to the success of WADA. And we will do whatever we can to help fight this battle that I think we've all been talking about this morning.

Let me close by telling Brandon that it's not just millionaires who are overweight and worry about the competing efforts for their time from kids, wives and others.

Thank you very much.
To read the newspaper headlines, the issue of drugs and sport appears to be a simple matter of black and white. Athletes abuse drugs, governing bodies catch up with them or not, and the credibility of sports suffers. But those of us close to the situation know that it is anything but a simplistic set of circumstances.

For the past two decades, I have worked and focused attention on the increasingly pervasive and multi-dimensional problem of drugs and sports, a subjunctive immense scientific and ethical complexity. Indeed, my interest as a physician in the general subject of drug abuse, dates back more than 30 years. Back in that ancient era, drug abuse, per se, was not even perceived to be a medical concern at all, but, rather, a strictly legal one.

Fortunately, that perception, in great measure, has changed and the subject is being studied from any number of perspectives, not just medical and legal, but cultural, sociological, psychological and ethical. In fact, it is because of the multi-textured nature of the problem that we stand at another crossroad.

We must recognize that the abuse of drugs in sports is not just an individual problem or a problem that is limited to the exclusive domain of athletes. It is a burgeoning problem that is threatening our youth and now threatens the public health.

Historically, doping in sports was the subject about which only a handful of physicians were concerned. Now it is a subject of conferences, task force, position papers of national and international medical bodies and associations.

Since the 1960's, the science and technology explosion has brought countless new drugs to the market, black and otherwise. And these drugs have triggered a chain reaction of events reminiscent of Newtononian physics. That is, for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction.

It seems like every time a new drug or technology is developed, an athlete determined to gain athletic advantage, finds a way to misuse or abuse that drug or technology, perverting its original intent.

For example, some 20 years have passed since the introduction of recombinant DNA technology and genetic engineering. Let's look at human growth hormone and EPO. Recombinant human growth hormone means that the promise of normal height for children otherwise destined to be abnormally short stature, but for the drug abusing athlete, it means the promise of bigger muscles. Erythropoietin, or EPO, means renewed vitality for those with anemia.

But, for the drug abusing athlete, it means greater endurance. That, today, but what about
tomorrow? Blood substitutes, gene therapy, designer genes, a host of technologies and 2 interventions that offer medical possibilities never dreamed of before and, sadly, doping possibilities never anticipated before.

It has already been demonstrated, for example, that by utilizing gene transfer technology, IGF1, the mediator of human growth hormone, can increase muscle strength by as much as 27%. This technology may be great for elderly osteoporotic women, but think of the opportunity it offers for the ethically deficient strength dependent athlete.

And that is just one example out of many, because as we enter the new millennium, we are at the cusp of therapy for correction of defective human genes that cause or promotes certain diseases. How long will it be before we have nanobatts influencing the blood levels of, say, indigenous hormones.

These shifting molecular sands are food for thought for all those governmental regulatory processes that will govern gene therapy and related technologies. I might add that this subject is of particular interest to WADA’s Health Medicine and Research Committee, which I am a member.

Before we stray too far into the future, let me very briefly address two other issues that are important to me from a medical perspective. The first is the issue of therapeutic exceptions for the treatment of legitimate medical conditions. As we continue to refine our processes for defining the banned list, we must not lose sight of the reality that there are those who yearn to participate in elite sports in the face of a medical condition that puts them at a distinct disadvantage.

They start below the level playing field, looking up at it, instead of meeting it at eye level. Wanting to compete, they seek no competitive advantage from the medications they need to normalize their conditions. Recently, a number of parents have voiced concern that their children, with attention deficit disorder eluded to earlier this morning, were being discriminated against because their medications are on the banned list.

Admittedly, this opens a Pandora’s box, but we must not let the difficulty of the task discourage us from doing what is right. It is essential that the uniform standards be developed with the review of such cases. And that they be incorporated into our anti-doping codes. Otherwise, those who use drugs illegally will succeed not just in debasing the code of sports, but in disenfranchising those who also deserve to play.

Moving further, dietary supplements pose yet another problem of medical significance and, caught my attention, I think, virtually every speaker this morning has alluded to that whole subject. Androstenedione and its congeners have dominated the headlines. We are all familiar with the seemingly endless list of positive drug tests.

But these so-called steroid precursors are not only a problem for elite athletes, their use represents a far broader threat to the public health because it goes beyond the effects of these substances on muscle. More importantly, it deals with a short and long-term physio-logical effects of, all things, estrogen, the female hormone. The substance of which androstenedione, et al, is converted into.
1 The hormonal implications of andro and its chemical cousins render it essential that the DeShay
2 Act of 1994 be revisited by Senator Hatch of this great state of Utah where we sit today, post haste,
3 with an eye towards reclassifying these so-called steroid precursors as prescription drugs. And I
4 would implore us, as a group, to not put this off for tomorrow or the day after, this is a pressing
5 problem that must be addressed, and forcefully.
6
7 Woven together, these strands lead us to the persuasive and compelling conclusion that sufficient
8 funds must be made available, whether from sports authorities, governments or the private sector,
9 to address the burgeoning problem of performance enhancing drug abuse. What is needed as
10 activism to assure that the broadest scientific community is engaged in addressing the myriad of
11 issues associated with doping. Independent, peer reviewed science must remain the bedrock of our
12 anti-doping efforts.
13
14 Specifically, in the short-term, priority research areas must center around the function and detection
15 of both growth factors, such as human growth hormone, and oxygen carrying factors such as EPO
16 and artificial blood, indigenous substances and, finally, the brave new world of genetic
17 manipulation.
18
19 And, finally, having served as General McCaffrey’s medical advisor in doping, I would like to
20 conclude my remarks by, General, publicly thanking you for your bold and persuasive leadership.
21 Not only would respect anti-doping policies as they relate to elite sports, but, even more
22 importantly, for underscoring the threat that doping poses to the public health, and to, particularly,
23 to our youth.
24
25 Thank you very much, General, and, thank you.
Dr. Angela Schneider  
Special Advisor, Canadian Center for Ethics in Sport

General McCaffrey, and Mr. Ibarra and honored guests, it is a great pleasure to be here, sharing with you this important moment. I think this is something to be noted. And, I would like to commend the director for taking the initiative to host this meeting. Because, what's become very clear, I think, over the morning here, is that the challenge we face is about restoring confidence in the integrity of national and international sporting competition, but, in particular, the Olympic games.

And we have a tall order to meet. In Canada, the Canadian Government and the Canadian Center for Ethics in Sport, is fully committed to ethics in sport and through the fight against doping as one of those allies.

This task force is about the future of sport. Its focus is doping and the targets of anti-doping campaigns will inevitably tend to be high-level athletes. But we are really helping to decide the future of sport, worldwide, and the future of sport for our children and our neighbor's children. Whatever the course for elite sport, youth sport will surely follow and everyone has eluded to that so we are all in clear understanding of that.

This past year, governments have participated aggressively and constructively in the world anti-doping agency. And, let there be no doubts that if General Barry McCaffrey had not been there, the movement that was made this year would not have happened. There is just no question that the presence he brought to that really caused serious movement to happen. And I think that needs to be publicly acknowledged.

I mentioned these initiatives by governments for the purpose of acknowledging the progress that has been made and that we must build on its successes by using existing structures and the expertise of the foundation for our future work. In Canada, the Canadian Center for Ethics and Sport promotes fair play and drug free sport by managing a comprehensive, national doping controlled program.

The model for this program involves research, which is broad based, medical, social, humanities, education, prevention, detection and deterrents and includes the support of an IOC accredited lab. The CCES has tried to develop an accountability framework, making funding to national sport organizations contingent on their meeting minimum standards under a set of principles that include ethical sport practices such as drug-free sport.

This is important because sport is a public trust. It deserves careful and vigilant stewardship. Sport is never neutral. It's potential to excite, enthrall and elate is matched by its ability to disappoint, dismay and even damage.

That is why pursuing excellence in sport by fair and ethical means is so important to athletes, sport organizations, the general public and governments. It has become very clear from the evidence that we've seen that anti-doping campaigns that focused only on punishment and control are ineffective
and ultimately doomed to failure. Brandon was right on the mark. It is values that you have to focus on.

To understand doping and to counter it, we have to understand sport, we have to listen to the athletes who speak so wonderfully, even when they are the older athletes, they still have wonderful things to say. And the constant pursuit of records and the desire to go faster, higher and stronger have always been important parts of sport, but, if that single-minded pursuit is taken as only, or even the central element of sport, the result, quite simply, will be more and sophisticated doping.

And, thank you, again, to the gentleman from the FBI for reminding us of what we should be focusing on.

Doping is not, in the first instance, a crisis of medicine or science, but, rather, a crisis of sports ethics and values. When the science is done, the hard questions remain. There are no scientific or medical criteria that allow us to determine whether or not some new substance, or old ones, is doping, and therefore should be ethically banned. That falls within the discussion, a philosophically based framework, and discussion, as Mr. Sorensen pointed out, and what we want sport to be.

What experience do we want our children to have? Decisions about the permissibility of various substances and methods of doping and decisions about enforceability of the resultant rules are ultimately decisions about athletes, their bodies, their conduct and their privacy. Doping is foremost an athletes issue. It effects all athletes, those who are clean and those who are not.

The sport system, it is a systemic problem. Inspired educational strategies are fundamental and must accompany high quality testing programs. We need a comprehensive, grassroots campaign for social change.

And, Dr. Don Vereen is one of the ones who have been pushing very hard for this in WADA. And it has been a pleasure to work with him on that, a change that means the doping will ultimately be seen as socially unacceptable behavior by all members of the sport community. And many of you have shared that with us this morning.

From their inception, the Olympic games and the Olympic movement have been vehicles for social change. And Coubertin’s grand vision was that sport could contribute to the personal and moral development of young people and that a great international sporting festival could bring the world together in peace and celebration.

These are lofty ideals and the Olympic movement, through the Olympic charter, still expresses these noble sentiments. But the Olympic movement has failed to live up to them and I think we have to be honest about that and thank goodness for the efforts of Johan and Donna and others that have been trying very hard to hand on to this ideal. There are many of us who have not and will not give up on that ideal.

It is an idealism we are proud to embrace. It is embraced by all of us who love sport and cherish sport and the young people who dream of greatness. It is an idealism that is not in vain. We have
the ability and the opportunity to put into practice real change. Do we have the will? We’ve got to carry the momentum forward.

What does this mean, putting it into practice? A number of policy and program principles underpin Canada’s activities in this area since the inception of what was originally called the Canadian Center for Drug-free Sport. A significant point in the process of evolution of this national agency was the name change to the Canadian Center for Ethics in Sport, signaling a broader understanding of the problem.

And doping was a symptom of a much deeper malaise in sport and that we must treat the cause, not just the symptom. Not just the skin breaking out, but what is causing it in the system, in the body.

It is essential that the issue of doping not be seen as being owned by any one agency or as a sport specific issue. Therefore, the development of policy requires the participation and support of athletes, the sport community, governments, and other sectors of society. In Canada, the investment in the process for the development of this policy was considered to be an investment in the social and moral value of sport.

There are many, many points in which we can help to bring this together and help you work with this. And we are very committed to doing that. And I’m very aware of the time constraints and what we are trying to do here today. So, what I would offer is that the details that I have for suggestions would go into documents that you are hoping to put out and help people with that.

And, thank you very much for listening to my remarks this morning and sharing them.
Dr. Jim Tolliver  
U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)

Let me just start by thanking General McCaffrey for the opportunity to come here and to talk to you today. What I’d like to do is, in a very few minutes, discuss how the DEA has got involved with the issue and then briefly mention the dietary supplement situation in the United States as I see it. And, finally, what the DEA is doing and what it needs to do.

Back in 1990, Congress passed that Anabolic Steroid Control Act. And, what that did is to basically place anabolic steroids as an entire class of drugs under the Federal Controlled Substances Act, which is one of the strongest laws governing drugs in the country.

Very few other countries have followed us in doing this. Congress, at the time, listed 22 substances as specifically being anabolic steroids. And they are your classical substances such as the testosterone, nandrolone, methandrostenolone, a variety of things like that. What they did not perceive, what we had no perception of is that in some years down the road we would run into some of these dietary supplements, that they would be an issue.

So, dietary supplements such as androstenedione are not included among the 22 that Congress specifically listed. Congress did, however, have the foresight to realize that there would, down the road, be additional steroids, anabolic steroids, that the DEA would probably run into. And, they needed to provide us with, and, in fact, did provide us with an administrative procedure whereby we could add those to the list.

In 1994, there was the passage of the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act. And, interestingly enough, if you look at any part of the Act, if you look at any of the legislative history of it, you will see absolutely no mention of the so-called steroid precursors at all. I think that’s an interesting observation to keep in mind.

Within a year and a half of the passage of this Act, however, these steroid precursors started appearing on the market. And, that would be around 1996 when they started appearing. Shortly after that, of course, Mark Maguire was found to be using androstenedione and there was a tremendous increase in publicity associated with that particular substance and the use of it.

With that increase in publicity and other factors as well, the DEA started getting letters, started getting requests to look at these drugs and to see whether or not they could, under the Federal Controlled Substances Act, be classified as anabolic steroids. We heard from various groups. And, including governmental agencies, and, of course, included among that would be ONDCP.

As a result, about a year and a half to two years ago, we started really looking at these substances in more depth. I am the one that has spent the most time on them. And, in order, it has been done for the purposes of trying to determine whether or not they do, in fact, meet the definition.

We have, our actions are governed by statute, by law, and, so, we can only do what our law allows us to do. And, started looking at these substances in relationship to what is known as a definition of
an anabolic steroid.

There are actually four criteria that we must meet and one is a chemical similarity to testosterone, a pharmacological similarity to testosterone. It cannot be an estrogen progestational agent or a cortico steroid. And, finally, it must produce muscle growth. And, so, those are the four criteria that we have been looking at. We have been documenting the literature. We’ve looked at well over 1,000 articles dealing with androstenedione as well as the others, and, in order to look at those criteria.

It is of interest to note that so much attention has been, and I am kind of fascinated by it, on androstenedione. That is all you hear, andro, andro, andro. And, yet, if you really look at the dietary supplement market, there is much more out there than andro. And, it is interesting to look at the market.

There are eight steroid precursors that are commonly mentioned currently in the dietary supplement market. They are sold in numerous single entity products. They are also quite commonly encountered in multiple entity products. And, single dosage range anywhere from 25 up to 300 milligrams. Daily dosages can be, if you look at the labeling, look on them, for example, can go anywhere from 25, to well over 1,000 milligrams per day.

When you consider that some of these individuals are athletes or bodybuilders, and you realize that one of the characteristics of anabolic steroid abuse is using much higher doses than that which is recommended, then it is not inconceivable that dosages well above 1,000, maybe 2,000, milligrams could, may be used, at a time. The formulations that you find with these dietary supplements include tablets, capsules, liquids, gels, and sprays.

And, the routes of administration that they talk about using include oral administration, sublingual administration, which is under the tongue, buccal administration, which is between the jaw and the cheek, topical administration and you even see intra-nasal administration.

Now, I am a pharmacologist by training, and, I find this kind of information particularly fascinating because I know that this violates the DESHEA, it has to.

There is, certainly, oral administration, is allowed. But, when you get to some of these other types of administration, topical, for example, it just simply can’t represent oral ingestion of the drug. But, nevertheless, that is what’s out there. And there are numerous products along those lines.

Getting back to the DEA response, both in terms of characterizing the steroid or the dietary supplement market, we have looked, we are not looking at just one, we are not looking at just andro. I mean, I can tell you right now, if all you are doing is, going to look at andro, you might as well forget it because there is still going to be a very large dietary supplement market out there for these steroid precursors.

And what the dietary supplement industry will more than likely just do is they’ll take andro off and they’ll remove it from any of their multiple entity products, but they will keep selling all the others. And, also, as a pharmacologist, I will tell you, that, more than likely, a number of these dietary, of
these other steroid precursors, are probably more potent than androstenedione.

When you get into the norandrostenedione, the norandrostenediol, these types of substances that are out there that are numerous, that you can get over the Internet, you can go into any health food store and get, then, you should raise concerns. And it should really, you should really be thinking, not in terms of just taking care of the andro problem, but taking care of these other steroids at the same time.

DEA has, is, in fact, looking not just at andro, but at all eight of the steroids at this time. We have collected data or information for the criteria, in terms of the chemical similarity, the pharmacological similarities, and the, whether or not it is a progestational agent on these particular substances.

And, for the most part, as far as we are concerned, they pretty much meet the definition of an anabolic steroid. Our problem, and it is a very big problem for us right now, it is a serious problem, is trying to meet that fourth definition, fourth criteria, and that is, that it can promote muscle growth. Look at the literature, the studies just aren't there. It is not a matter that they've been done, it's a matter that they have not been done, for the most part.

We cannot, as of yet, satisfy that criteria.

We are in the process, now, of, we are funding one study on androstenedione. I'll back up for just a minute and say that the law does not specify what kind of muscle or from where it has to come. And we have taken a position that it does not have to be human muscle.

So, we are working along the lines that we would like to have an animal model that we can put these substances in and look for effects upon muscle growth. We are currently funding one study to, it actually utilizes the rat, and it is looking strictly at androstenedione. We are, now that that study is on the way, it started in October. We expect it to be done sometime in late summer or early fall of next year.

We are, at the same time, now, however, beginning to put together a second study. This one would be much more extensive, looking at all eight of the steroid precursors that are on the supplement market today. And, I will, in fact, be going to Manhattan this coming, tomorrow, to talk to some researchers about getting, possibly the study, ongoing.

And, the one thing that we don't have, right now, we have a protocol, what we think is a good protocol, and, we have some possible people to do it, but, we do have problems with funding. We estimate that this research will, to do all eight of these subcompounds, will cost somewhere around $400,000.00. And, the DEA just does not have that funding available at this time.

So, we are going on and trying to put the study together and hope that the funding will become available at some point.

Finally, we are also interested in not only the muscle studies, but we would actually like to see some epidemiological information. That would be of help to us. I think it was mentioned earlier
that there has recently been shown an increase in steroid use among our youth.

One of the interesting things about that, though, is that there is no indications. The people that have put together that study and shown those results, cannot determine whether or not the steroid use is related to so-called, what I'll call hard steroids, those that are illegal right now. Or, to what extent it may reflect androstenedione or other steroid precursor use. That when the youth fill out the surveys, they are looking at these as steroids and writing down the response. So, it would be, really be nice to have some kind of a study in which it would be possible to get some information on steroid precursors and the use of them by our youth.

Finally, it would also, certainly be of help, to get information on the patterns of abuse. We can talk about single doses. We can talk about daily doses based upon what you, what we see in the packaging, the labeling, what you see on the Internet, etc., and then we can make our little jump by saying that, well, this is steroid abuse.

And, normal steroid abuse involves multiple dosing and, etc. And, we can make estimates, but there is no clear indication as to what the patterns of abuse of these steroid precursors are. And, this type of information is always helpful for promoting whatever actions the DEA should take in the future.

Thank you.
Dr. Nancy Pillotte
U.S. National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)

First of all, I’d like to thank General McCaffrey for inviting me to come to this forum. This is something that is fairly new to me and so I’ve been really impressed with the complexity of the problems and the many dimensions you’ve all brought out with us. And I have a new appreciation for the passion and the dedication you all bring to the problem.

Now, the National Institute on Drug Abuse is one of 23 separate institutes that form NIH, in the National Institutes of Health. And, any number of other institutes could be sitting here in my place because the kinds of issues that you bring up, in fact, cut across many of the missions of the institutes.

NIDA is specifically interested in the abuse of these androgenic anabolic steroids and their medical consequences.

We are currently funding research in four separate areas. The first is in abuse liability, that is independent of the growth promoting effects on muscles as Dr. Tolliver has just pointed out. We are interested to know if these compounds are reinforcing or rewarding to the people who take them, regardless of whether or not they promote muscle growth.

So, how would we know? Well, our studies in this area are done in animals. So, in fact, what we look at is the propensity of an animal to self-administer a steroid. There are also reports in the literature about people who use these kinds of compounds regularly and when they stop using them they feel bad. They become dysphoric. This is what puts this into the purview of NIDA.

The second area of research is something that has been eluded to by several of the speakers here today. And that is the neuropsychological effects on the athletes of the use of these steroids. And we are most familiar with the research by Harrison Pope on the aggression and rage that is induced by steroids in certain individuals. We would like to know who’s most vulnerable to having these kinds of episodes. And, is aggression a uniform characteristic of people who use these?

A third concern relates to other illicit and licit substance use. So, we are concerned when bodybuilders use marijuana to relax after the stress of a weightlifting session. We are concerned with reports that people are using opium narcotics like nalbuphene to relieve the pain of overextended muscles.

And, finally, our research portfolio also includes a concern in the medical consequences of the steroid use, particularly those that are injected. And the kinds of concerns that we have here relates not necessarily to hormonal profiles, although those are important, that could be easily taken care of by another institute, but, in fact, medical consequences on immune system of things like sharing needles.

Now, that said, I had mentioned earlier in this meeting, that NIDA does have initiatives and...
prevention in education. And we are very pleased to be supporting the Atlas program that has been instituted by Lynn Goldberg and Diane Elliot. And we think that this gets at some of the concerns in terms of getting coaches, getting parents, getting kids, getting peers on board to say that you can train and not have to use drugs or illegal substances to increase your physical strength or your prowess.

We are also happy to see that it will be instituted here in Salt Lake City in at least one of the high schools, in one, I think, this year. And within two years, a comparable program for all young women athletes, the Athena program will also be put in place.

Now this has been piloted in 31 schools in Portland already. And, in fact, after a single year of its use, it has reduced the effect, it has reduced the use of anabolic steroids in the high school athletes. It has reduced the use of marijuana in high school athletes. And it has also reduced other negative behaviors like drinking while driving in the athletes that have been part of this program. And we do get a lot of buy-in from the coaches. And we get buy-in from the parents.

And this is, I think, one of the things that makes this work. And I think it speaks directly to the values that we, as parents, or, as coaches, or as participants in athletics are trying to instill in our young people so that they can, in fact, produce good things without resorting to illegal means.

Earlier this year, NIDA also, you have a packet that General McCaffrey was kind enough to show you earlier, which, sort of, summarizes NIDA's education efforts in the use of steroid prevention, or, prevention of steroid use. And this is something that is aimed at kids who are in middle school and high school.

We had a press conference in April announcing this initiative. And, we have been putting money behind it. And, I think that, in the interest of time, I will stop here.
Open Discussion

Question: Let me just, if I might, because there is so much discussion about andro, and, certainly Dr. Tolliver is probably going to anticipate what I'm trying to say, the stumbling block about reclassification has been demonstrating muscle growth.

But, I was alluding to my remarks, is that, these, the word steroid precursor is a political definition of a steroid. It is not a scientific definition of a steroid. And, I think that, the sooner we realize it is the political definition, we can deal with the more scientifically rational approach. But, clearly, all the studies that have come out on andro, questioning whether they, the ones done by, sanctioned by major league baseball, done in Harvard and so on, with respect to effects on strength, that is one issue, but they all have shown increases in estrogen, estrodiole, specifically.

And, for everybody in this room who has a wife or a mother or whatever, who is considering hormone replacement therapy as an answer to their menopausal years, remember they all hesitate because it clearly does positive things, preventing heart disease, osteoporosis, so why do they hesitate? They hesitate because the association of estrogen’s development of breast cancer in year’s past, before progesterone was added to uterine cancer.

And those studies continually appear about that association. We are enabling young people, by taking andro, to increase their estrogens on a prolonged basis.

Now, the unique thing about steroids, whether they be testosterone, estrogen, cortico steroids, they all have the quality of asserting their adverse effects not while you are taking them, but months and years afterwards. So, we have a pact set up here. We think we are taking these supplements with impunity. When, in fact, five and ten years down the road, we may see adverse effects. I’ll give you one concrete example and I’ll be quiet.

Many of you remember DES, diethylstilbestrol, which had a wonderful purpose. It prevented miscarriages. The only thing is, 16 years later when these fetuses were now teenagers, we saw a spike in the incidence of vaginal and male genital cancers directly associated with the use of DES.

So, my suggestion is that we immediately, and I know the DEA and the FDA and Blue Shield/Blue Cross have been addressing this, have hearings held by Senator Hatch. Not so much as reclassifying these andro related products as controlled substances, which is the ultimate, but as prescription drugs, the same as you would for any other steroid, whether it is cortico steroids or estrogens.

And I think that should be done with dispatch. I think that is a public health crisis. And I think getting caught up in all this dialogue is, too much time is passing by, and I think this is something that should be done immediately.

I’ll really ask Senator Hatch to revisit that Act specifically towards that. That definition of a steroid precursor, and it was alluded to, is not even in the legislation. They refer to it as a metabolite, and there is no reference to it at all. So this is so-called a political definition and it is causing us a
paralysis of analysis and nothing is happening. In the meantime, the sales of andro are just skyrocketing and all the related substances.

Marc Gurwith: I'm from Gene Labs in California. We have been developing DHEA, one of the substances mentioned. We are developing it as a drug for treatment of systemic lupus. And, it is effective, as a drug, for systemic lupus.

But I really want to add to the comments that have already been made about DHEA and the other substances. We know DHEA, the best, so, I’ll confine my comments to that, but, almost everything I say will apply to andro and all these other drugs. And, the first thing to say, is, again, these are steroid precursors.

The DHEA is a precursor of androstenedione, which is then a direct precursor of testosterone as well as estrodiol. And, they are taken to, by athletes, to increase testosterone, especially, the estrodiol effects may be unwanted. And, they certainly do that. In our studies in lupus we are able to show that, clearly, in a dose related fashion, testosterone levels increased.

So we had women who were taking placebo, and then taking 100 milligrams and 200 milligrams of DHEA. And, just as expected, the dose, the blood levels of testosterone, these women doubled, when the dose of DHEA doubled, and the blood levels were far higher than the placebo levels. So the drugs are precursors and they increase testosterone.

And, again, testosterone is a banned substance. It is a androgenic hormone and will certainly, it is certainly covered as a controlled substance. We have tried, we have supported both the efforts that have been suggested.

One is that DeShay be enforced. The law really, DHEA and these other substances, really shouldn’t and don’t fall, at least in our opinion, follow under the Act. They are not dietary supplements, or, they are not constituents that diets, and they are steroid hormones with all the bad side effects, or, at least, potential bad side effects of those.

And then, secondly, we also, have petitioned DEA to, in a sense, enforce ASCA, the Anabolic Steroid Control Act. We think DHEA definitely meets the criteria of a controlled substance. We think this is important enough that we’ve taken the step to try to have this classified as a controlled substance, even though we, potentially we’d be marketing this as a prescription drug and it will at least make it less convenient for physicians to prescribe it.

As Dr. Tolliver says, it does meet the, at least three, without question, three of the criteria. It clearly is a precursor testosterone. It is chemically related. It has the pharmacologic effects of testosterone. The main side effects we saw in our trials were acne and a little increased hair growth. We saw some increased libido. These were women and this was a known effect of testosterone in women.

And then the fourth criteria, muscle growth. We feel, at least for DHEA, there is already adequate studies in humans that show that this increases muscle strength, or, muscle mass, I can provide you at least three studies where it has been shown. We know that there is studies that it hasn’t been
1 shown.
2
3 But, again, it is not ethical and not possible to give DHEA or androstenedione to healthy volunteers
4 in the doses that are doses of abuse. No one is going to give two grams a day for six months to see
5 if they increase muscle mass. But there are definitely positive studies that show this.
6
7 And then, just to finish up, although we support doing animal studies, that that will do it, although
8 again, we think the data is already available. You have to understand there may be real problems
9 with animal studies. DHEA is a major steroid in humans, the most common steroid produced by
10 the adrenal glands.
11
12 In animals, it is not that at all. It adds a much different metabolism. I can go into lots of
13 differences, so there is a possibility that you could do animal studies, and they are negative, because
14 it has a different role in animals and still not address the human situation.
15
16 So, again, we really feel, both DeShay, and ASCA should be enforced in DHEA, androstenedione
17 and these others, removed as dietary supplements.
18
19 Mickey Ibarra: I’d like to direct a question both to Dr. Tolliver and also to Mr. Sorensen and then
20 wait for the response. Dr. Tolliver, you mentioned research activity that you are engaged in with
21 the DEA and the planning that’s going on as it relates to needed research in the future in this area.
22 What is the cost figure that you would estimate. And, if you don’t have that figure, when do you
23 expect that we would know that cost estimate.
24
25 And, to Mr. Sorensen, at the White House, I would suggest that the perception of the Sydney effort,
26 as it relates to the enforcement efforts of the Sydney Olympic officials and others. I think we had a
27 perception that we had really made a step forward. And, I was very curious by your different
28 perception, I believe. I would like to hear a little bit more about that so that I have the benefit of
29 that knowledge.
30
31 Dr. Jim Tolliver: Well, the study that we would like to get going, which would involve all the
32 steroids, our best estimate right now is $400,000.00 to complete, to do the study. And that would
33 be looking at all eight steroids on muscle growth.
34
35 Question: And the timeline for that?
36
37 Dr. Jim Tolliver: The total length of time, we would estimate, would be two years, but we would
38 have set priorities on certain drugs to get them out as quickly, on a faster timeline.
39
40 Question: And when would that begin, assuming you had the $400,000.00 in funding?
41
42 Dr. Jim Tolliver: I really can’t say for sure. I would estimate some time in the spring or summer,
43 it could possibly get going.
44
45 Question: Thank you. Mr. Sorenson?
Ole Sorenson: Thank you. I made a comment during my intervention which suggested that if we netted out the contribution made in the context of the Sydney initiatives on anti-doping, the contributions of the wonderful work of WADA, no-notice testing, independent observer, new result management system, the extraordinary workshop that drugs and sports summit, and traded that off with some of the realities of the doping scandals in Sydney, that the general population, in my view, would have a net negative impact on whether we had really moved ahead in the anti-doping thing. At the level of those of us informed and engaged in the enterprise of anti-doping, we could easily say there are great strides. But, the mom and dad of the general scene, know nothing about the WADA observer program, know nothing about the no-notice testing, don’t even understand the concept. So, I think there is two perspectives. One is at the very real informed level, we can take great bows on the advances. The general population are going to tell us, Bulgarian weightlifters, Romanian gymnasts, United States shot-putter, etc., etc. So, I think we have to balance those two and decide what is the net impact of that. And that was a challenge to us, to be ready for that, because when you stick your neck out and say that we will guarantee you the cleanest games in the history of the Olympics.

You have to anticipate what would be the downside of another series of mishaps. And have some creative strategies to manage them. That was my perspective.

Comment. I’m a professor at the University of Utah. I run the Sports Psychology program. I just want to throw out a simple thought. Drugs are for health, nor for performance. And that might be a motto that you might think about a little bit. Drugs are for health, not for performance. What were drugs founded for? For health issues.

But that simple thought, and I’m going to follow-up on Dr. Tolliver just talked a minute ago, and, I think, Angela, she is saying the same thing I am. If we are going to go back, instead of giving money for research, and I think that is extremely important, it seems like, probably strange, coming from a professor, drug labs and all these types of things, we have to change perception of the general population.

And what is the perception? Drugs are good for anything. Even sport, isn’t that what they are saying? You and I all take drugs, don’t we? Some of them took them this morning, probably. You have a cold, you take drugs. Athletes are no different. Unless we change the perception and it has to be from the media, from the professional athletes, it has to be a concerted effort, that we talk about drugs for health issues, not for performance issues.

It was strange. I left a little bit ago, I went over one of the team’s I work with, the Utah Jazz. And, as I walked in, they said, Doc, come with us. I said, what’s going on? They said, well, [inaudible] is being drug tested. The rookies in the NBA get drug tested three times a year. What we are doing with the testing and so forth is treating a symptom, not a cause.

And, until we go after the cause, we are still going to have meetings like this.
SALT LAKE ANTI-DOPING PROGRAM

Dr. Douglas Rollins
Doping Control Medical Director, Salt Lake Olympic Committee

I'd like to begin by announcing, or, introducing some of the other members of the Salt Lake team that are present today. I'd like to begin with Kathy Presner Alinger who is Director of Sport. It is the Sport Division under which medical services exists. Dr. Chuck Rich who is our Chief Medical Officer for SLOC. Ginny Bordencamp, Ginny is back over here. And, Michelle Brown who is the doping control program manager. And I'd like to echo the statement by Mitt Romney earlier, at the beginning of this session this morning, that Salt Lake is a point in time.

We hope, again, that it will be an exclamation point. Our program is designed to protect drug-free athletes. We will catch cheaters, as Ole has just pointed out. As they did in Sydney, we will catch cheaters. But, the purpose of our program is to protect drug-free athletes. It is going to be your efforts over the next 14 months, as to whether those drug-free athletes come to Salt Lake City.

Our program has seven parts. The first is athlete selection, where the random athletes are selected, as well as the top three or four winners.

The second part, is athlete notification and escorting.

The third is specimen collection.

The fourth is preparation of specimens for transportation to the laboratory.

Fifth is specimen transportation to the laboratory.

The sixth is specimen analysis.

And, the seventh is result management.

To date, we have trained ourselves, 47 doping control officers, 57 escort and sight supervisors, and 355 escorts. These people are involved in training events this winter. They are involved in 27 World Cup test event days at 10 competition venues.

To follow on to Ole Sorensen's comment about continuing the out of competition testing, SLOC is committed to following the IOC's lead in Sydney. We will test, approximately, 4% of the athletes in out of competition testing that will begin on January 29th when the Olympic village opens.

This will include athletes not only in the Olympic village, but throughout the United States and, indeed, throughout the world, will do this out of competition testing, in conjunction with USADA, WADA, and, to some extent, within the United States, probably using doping control officers from the NCAA. This will be a random selection of all registered athletes for the 2002 Olympic Winter
Games.

Our partners in this effort are the IOC Medical Commission, USADA for out of competition testing, and we’ll also be bringing in USADA doping control officers to facilitate our efforts and WADA. We will encourage, in fact, we are meeting with WADA next week, to encourage them to continue the independent observer process and to give us help in out of competition testing.

Finally, we will have an IOC accredited Olympic drug testing laboratory in Salt Lake City. It will be a temporary laboratory. They will perform standard Olympic drug tests. And, in addition, the Salt Lake organizing committee is committed to working with the IOC laboratory to develop an EPO test that is scientifically valid and forensically sound.
Dr. Don Catlin
Director, UCLA/IOC Lab

I’m trying to figure out how to explain to you what I do and how we do it. It’s not so simple. I live in a world of molecules, swimming around in a yellow, kind of smelly, fluid. And we get lots of those bottles coming in every day.

And, we have to figure out a way to get all those molecules extracted out of the urine and passed through an extraordinary complex series of chemistry steps and then into a very expensive instrument called a mass spectrometer. And then, build up about this much documentation and then present it to the lawyers and hope and pray that we can win the case.

This is an extraordinarily complex job. I can’t tell you. You are all invited to visit the lab and see what we do and how we do it. It is not simple. But we’ve learned how to do it. I got into this business in ’82. And, somebody from the IOC came, I was a young, younger professor at UCLA in the Department of Medicine and Pharmacology. And this Professor, his name was Beckett, said, well, you need to build a lab here to help us.

I said, well, show me your list of drugs. And he gave me this long list of drugs. I looked at it and half of them I had never heard of and certainly didn’t use, even though I was a medical practitioner. And, I said, no, we couldn’t possibly do that. He went away and then he came back and he explained that there would be a contract. So, there was a contract, eventually.

And we became the first IOC lab in the U.S. And it was very exciting to me. I read everything I could find about drugs and sport. And I couldn’t find very much, not very much. I went to Gold’s Gym and I talked to people about steroids. Do you really get big and strong? Oh yeah, you do, and I watched them grow.

And then I started talking to, I couldn’t believe, that young men and women who were the cream of the crop, they are athletes, are put in this intolerable position of taking drugs to win a game. I couldn’t believe that it could happen. But, it does happen. Not all of them, by any means.

There are many, many athletes out there that you can put all the drugs in the world underneath their nose and they will never touch them. They are going to be clean. But, unfortunately, there are some that will cheat. And they are supported by an incredibly complex underground that runs rings around what we do. And, I could spin stories about this all day that would really curl your hair.

We got up and running. I became, I became addicted to this issue. It was extraordinary to me and it has been my life ever since. I’ve switched out of the other area and I’ve stayed with it. But, right after the ’84 games, we had to close. We had no clients. Thank you very much, you did a wonderful job. Well, we did have some problems, but, we finished the games.

Then it was a year or two later, USOC came back and said, well, we need a drug testing lab. And then, suddenly, everything was changing in this country and internationally. We needed a lab
because we couldn’t get international sport events on U.S. soil without a lab. So, would we reopen.

Well, of course, yes, we reopened.

The USOC was there, and, suddenly there began to be some public concern. But, it was mainly about weightlifters and other sports that are, sort of, not quite mainstream that were taking drugs. It wasn’t until ’88 when Ben Johnson, track and field, competing against Carl Lewis at the Olympic games in Seoul, broke it wide open. Because now, suddenly, you were confronted as a public with the fact of life that here we are in this premier sport, the 100 meter, and we got a drug issue right here. And that, that helped a lot to move the process along.

And then right after the USOC came, NCAA came and the NFL came to us and asked if we’d build a program for them. And we worked with all three of them now and they are great clients. Frankly, I am sick of IOC bashing. They particularly like to bash the NFL because they say all professional sports in the U.S. are corrupt and dirty and drug taking. That’s not true. I’ve been working with the NFL and their steroid program for, probably, 10 years or so. And they have a really solid program. It is very good.

And now, look where we are at. We’ve got NCAA coming along, with a much better program than they’ve ever had before. USOC has had, sort of, some meanderings for a few years, but now we have USADA. And that is a brand new ball game. And, internationally, we have WADA, and we have General McCaffrey to thank enormously for his efforts to make that, make all those things go. We need to give these new groups, WADA and USADA, a chance. They are brand new. I don’t have to tell you how complex the whole issue is.

Let me just say a word about supplements. It’s not andro, androstenedione, from my perspective, is not a drug I’m worried about. Why? Because, yes it is a steroid. But it doesn’t really enhance performance unless you take huge amounts of it. It just doesn’t.

I am much more concerned about the other substances, like 19 norandrostenedione, that’s a very serious drug. But andro, no. There is a misconception that we have a test for androstenedione. We don’t. I don’t have a test for androstenedione. Fortunately, some of them are contaminated with other steroids and we catch people on that. And then the athletes yelp because they took androstenedione and they got caught for 19 norandrostenedione.

I don’t know, this doesn’t make sense. But, it does make sense. Because all of the sport organizations in this country and the IOC, the major ones that deal with steroids, ban androstenedione. So you can’t stand up and tell the Committee that you took androstenedione and you got caught positive for something else because you are admitted to using a drug.

But I would not want to focus so much on androstenedione. The thing you should focus on, why do we have a test for it? What do you mean you don’t have a test for androstenedione, what do you do? We don’t have a test for a lot of things, let me tell you.

We operate in a high tech business. We have to be, get it absolutely right. All these instruments and all these people and all these chains, it all has to work, and then we can win a case. But, we don’t have any R&D underpinning it. Now you go to Eli Lilly and you say, well, really, thank you
Eli Lilly for developing all these lovely new drugs.

And, by the way, what percent of your income do you spend on R&D? Well, talk to Mark, 30%.

You know, what do we spend? Zero. There is nothing. It’s not quite zero, thanks to USOC and the NCAA and the NFL, we have a sport consortium that gives us grant moneys worth about $150,000.00 a year for the last few years.

I am forever thankful for them. Without that, we would have had nothing. It’s not that I haven’t tried to get money out of other agencies. We get money out of other places. We have to collaborate. I’ll collaborate with endocrinologists who are working on some testosterone project, but, that’s the way I piggy back my work, to try to get, that’s how we did the androstenedione study, is we piggy back it. You don’t get any direct funding for these kinds of things.

So, if you really want to make an impact on this issue, you’ve got to start looking at it from the bottom up and say, what kind of R&D is needed and how are we going to organize it and get it going? It’s that simple. The testing, the overall quality of the testing, it’s not that great.

I have to tell you. There are many, many holes. With the information I have, you could test me any day of the year and I’ll take lots of drugs and you will never catch me. I absolutely guarantee that because I know how to miss it. You just can’t. We’ve got to get really down to the nitty gritty and look at the technology. There is a lot of drugs that we don’t have.

EPO, I’ll just say, one word, the reason I’m worried about EPO, here in Salt Lake, is the Winter Games are generally mild with respect to drugs. It’s not like the Summer Games. They weren’t that bad in Sydney. Drugs made a lot of noise, but, if you actually looked at the details of what drugs were found, and what the real infractions were, they were minor.

We are getting somewhere. Drugs will always make a lot of noise. They will make noise here in Salt Lake. How much noise, nobody really knows. That’s a risk of doing business. You shouldn’t be afraid of it. Just take it head on, it’s business as usual, and put together the best program you have and try to head off and deal, try to come to some negotiations with the IOC to stop them from bashing the United States of America and all of its sport.

That’s just very annoying. I don’t know quite how to do it, but, it is overdone. And if we have to go through that again, none of us will be very happy. We don’t deserve that kind of bashing.

We’ve done pretty darn well over the years. Yes, we have more to go.

What drugs will we have here in Salt Lake? We are going to have a lot of EPO. That is the drug for the Winter Games. A lot of different sports get benefits from EPO. We’ve got a lot of work to do on EPO. We did have a test in place in Sydney. It was interesting to watch the IOC falling over each other taking credit for it, after holding it back for some years, but, the issue is that it is a very complex test. And it needs a lot more work to get it online and to be robust, bulletproof and litigation proof.

And that, I think, is going to be a concern. Whether we can, in fact, get this done. It is going to take a lot of effort to work it through. And, without it, then you are not going to have a drug-free
games, you are going to have an EPO games. Just like, there is no way you can say Sydney was
drug-free. You have no test for growth hormone, a major drug. It's not drug-free, but it sounds
good.

And, I don't wish to paint a dismal picture, quite the contrary. I wish to paint a very progressive
and happy outlook. I think things are going pretty darn well.

You know, back 20 years ago, we had no support. Now, look, we've got a room full of lots and lots
of people and federal agencies and General McCaffrey who are really interested in this issue. And
they are here because they care. That's why I stayed in the field. I don't need to do one more urine
test, but I care about this. I really do care about this issue.

So, I'm absolutely and completely delighted to see so much interest. And, out of that, will come
nothing but good things. It is not hopeless. Technology and testing, we can deal with this issue.
There is lots of ways to deal with it. Now that we are beginning to harness the horsepower, we've
got USADA coming on board and they are going to have some research funds. And we've got
WADA. And the future looks just wonderful and I'm excited. Thank you.
Open Discussion

Question: I want to ask Mitt Romney if you want to add, because we did end with the panel on Salt Lake and the doping issues at the games, and —

Mitt Romney: I can’t think of anything I’d add to that. That was very helpful. Dr. Katlin and our own team have been working together and I think we have very high hopes for doing an excellent job.

I think that Dr. Catlin makes a good point. It will not cover, identify everything, but, to the extent that modern medicine and modern science allow us to identify cheaters, we intend to do so and to take the steps necessary to do so.

Coach Steve Hill: Yes, thank you. May I just, we’ve heard from the research side and I would hate to have us end at that. You wouldn’t have any young athletes left here in the room, they wouldn’t understand. And, I think, in terms of education, there is not a lot of money that needs to be expended.

We have some fine organizations here already that have programs, the National Federation for Coaches. There are some vehicles already in place to help educate young athletes, their parents and their coaches. But, again, that information gets lost in the research.

Young athletes do not care about the side effects. They want the immediate results. And, when they see immediate results and they have a feeling that the things they are taking are going to bring about the accolades of success, then they are going to use. And they are going to use whatever is out there and whatever is available, research aside, side effects aside, that’s not their concern.

They, the people who have emphasized that ethics, that value system, that’s where we hit our young kids. And, I would hope that we don’t lose sight that, often times when we “catch” those athletes cheating, often times that reinforces young athletes because they get that misperception that so many of these athletes have talked about that all successful athletes, all the lead athletes are using. That is the perception that is reinforced with them.

And, so, to have these elite athletes go to the media and have those media campaigns to say no, that’s not the case, most athletes are not using. Those elite athletes that don’t use need to have that forum to present their message.

Thanks.

Mickey Ibarra: Well, I’ll tell you, I have enjoyed, so much, the opportunity to return to my hometown, Salt Lake City. And as the Co-Chair of this taskforce, I want to thank all of our taskforce members for their participation today. Also, I do believe that we learn most by listening, rather than talking.

And, I’ll tell you this, I’ve certainly learned a lot today, as it relates to our panel on sports and
Iyouth, hearing from our athletes, our science and research panel, the Salt Lake Anti-Doping Program, and also, of course, from the USOC.

And, I can pledge to you that we will do all that we can to insure that we capture this information and your recommendations. Consistent with the executive order of President Clinton, to report those recommendations to him and to the next President of the United States, to keep our progress moving forward.

I'd also like to thank Mitt Romney for the great leadership that he has provided here. He has been a wonderful partner to work with. I continue to look forward to doing that for 48 more days.

And, also to Barry McCaffrey, who, some of you may be aware, is going to get out the door just a couple of weeks before I do, on, I believe, January 7th. January 6th is actually his last day. And, again, I want to thank Barry McCaffrey for his continued leadership.
CLOSING REMARKS

BARRY R. McCAFFREY
Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy

Thanks, Mickey, for being my partner in all of this, along with Donna Shalala and Goody Marshall and others. There is a bunch of people in the room that should be recognized.

Just again, mention, Scott Blackman, we thank you for being here, your leadership. USOC has reinvented itself again. It was a pretty good team to start with and we look forward to the next group. And, you are under the spotlight for two years and we are very proud of the skills and the dedication you bring to bear in all this.

We thank Mitt for bringing us together out here and allowing the White House Task Force to engage in this conversation. To Frank Shorter, Terry Madden, USADA, you know, again, 15 years to build an institution. But, I think the first two years will show dramatic changes as we get a tool. Many have focused correctly on the notion that it is not catching cheaters that change the nature of the game, it is attitudes and ethics in sports.

Having said all that, many of you know, as well as I do, that when you put an effective drug testing regime in place, it allows the great kids, the young people to say, I can’t use these drugs, I’d break the coaches heart, I’d let down my team mates. But you got to give them a tool and it’s got to be credible.

And, so, Frank Shorter and to his effort and the research base, all of you who talk to the research base, we’ve got a lot to do. And, as Don Catlin mentioned, this is not beyond the frontiers of technology. It is a matter of getting organized. $150,000.00, that’s embarrassing. You know, it is $200M to $400M to bring a drug online. We do that casually for lots of drugs.

All the athletes here, Donna de Varona, Johan Olav Koss, Brandon Slay, Heather Clarke, all of you, for, at end of the line, that is what this is all about and that is who we will perceive we are working for. Coach Hill for your remarks. You know, the big shapers of youth attitudes in America are the women and men who coach, not just visible sports, but all the way down to Little League and youth soccer.

We got all the federal participants in the room and they are staying into the next administration. The Department of Justice is here, Health and Human Services, Department of Education

You have suggested, today, it seems to me, an emerging agenda. We will write this down. We’ll feed it back to you for your own comments. But, number one, you said we got an educational responsibility and it is targeted not just on young people, but also their mentors, their coaches, their team trainers, their physicians.
We are going to have to systematically build that, this again, can’t be haphazard. You know, Rob Housman created the Coach-A-Thon in two months and we put it on the web and the Department of Justice and Health and Human Services whacked together a booklet and we sent it out. We got to be a little better organized than that. We’ve got to follow Donna de Varona’s admonition and get people like Brandon out there talking to children. You know?

This is not high science. It’s got to be changing one human heart at a time. And the people who have to be the spokesmen on that are people like Brandon and other heroes and heroines to American Youths. We’ve got to get Federal facilitation of this.

You know, at the end of the day, we don’t have a minister of sports. I told Donna Shalala, you are it, she is a better athlete than the rest of us in the cabinet. I thought she would well serve the purpose. But we do have to have a continuing focus. That will be up to the Director of ONDCP and Health and Human Services Secretary.

And I think we ought to follow-up on Canada’s offer of cooperation and help. You know, I make no bones about it, I was knocked out of my socks by how well the Australians were organized. I think the Canadians have thought through this thing and have a more coherent approach and we ought to learn from them and ask them to stand with us on the issue.

Point number two, we must raise the bar for Salt Lake. First of all, we’ve got to get going on science. As Don Catlin points out, EPO, we got to find out what can we do given the amount of time we’ve got, and investment research dollars we can bring to bear. We have a share of adequate federal support, DEA, customs education for the environment within which these games take place.

Every one that shows up in the United States of America in the coming two plus years for that competition, should understand when you set foot off the aircraft, you are now under the sovereign influence of U.S. Customs Inspection, Drug Enforcement Agency, etc. We must educate those coming to the games about that matter.

Third, we need to improve our own home. We have a problem as the host in which we are going to have to look and do something, as Gary Wadler says about things like supplements. And, we are going to have to build USADA until it is a credible organization, prior to the start of the games.

Fourth, we have to put the right structures in place. A lot of us have been impressed by what WADA has accomplished. It’s got to be more than an observer. It’s got to be an actor before the Salt Lake games.

Some deliverables, you know, what is it we are supposed to do coming out of this conference? I heard, quite clearly, show me the money. We have to go get adequate funding. This is not going to be difficult to do if you help. All right? And, I think part of it is just the transcript of this conference is going to be a step forward. We are going to go get the money.

Secondly, we do need to give Frank Shorter, Terry Madden and others some instrumentality of the United States status. We are going to have to make sure we do have an agency that can act as a
a representative of the U.S. Government.

Third, we are going to have to do something about legal challenges. The Amateur Sports Act, the questions that were raised here today, DeShay. We are going to have to help with the legal challenges because at the end of the day sports associations aren’t going to risk their future. People aren’t going to serve on boards of directors if they think they are vulnerable to legal challenge.

We need serious research support. NIDA, you know, this is a $600M a year budget, this is 800+ scientists. These people are world class. We are going to have to get on the table with some continuing endorsement of this as a major area, scientific inquiry, and see if we can pull that together.

And then, finally, we, as a task force, the co-chair’s, Mickey and I and others, must deliver to you the next administration. We may be leaving office, but we are not leaving the field of play. So, we will insure we do that.

That’s what we owe you. Let me tell you what you owe me. And, I have four things, you might want to jot them down. First of all, you need to aggressively follow-up on these offers. You can’t go home and think that was a tremendous exchange. I expect to see emails, letters and visits come out of here, in which, for one, you start tasking NIDA. You know, you understand how peer group science works, we need qualified requests for research funding hitting NIDA, so we get proposals from this community.

Secondly, you must help me work on legislation. If you live one kilometer beyond the Beltway, you have tripled the apparent credibility with Congress compared to those of us inside the Beltway. So, we are going to ask you not to become lobbyists, but, instead, to join us to provide a broad gauged endorsement for the requirement to change the law on some of these cases.

Third, when you see the new administration, whoever that may be, take shape, you’ve got to engage on them right off the spot. And, I’m going to make sure they know who the believable names are in this field. And then, you have to come up on the net and embrace them as they come in office and try and educate them and get them working immediately on these critical issues.

And, then, finally, it seems to me, one of the things that most encouraged me, you know, some of you in the room have been doing this for 20 years or longer. And, you know, you just, you’ve held it together, whether Don Catlin or Donna de Varona or Frank Shorter, whoever, now’s the time not to lose faith. I think there is growing momentum. I thought, from the start, when I went to the IOC meeting, Lausane, Switzerland, I was in utter disbelief.

Like many Americans, you know, amateur athlete, college boxer, I’ve spent 10 years working with international organizations. I had never heard anything like this. I had never seen an organization that wasn’t transparent, accountable, elected leadership, external audits, leadership that acted with a sense of integrity.

And, oh, by the way, we had these huge issues at stake, doping in sports, our children, and it was our money. When I say our money, it is Western European, it is the United States, and then we
listen to people like the South Africans, the Brazilians, the Mexicans, and they said, we will not tolerate this kind of unhealthy situation.

And, oh, by the way, we expect to have our voices heard. And, they are going to be heard. So, from the start, I thought there was an inexorable sense of momentum to all this. And, I think that’s where it is going to come out.

We’ve got men and women of good will in the IOC, and, you know, the people that were added to office, I thought, were first rate. We have Dr. Henry Kissinger in the middle of the pile. I have, sort of, a primitive sense of belief in the man’s ability to move issues along.

So, I think we are in good shape. But, at the end of the day, you know, we’ve got produce the goods. And, Mitt, again, thanks to you and your colleagues and the team you are assembling, and the 42,000 volunteers, and, we are behind you all the way.

Thanks very much all of you for being here.
During the White House Task Force meeting, a number of attendees made formal statements and informal comments deploring the fact that certain anabolic steroids such as DHEA (dehydroepiandrosterone), androstenedione, and related compounds are inappropriately and easily available as so-called dietary supplements. Genelabs Technologies, Inc. has been developing DHEA as a new drug for the treatment of SLE (systemic lupus erythematosus or "lupus"). Consequently, we have particular expertise and experience regarding DHEA. Therefore, our comments will be based mainly on our experience with DHEA, but, in general, apply to all such steroid hormones sold as dietary supplements. The evidence discussed herein supports that DHEA should not be available as a dietary supplement for two principal reasons: (1) it does not meet the definition of a dietary supplement under the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act (DSHEA) of 1994; and (2) it should be scheduled as a controlled substance under the Anabolic Steroid Control Act (ASCA) of 1990.

DHEA is a steroid hormone secreted by the adrenal glands. In humans, it is the most common hormone produced by the adrenals. In many tissues, DHEA is converted directly to androstenedione which is then directly converted to testosterone, and as such, DHEA is a direct precursor to testosterone, other androgenic, anabolic steroids, as well as estrogenic steroids. In the 1980s, researchers noted that women with lupus had abnormally low levels of androgenic hormones, including DHEA. It was shown in a mouse model of SLE that the mortality from SLE in these mice was considerably decreased by treatment with androgenic steroid hormones including DHEA. These findings, along with other studies of the immunologic effects of DHEA and other androgens, led to a number of studies of DHEA in women with lupus. These studies serve as the basis for Genelabs’ NDA (New Drug Application) for DHEA as a treatment for lupus. The NDA is currently under review by the FDA.

Genelabs developed DHEA as a hormonal drug therapy for the treatment of lupus precisely because DHEA is an androgenic steroid hormone. The beneficial effects of DHEA and other androgenic steroids in lupus are related to immunologic and anabolic properties shared by these hormones. In our clinical studies, patients who received DHEA showed a significant increase in serum testosterone levels compared to placebo recipients. As described by several speakers including Coach Steve Hill, athletes similarly take high doses of androstenedione, DHEA or other related steroid hormones available as dietary supplements, for their performance-enhancing properties, specifically for their anabolic properties. However, unlike women with lupus, their levels of these hormones are not abnormally low. Their goal, whether they realize it or not, is to raise
their blood levels of these hormones, and consequently raise blood levels of testosterone, a controlled substance banned in the Olympics and most sports.

DHEA and other similar steroid hormones should not be available as dietary supplements. They are not found in the diet, but rather are potent steroid hormones similar to testosterone or estrogens. As steroid hormones, they have potential therapeutic benefits, but also carry long-term risks similar to those associated with testosterone or estrogens. These risks are particularly amplified in the case of steroid hormones masquerading as dietary supplements, since they are being taken without medical supervision and in inappropriate doses. Unsupervised access of these drugs to minors is particularly of great concern, since their effects on growth and sexual maturation of pre-pubertal children and adolescents in their growing phases are unknown. Young athletes taking anabolic dietary supplements in an attempt to enhance performance are in the age groups at highest risk.

Given the significant compelling medical concerns associated with the use and availability of DHEA and similar steroid hormones, this situation can easily be made better by simply having the government enforce the law (DSHEA) that sets the standards for dietary supplements. It is clear that these compounds (i.e., DHEA and similar steroid hormones) do not meet the definition of dietary supplements, as outlined in Supplement DSHEA. For a compound to be a dietary supplement, it has to be a vitamin, mineral, herb or other botanical, “dietary substance, “amino acid, or concentrate, metabolite, constituent, extract, or combination of the above. DHEA does not meet this definition. In addition, there are supplementary criteria outlined in DSHEA that DHEA also does not meet, such as the definition of “[A] dietary substance for use by man to supplement the diet by increasing the total dietary intake” since there is no dietary means to increase blood DHEA levels. DHEA is primarily secreted by and found in the adrenal glands, which are not part of the American diet.

It was emphasized by several participants that, in order to help support a drug-free Olympics, the FDA need only enforce DSHEA to remove DHEA and related anabolic steroid hormones from their easy and unsupervised availability under the guise of dietary supplements. As stated above, the safety concerns posed by the unsupervised use of these steroid hormones, of course, is an equally compelling reason for prompt enforcement of DSHEA with regard to these drugs.

As described above, DHEA does not meet the criteria for being freely available as a dietary supplement. In addition, it does meet the criteria for being scheduled as a controlled substance under the ASCA. Dr. Tolliver from the DEA described the four criteria and administrative procedure for scheduling a substance under ASCA. Eight related compounds including, androstenedione and DHEA, have been under review by the DEA for approximately two years. As he described, there is little question that DHEA (as well as androstenedione and the 6 other related compounds) meets three of the criteria: (1) DHEA is chemically similar to testosterone, (2) pharmacologically similar to it, and (3) is not an estrogen or progestin. However, according to the DEA, there is insufficient evidence from studies in humans for the fourth criterion: promotion of
muscle growth. For this reason, the DEA has started initial phases of animal studies to investigate whether androstenedione promotes muscle growth. In addition, animal studies to include all eight compounds, which will take two years to complete, are planned to be initiated during the summer, 2001, provided funding can be obtained. Under this proposed process, DHEA, androstenedione and related compounds would still not be treated as controlled substances before and during the Salt Lake City Olympics in 2002.

Although Genelabs is in favor of the conduct of studies, including studies in animal models, that may definitively confirm the anabolic effect of DHEA and related steroids, our experience with DHEA in toxicology studies has shown that animal studies may not be predictive of the human situation. In humans, DHEA is the most abundant steroid secreted by the adrenal glands. By contrast, DHEA is not a major steroid hormone in laboratory animals (Feher et al, 1977). In such animals, endogenous levels are considerably lower and its metabolism is different than in humans. In humans, the metabolite of DHEA, DHEA-S, which serves as a reservoir and a way of delivering DHEA to various tissues, circulates at blood levels 500 to 1000 times higher than DHEA itself. By contrast, in dogs, the ratio of blood levels of DHEA and DHEA-S is approximately 1:1. In dogs and other laboratory animals, the total of circulating DHEA and DHEA-S is less than 1% of that in humans.

Perhaps more relevant to the issue of demonstrating an anabolic effect in animal models is the fact that much higher levels of DHEA must be administered to laboratory animals to achieve blood levels comparable to that in humans. For example, in order to achieve blood levels of DHEA in the dog comparable to those achieved by orally administering 200 mg/day in humans (approximately 3 mg/kg/day), it was necessary to orally dose dogs with more than 30,000 mg/day (1500 mg/kg/day). Oral doses higher than 30,000 mg/day could not be practically administered to dogs. It is highly likely that a study in laboratory animals could not achieve levels of DHEA comparable to the levels expected for humans taking as much as 2000 mg/day.

Nonetheless, Genelabs believes there is already ample evidence demonstrating that DHEA is an anabolic steroid, and has submitted a Citizen’s Petition to the DEA requesting that they follow the administrative procedures under ASCA to schedule DHEA as an anabolic steroid. A summary of the evidence for DHEA’s promotion of muscle growth is provided below. As specifically provided under §1308.43(e) and §201(b) of the CSA (21 U.S.C.811(b)), to support a scheduling action only “substantial evidence” to support the rule is required; that is, evidence that is less than a “preponderance” but more than a “mere scintilla.” For a scheduling decision on DHEA, clearly this test has been met.

There are a number of studies in humans demonstrating that DHEA promotes muscle growth. Genelabs has identified 7 published studies which are summarized in Table 1, and are described in more detail below. Although they used different methodologies for assessing increased muscle mass, four of these studies, Morales et al., 1998, Diamond et
al., 1996, Nestler et al., 1988, and Sugino et al., 1998 demonstrated increases in muscle strength or muscle mass.

Table 1: Summary of Studies From the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Reference</th>
<th>Dose</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Study population</th>
<th>Criteria Assessed</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morales et al., 1998</td>
<td>100 mg/day</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>oral</td>
<td>healthy men and women 50-65 years</td>
<td>circulating sex steroids, body composition and muscle strength</td>
<td>in men lean body mass increased and muscle strength increased; in women lean body mass increased, but change was not statistically significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond et al., 1996</td>
<td>3-5 g 10% DHEA cream (approx. 300-500 mg/day)</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>topical</td>
<td>60-70 year old women</td>
<td>mid-thigh fat and muscle area</td>
<td>femoral muscular areas were increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestler et al., 1988</td>
<td>1600 mg/day</td>
<td>28 days</td>
<td>oral</td>
<td>healthy male subjects</td>
<td>body fat mass, serum lipids levels, tissue sensitivity to insulin</td>
<td>lean body mass increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugino et al., 1998</td>
<td>200 mg/day</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>intra-venous</td>
<td>male patients with myotonic dystrophy</td>
<td>activities of daily living (ADL), muscular strength, percussion and grip myotonia, arrhythmia</td>
<td>improved ADL with increase in muscular strength and decrease in myotonia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usiskin et al., 1990</td>
<td>1600 mg/day</td>
<td>28 days</td>
<td>oral</td>
<td>young obese men</td>
<td>weight and body fat mass</td>
<td>no increase in lean body mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welle et al., 1990</td>
<td>1600 mg/day</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>oral</td>
<td>healthy men 20-43 years</td>
<td>energy expenditure and muscle protein synthesis</td>
<td>no significant effect on lean body mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortola and Yen, 1990</td>
<td>1600 mg/day</td>
<td>28 days</td>
<td>oral</td>
<td>post-menopausal women</td>
<td>serum hormones, serum and urine chemistries, percent body fat and body weight</td>
<td>no increase in lean body mass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a placebo controlled, double-blind, crossover trial, Morales et al., 1998, studied the effects of 100 mg/day of DHEA administered for six months to healthy, age advanced (50-65 years) men and women. In both men and women, lean body mass increased compared to baseline or to placebo, but the difference was statistically significant only in men. Muscle strength, as measured by tests of lumbar back and knee strength increased in men but not in women.
Changes in body muscle mass have also been reported in women receiving DHEA chronically. Diamond et al. (1996) evaluated the effect of DHEA replacement therapy in fifteen 60- to 70-year-old women who received a single daily percutaneous application of 3 to 5 grams 10% DHEA cream for 12 months (equivalent to approximately 300 to 500 mg DHEA applied percutaneously daily for 12 months). Seven of the women received a placebo cream for 6 months after cessation of DHEA therapy. Compared to baseline, there were no mean changes in body weight but a 9.8% reduction in subcutaneous skinfold thickness at 12 months (P<0.05). Mid-thigh fat was reduced by 3.8% (P<0.05) while femoral muscular areas were increased by a mean of 3.5% (P<0.05).

In an earlier study, Nestler et al. (1988) and colleagues compared DHEA and placebo in a double-blind, randomized parallel group design, in 10 healthy subjects. In contrast to the Morales et al. (1998) study, the population investigated was young men, the dose of DHEA was higher (1600 mg/day), but the duration was shorter (28 days). In the DHEA group, mean percent body fat decreased by 31%, with no change in weight, suggesting that the reduction in fat mass was coupled with an increase in muscle.

Sugino et al. (1998) administered DHEA-sulfate ([DHEA-S] which is interconverted to DHEA intracellularly, and which acts as a transport and reservoir for DHEA) 200 mg/day intravenously for 8 weeks to 11 patients with myotonic dystrophy. Myotonic dystrophy is an autosomal dominant disease characterized by weakness, myotonia (tonic spasms of muscles), and multi-system abnormalities. Adrenal androgen levels are reduced in this disease, compared with age matched healthy controls. The study showed improved activities of daily living, muscle strength and decreased myotonia, consistent with anabolic effects of DHEA in males. As patients with this disease have low serum DHEA and DHEA-S concentrations which are probably due to decreased production rather than increased clearance, it would be anticipated that treatment with DHEA would improve muscle performance.

There have been three published studies where DHEA administration was not shown to increase muscle mass. Nestler's group conducted a study similar to their previous study (described above), comparing DHEA and placebo in six young obese men (Usiskin et al., 1990). The dose and duration of DHEA were the same as in the previous study, but the latter study differed in design; it was a single-blind study where the study population received placebo for 28 days, followed by DHEA for 28 days. In this latter study, no differences from placebo in body weight, body fat mass, or waist-to-hip ratio was observed during the study.

The authors offered several explanations for the lack of effect of DHEA administration found in this study compared with their earlier work. These included differences in study design and/or the possibility that obese individuals might be relatively resistant to effects of DHEA on metabolism. On a total weight basis, obese subjects received a dose which was 20% lower than that administered in the previous study; differences in body habitus (obese vs. non-obese) may in some way alter the catabolism of DHEA to androgens, estrogens or other metabolically active metabolites. In addition, since all subjects received DHEA only during the second 28 day phase (they were blinded as to treatment...
order), there may have been a lack of compliance with a four time per day regimen during the later portions of the study.

Another study in men was conducted by Welle et al. (1990) where protein metabolism was studied in eight healthy men who received placebo and DHEA (1600 mg/day) for 4 weeks each in a double-blind cross-over study. There was no significant effect on body weight or two indices of lean body mass (total body water and total body potassium), and no effects on parameters of energy and protein metabolism, including resting metabolic rate, total energy expenditure, leucine flux (an index of whole body proteolysis), the non-oxidized portion of leucine flux (an index of whole body protein synthesis) and the rate of incorporation of leucine into muscle proteins.

Finally, Mortola and Yen (1990) treated six postmenopausal women with DHEA 1600 mg/day (in four divided doses) for 28 days in a double-blind, placebo-controlled cross-over study. Per cent body fat (determined by underwater weighing) did not change during either DHEA or placebo treatment, but this too is not a direct measurement of muscle mass and/or strength.

In summary, Genelabs has identified 7 published studies where the effect of DHEA on muscle mass has been investigated. These studies vary widely in type of patient or subject studied, dose and duration of DHEA, and types of assessment of changes in muscle mass or strength. Taken as a whole, the studies demonstrate that DHEA increases muscle mass. The most convincing data are from the studies in an elderly population (who are relatively deficient in endogenous DHEA and testosterone) with relatively high chronic dosing. The fact that some studies were negative largely reflects the fact that optimally to show an anabolic effect in young healthy volunteers, high doses of DHEA, chronically administered, accompanied by strength training may be required. As with testosterone, demonstrating that DHEA increases muscle mass is easier in populations with low levels of androgens, such as the elderly or hypogonadal males. To demonstrate an effect of testosterone on muscle mass in healthy young men required supraphysiologic doses and, in some cases, strength training (Bhasin et al, 1996), precisely the setting where testosterone is abused and where DHEA and other similar steroid hormones, available as dietary supplements, are promoted.

This situation is not substantially different from early studies with testosterone. In fact, many of these studies were inconclusive due to a number of factors including lack of control for intake of energy and protein, lack of standardization of exercise stimulus, and most importantly, doses of androgenic steroids used in previous studies were too low (see Bhasin et al, 1996 for a discussion on these shortcomings). Surprisingly, it was not until 1996 when Bhasin for the first time administered 600 mg per week of testosterone enanthate to men that testosterone was conclusively shown to be anabolic in man. The dose of 600 mg per week was known to be lower than that used by body builders but was higher than any previously studied dose.

Thus, there are data showing that DHEA increases muscle mass in DHEA deficient or relatively deficient populations, when dosed at high enough and for a long enough time.
period. It is apparent that to show anabolic effects would require studies in which volunteers would have to receive potentially dangerously high doses of DHEA (1000 to 2000 mg/day for many months) without any therapeutic benefit. Such studies, as well as being unethical, are unnecessary.

As described above, DHEA is a direct precursor of testosterone, and is converted to it in the body. Taking DHEA in the high doses reported anecdotally by athletes (as much as 2000 mg/day) will lead to high levels of testosterone, with testosterone's well-recognized anabolic effects and toxicity. For example, in the Genelabs' placebo-controlled studies of DHEA in women with lupus, there was a dose-related increase in blood levels of testosterone with the administration of DHEA. The most common side effects associated with DHEA in these studies were acne and hirsutism or facial hair growth, side effects expected from testosterone. Blood levels of testosterone, prior to receiving DHEA or placebo, were approximately 20 ng/ml or lower. After completion of up to one year of treatment, blood levels were slightly lower in the placebo group, while they doubled to approximately 40 ng/dl in women receiving 100 mg/day of DHEA, and were almost double again to approximately 70 ng/dl in women receiving 200 mg/day. [Note: These are the levels of testosterone achieved by women who were taking therapeutic doses of DHEA.] Young athletes indiscriminately and without supervision may take 10 times the amount of DHEA used in our studies, which would mean that these athletes would achieve substantially greater blood levels of testosterone than those described above.

In summary, ASCA requires that the DEA schedule substances as controlled drugs that meet the four criteria described previously. DHEA meets each of these criteria. Neither ASCA nor common sense require that every single study, no matter what its design, dose or patient population, show that DHEA does promote muscle growth. Studies that meet scientific and ethical standards have shown that DHEA promotes muscle growth. It is for this reason that DHEA is promoted and sold to athletes as a dietary supplement to increase muscle strength. Athletes take DHEA, frequently at doses that could not ethically be administered to volunteers in scientific studies, in order to achieve increased muscle strength and mass. Studies have shown that DHEA increases levels of testosterone and others potent anabolic steroids which are known to increase muscle strength. These studies have also shown that women receiving DHEA have the side effects associated with testosterone, i.e., acne and hirsutism or facial hair growth.

Thus, there is already sufficient evidence for the DEA to make an informed judgment. By planning and relying on animal studies of unknown relevance to the human situation, the DEA will needlessly delay for more than two years an important assessment. In fact, at least three other countries have already made this assessment: that DHEA and related androgenic steroids are anabolic steroids which should be scheduled as controlled substances. DHEA is considered an anabolic steroid in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia; and treated as a controlled substance in Canada and the United Kingdom and is banned in Australia. They are banned by most major sports and by the IOC. DHEA and similar steroid hormones, in the form of unregulated dietary supplements, for which DHEA and similar steroid hormones clearly do not meet the definition, have been shown to be contaminated by substances such as nandrolone, and to have the potential for
causing urine tests to be positive for nandrelone. The easy availability in the United States of DHEA and related steroid hormones continues to jeopardize athletes here, and now will jeopardize the upcoming Olympics.
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December 20, 2000

General Barry R. McCaffrey
Director, ONDCP
Executive Office of the President
Washington, DC 20503
RE: Task Force Record

Dear General McCaffrey:

Having worked as a senior communications specialist for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign during the past two years, I am pleased to see your sincere interest in working with sports and athletes as a vehicle to effectively communicate with America's youth.

The recent White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports in Salt Lake City was an excellent place to begin the dialog of creating a strategy of reaching kids through the 2002 Olympic Games.

As discussed at the Task Force meetings, it is vital to continue research in the area of doping among athletes. However, I am disappointed that little time was spent discussing the youth outreach anti-doping educational program even though the consensus was that education was equally as important as research.

It is unfortunate that the ONDCP's National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign does not currently allocate any resources to youth outreach through sports. The sports-related programs that have been developed by the Media Campaign's contractors have primarily been created as an appendage of other youth-serving organizational relationships that have been developed through the "partnership initiatives and stakeholder communications" aspect of the Campaign.

In order for the Task Force to be effective, resources for a "youth education through sports program" need to be allocated directly by the ONDCP or as part of the Media Campaign.

The Youth Empowerment Alliance's sole purpose is to develop these youth-serving educational programs through our vast network of grassroots organizations and media. We have been working closely with the 80,000-member World Olympians Association to develop an anti-doping platform. The ONDCP's financial support of this multi-media initiative would give it the power it deserves.

Again, thank you for your leadership in fighting drug use among America's youth.

With sincere regards,

Sherry Sizemore, President
Youth Empowerment Alliance

8. The Deseret News (Salt Lake City, UT), December 8, 2000, Friday, LOCAL;, Pg. B10, 556 words, SLOC vows to catch drug cheaters, By Derek JensenDeseret News staff writer

11. National Public Radio (NPR), MORNING EDITION (11:00 AM on ET), December 8, 2000, Friday, 707 words, US DRUG CZAR'S TASK FORCE OUTLINES PLAN TO PREVENT DRUG USE AMONG ATHLETES ATTENDING 2002 WINTER OLYMPICS, BOB EDWARDS, HOWARD BERKES

12. The Salt Lake Tribune, December 8, 2000, Friday, Final; Pg. C1, 910 words, Task Force Tackles Sports Drug Abuse; Secrecy, diet supplements cited as big hurdles; Chemicals, CHRISTOPHER SMITH, THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE


21. The Deseret News (Salt Lake City, UT), December 7, 2000, Thursday, WIRE;, Pg. A01, 442 words, Goal is drug-free Games, By Lois M. CollinsDeseret News staff writer

31. The Deseret News (Salt Lake City, UT), December 6, 2000, Wednesday, WIRE;, Pg. A20, 583 words, Drug czar stresses strict tests, ethics, By Matt Kelley Associated Press writer

33. The Salt Lake Tribune, December 6, 2000, Wednesday, Final; Pg. A6, 577 words, 2002 Backdrop for Anti-Drug Message, CHRISTOPHER SMITH, THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE
The Salt Lake Organizing Committee will run about 1,000 random, out-of-competition drug tests on athletes before and during the 2002 Winter Games.

"We will catch the cheaters," SLOC President Mitt Romney told members of the White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports Thursday.

But making the Salt Lake Olympics the cleanest Games ever will require more than just random testing, according to members of the task force.

"Our program is designed to test drug-free athletes," Dr. Douglas Rollins, SLOC's doping-control medical director, said. "It's going to be your efforts in the next few months to see that drug-free athletes come to Salt Lake City."

The task force, chaired by White House drug czar Barry McCaffrey and made up of former Olympic athletes, doctors and representatives from SLOC, the U.S. Olympic Committee and International Olympic Committee, met for the first time Thursday in downtown Salt Lake City.

According to many on the task force, keeping drugs out of national and international competition requires a change in societal values.

"It's not catching cheaters that changes the nature of the game," McCaffrey said.

Canadian Olympic rower Heather Clarke said doping will only end when it becomes socially unacceptable.

"Young athletes do not care about the side effects, they care about the immediate results," Steve Hill of the Davis School District Safe School Staff said.

The focus needs to be returned to doing your best instead of being the best, Clarke said.

According to many on the task force, Sydney was a turning point for anti-doping efforts. But there were still the drug controversies surrounding U.S. shotputter C.J. Hunter and Romanian gymnast Andreea Raducan. Hunter tested positive for a banned substance in an out-of-competition test, although he was not on the U.S. Olympic team. Raducan had her gold medal stripped after she tested positive for a banned stimulant contained in cold medicine she took at the advice of a team physician.

"The Sydney experience may indeed be a net negative our public had on having a clean sport," said Canada's federal doping policy director Ole Sorensen. "At the inner levels, we can say we've definitely moved ahead."
Organizations such as the World Anti-Doping Agency and U.S. Anti-Doping Agency have brought together a worldwide coalition to fight against performance-enhancing drugs.

But keeping up with the ever-changing drug market is difficult because of the intense pressure many athletes are under to use drugs.

"They are supported by an incredibly complex underground that could run rings around what we do," said Dr. Don Catlin, director of the UCLA/IOC Lab.

Drug testing is usually a step or two behind the latest drugs on the market. SLOC and the IOC are working to develop a more accurate test for erythropoietin, commonly called EPO, for the 2002 Winter Games. EPO is a performance-enhancing hormone that boosts production of red blood cells, providing the body with more oxygen for a time. It will likely be the drug of choice for the Winter Games.

The first tests for EPO were conducted in Sydney for the 2000 Summer Games, but many questioned the credibility of those results.

"It's a very complex test and it needs a lot more work to get it online and to be litigation-proof," Catlin said.
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BOB EDWARDS, host:

White House drug czar Barry McCaffrey says the next Olympics won't involve as much illicit drug use as the last. The 2002 Winter Games take place on American soil, and McCaffrey's pledge is made amid international skepticism of the American anti-doping effort. That drug-fighting plan was outlined yesterday in Salt Lake City, the host of the 2002 Winter Olympics. NPR's Howard Berkes reports.

HOWARD BERKES reporting:
Barry McCaffrey's **White House Task Force** on Drug Use in Sports convened in a downtown hotel, just across the street from the plaza where Olympic athletes will receive their medals, just up from the arena where skaters will glide for gold and just beyond the morning shadows of the Wasatch Range, where skiers, sledders and jumpers will compete. The task force set goals for the Salt Lake Olympics as lofty as that mountain backdrop.

Mitt Romney directs the Salt Lake Olympic Organizing Committee.

Mr. MITT ROMNEY (Director, Salt Lake Olympic Organizing Committee): Now I want you to know that we are 100 percent committed to having clean, drug-free Games in Salt Lake City in 2002.

BERKES: Mickey Ibarra is President Clinton's adviser on intergovernmental affairs.

Mr. MICKEY IBARRA (Clinton Adviser): Salt Lake will be the most drug-free Winter Olympic Games ever held. We think you can bank on that.

BERKES: And Barry McCaffrey is the White House drug czar.

Mr. BARRY McCAFFREY (White House Drug Czar): And what we want isn't to catch cheaters. It's to assure world-class athletes that you can go compete based on talent and expect to win or lose on that basis.

BERKES: More than 5,000 drug tests are planned before and during the Salt Lake City Games. Half will be surprise tests. But the task force's testing experts warn they don't necessarily keep pace with the development of new performance-enhancing substances. Gary Wadler is a physical and medical adviser to the task force.

Dr. GARY WADLER (Task Force Adviser): It seems like every time a new drug or technology is developed, an athlete determined to gain athletic advantage finds a way to misuse or abuse that drug or technology, perverting its original intent.

BERKES: And athletes who cheat figure out how to hide their use of banned substances. The drug of choice at the Salt Lake Olympics is expected to be EPO, which builds endurance. New drug tests for EPO premiered at last summer's Olympics in Sydney. They were credited with prompting more than two dozen athletes to pull out of the Games. But they're not fool-proof yet and probably won't be before the Salt Lake City Olympics, according to Don Katlan, who conducts drug tests for the International Olympic Committee.

Mr. DON KATLAN (International Olympic Committee): Look, 14 months away. This is a big project, and if you want to try to really carve new territory, you have to start it before. It takes a long time.

BERKES: Some at the meeting were also concerned that the rest of the world won't trust the Salt Lake City testing effort. That stems from revelations in Sydney and allegations and lawsuits that the US Olympic Committee suppresses positive drug tests of American athletes. This is how the international suspicion is described by Johan Olva Koss, a speed-skating gold medalist and member of the International Olympic Committee.

Mr. JOHAN OLVA KOSS (Gold Medalist; International Olympic Committee): Perception internationally is bad about USA and what USOC or other national governing bodies has done to protect their athletes and help them cheat. This is the perception. I mean, there is no way you ask anyone outside United States to believe that American athletes has not been cheating.

BERKES: US Olympic officials say this is all a misunderstanding over the Amateur Athletics Act, which requires a hearing for athletes before positive drug tests are revealed. But American Frank Shorter disagrees. Shorter is a former marathon runner and chair of the new US Anti-**Doping** Agency.
Mr. FRANK SHORTER (Chairman, US Anti-Doping Agency): We used the Amateur Sports Act as an excuse not to give any information to anyone. It was not by law that this was required, and yet it was held out that it was by law that it was required.

BERKES: Shorter's agency will test American athletes competing in Salt Lake City and will make the results available on demand to accredited international Olympic groups. But the results won't be made public until after two tests, a scientific review and a hearing. That could take a month, which could still strain credibility. Shorter adds that his agency will preserve blood and urine samples indefinitely so that new tests for drugs can be applied later. An athlete testing positive long after the Games still might lose a medal. That, he says, should be a powerful deterrent.

Mr. SHORTER: It's the fear of getting caught that we're trying to create here. We're not really trying to catch anybody.

BERKES: The drug testing begins next year as athletes train and qualify for the 2002 Games. Howard Berkes, NPR News, Salt Lake City.
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Track and Field failed to report positive tests and covered up the positive test of shot-putter C.J. Hunter, who was named to the team but did not compete.

Track's national director, Craig Masback, said those charges are "demonstrably false," partially blaming the allegations on the American legal standard of due process that requires sporting bodies to maintain the confidentiality of the athlete until a final determination of guilt or innocence is made.

"The provision of the Amateur Athletic Act that you may not suspend or remove from competition someone who hasn't had a hearing ultimately undermines the overall effort we have here," Masback said. If an athlete tests positive in a medically reviewed drug screening, Masback said, "let's get that athlete off the playing field. Right now, the law of the United States prevents that."

The new U.S. Anti-Doping Agency assumed athletic drug test responsibilities for all U.S. Olympic sports in October. USADA boss Terry Madden said he believes in complete transparency.

"No longer do we expect our [national governing bodies of sport] to be accused of delaying testing or hiding test results," said Madden. "We have nothing to hide."

But USADA has joined with the U.S. Olympic Committee in asking a federal judge in Colorado to prevent public disclosure or discussion of hundreds of positive drug test results of Olympic hopefuls that the USOC's former drug control chief wants to use as evidence in a lawsuit. Asked how that desire to conceal test results squares with the United States' proclamation of transparency, White House drug czar Barry McCaffrey conceded, "It's very difficult."

"You can't jeopardize your standing by pouring your lifeblood into failed legal action," he said. "We will have to carefully step through this. USADA may not be built in a day. There may be a requirement to go back and re-look at national U.S. legislation."

USOC acting CEO Scott Blackmun said athletes are divided on the question of disclosure. "I would challenge U.S. athletes to answer the question whether the fundamental notion of due process embedded in our system should have application to doping issues," he said.

Salt Lake Organizing Committee President Mitt Romney said his guiding principal on drug testing for 2002 is simple: "It's inexcusable to hide the truth."

Another area of doping that may require congressional tinkering involves dietary supplements known as "steroid precursors." Although substances such as androstenedione and 19-norandrostenedione metabolize into anabolic steroids -- a controlled substance -- once they are ingested, they are sold over the counter to customers of any age under the Dietary Supplement Health Education Act of 1994, sponsored by Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah.

"The legal stand in the U.S. is you don't necessarily have to say what is contained in these supplements, and a lot of these supplements are produced right here in Utah," said Johan Olav Koss, a physician and former gold medalist who serves on the World Anti-Doping Agency.

The Drug Enforcement Agency's top researcher on dietary supplements, Jim Tolliver, said eight steroid precursors are currently sold as dietary supplements and they meet the definition of anabolic steroids in all but one category, scientific proof of muscle growth. Tolliver said the DEA needs $400,000 to study the muscle-building characteristics of the eight dietary supplements now marketed as performance enhancers.

Other experts called for immediate amendments to federal law to require the steroid precursors -- which have legitimate medical purposes such as treatment of lupus -- to be sold only as prescription drugs.

"We are enabling young people to increase their estrogen on a prolonged basis," said New York University doping expert Gary Wadler, noting the increased risk of breast and uterine cancer in women from estrogen supplements. "It's a public health crisis. I really ask Sen. Hatch to revisit that act,
specifically toward the definition of a steroid precursor, which isn't even mentioned in his legislation." McCaffrey said he planned to meet with Hatch to discuss problems with the dietary supplement law. "We put 50 years of work into getting the Food and Drug Administration laws to handle dangerous drugs," said McCaffrey. "Now, we've developed this parallel system of frequently goofy substances that are available in grocery stores. It doesn't make much sense."

GRAPHIC: Olympic medalists Brandon Slay, left, and Donna DeVarona discuss drug control policies with Barry McCaffrey, White House drug czar, Thursday in Salt Lake City.
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More aggressive drug testing will help keep the 2002 Winter Games clean, members of the White House Task Force on Drug Use in Sports said Thursday at their first meeting.

The group discussed how to develop tests to detect the ever-changing drugs used by athletes, and how to educate athletes, coaches and the public about the problem.

Scott Blackmun, president of the U.S. Olympic Committee, said the use of performance-enhancing drugs violates the spirit of the Games.

"What we're really talking about is competing to your best ability," he said. "And doping undermines that."

Frank Shorter, the chair of the U.S. Anti-Doping Agency, said substantially more athletes will be caught by drug testing during the next five years.

Shorter said his agency, which is running the USOC's anti-drug efforts, plans to conduct 5,000 drug tests next year - half of them unannounced, out-of-competition screenings.

But even while drug screening becomes more aggressive, scientists, athletes, politicians and researchers
agree that testing alone won't solve the problem.

Many suggested that the push to be the very best has overshadowed the pureness of competition.

"We must protect the overwhelming majority of athletes that play clean," said task force co-chair and White House drug czar Barry McCaffrey.

Another problem, McCaffrey said, is the widespread use of herbal supplements that "can be bought at the corner Safeway."

Dr. Gary Wadler, medical adviser to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, called the widespread use of supplements a public health crisis.

He said Sen. Orrin Hatch should hold hearings to revisit his 1994 Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act, which limited the authority of the Food and Drug Administration to test and regulate food supplements.

But the real issue, said Dr. Don Catlin, director of the joint IOC and University of California at Los Angeles drug-testing lab, is the banned performance-enhancing hormone called EPO, which will be the drug of choice for the Winter Olympics.

EPO, or erythropoietin, enhances endurance by boosting the production of oxygen-rich red blood cells.

The first test for EPO was introduced during the Sydney Olympics, although questions were raised about its credibility. Catlin said a new test must be developed before 2002.

"Without it, you're not going to have a drug-free games, you're going to have an EPO games," he said.

As for the Salt Lake Games, organizing committee president Mitt Romney vowed that no one will be above the anti-doping rules and it will be inexcusable to hide the truth.

Mickey Ibarra, task force co-chair and assistant to the President, said Utah has made much progress in preparation for the 2002 Olympics.

"Now I think we're building a level playing field," he said.

---

On the Net:

Salt Lake City Olympic organizers: http://www.slc2002.org
Anti-doping information: http://www.playclean.org
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Goal is drug-free Games

By Lois M. Collins

Deseret News staff writer

The nation's leading drug policymaker believes Utah's Winter Games in 2002 will be the most drug-free in recent memory, building on successful drug-free efforts in Sydney, but it will require a concerted effort to make that happen.

Some of the strongest support is coming from within the ranks of the athletes, said Gen. Barry McCaffrey, the federal drug czar. "Athletes are demanding that we do it. "Winners are uniformly suspect," he said, and they are driving the move to "go transparent and respond to some international rules," including a "common code of banned substances."

"How can we have sports records that are being artificially generated by sports pharmacies?" McCaffrey asked.

Recent events have shown a change in attitude. When the United States suggested that Olympic anti-doping efforts should be overseen by an independent international agency, McCaffrey said he received "essentially a blow-off from the IOC."

But the United States was not standing alone in its desire to see the Games drug free. McCaffrey had what he calls a huge groundswell of support. And the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), a semi-independent agency, was born in time for the Sydney Summer Olympics.

The Sydney Games were "unquestionably the most drug-free Olympics in modern history," he said during a meeting with the Deseret News editorial board as part of his two-day stay in Utah to promote a no-drug-tolerance agenda for professional athletics. He also spoke Wednesday in Park City to the Utah Olympic Public Safety Command. Thursday, he was to convene the first-ever White House Task Force on Drugs and Sports in Salt Lake City.

During both the Atlanta and Los Angeles Games, McCaffrey said, "allegedly positive" drug test samples disappeared.

The antidrug message got through even before the Sydney Games. McCaffrey said China dropped 27 people from its team before it went to the Games. And athletes from all over the world who did use banned substances were disqualified and even stripped of medals.

To promote the no-doping effort, Olympic officials will conduct 5,000 out-of-cycle drug tests of athletes in the next year -- half of them with no notice to the athletes.

Officials believe there may even be time to develop a test for human growth hormone before the Salt Lake Games.

There will be "absolutely greater safeguards in Salt Lake," McCaffrey said. "We have to get back to the purity of sports."

McCaffrey said that, as his term as drug czar comes to a close, "I'm astonished at what we did. I was not a volunteer. I did not want this job. But we came a long way. A lot more needs to be done."

E-MAIL: lois@desnews.com
Drug czar stresses strict tests, ethics

BYLINE: By Matt Kelley Associated Press writer

WASHINGTON -- Strict drug tests and a renewed focus on athletic ethics are needed to keep Olympic competitors from souping up their bodies with banned substances, White House drug policy director Barry McCaffrey said Tuesday.

McCaffrey will be in Salt Lake City to convene the White House Task Force on Drugs in Sports for discussions on ways to minimize doping in the 2002 Winter Games on Thursday.

While in Utah, McCaffrey will also meet separately with Mitt Romney, the president of the Salt Lake Organizing Committee, on Thursday, to discuss the doping issue. He was also to address the Utah Olympic Public Safety Command on Wednesday in Park City.

The task force includes Olympic officials, athletes, Utah Gov. Mike Leavitt and Brandon Slay, the American wrestler belatedly awarded a gold medal this year after his German opponent failed a drug test.

"What competitors want is an assurance that they don't have to use performance-enhancing drugs," McCaffrey said. "They're not after catching the cheaters. They want to make sure that when they go out to run, to ski, to jump, that it's a level playing field. I think that's what testing can do."

U.S. Olympic officials have turned over drug testing programs to an agency that plans 5,000 drug tests next year -- half of them unannounced, out-of-competition screenings.

The federal government also is chipping in $3.3 million for anti-drug efforts in the Salt Lake City Games. McCaffrey, who steps down as White House drug policy chief Jan. 6, said he thinks the drug screening process for the Utah games will be a strong deterrent.

"I think that right now, if you're out there in Ulan Bator or Hawaii or Beijing and you're looking at the Salt Lake Winter Olympics, you and your coach and your trainer ought to say, 'We'd better go with our talent, good nutrition and coaching, because we don't want to risk the shame of winning and being exposed,' " McCaffrey said.

McCaffrey has strongly criticized past anti-drug efforts by the International Olympic Committee and other sports groups, saying they were too lax to act as a credible deterrent. Drug testing during year's games in Sydney marked a turning point, however, McCaffrey said.

Dozens of athletes either failed drug tests or avoided the Olympics for fear of testing positive, and several medal winners were disqualified because of drug tests. Rather than sullying the Olympic image, those tests helped give fans confidence that the winners weren't chemically cheating, McCaffrey said.
The drug question also has dogged the U.S. Olympic Committee. Claims that the USOC was lax on drugs intensified when news leaked in Sydney that shot putter C.J. Hunter, husband of Olympic track medalist Marion Jones, failed four drug tests in Europe last summer.

In October, the USOC turned over its anti-drug efforts to the U.S. Anti-Doping Agency, an independent board headed by 1972 marathon gold medalist Frank Shorter. McCaffrey said he was confident Shorter's organization was independent and qualified enough to perform fair and accurate tests.

The International Olympic Committee also has created a semi-independent World Anti-Doping Agency, which McCaffrey said is a good step but needs more independence to be completely effective. Still, all the trends are in the right direction, McCaffrey said.

"I think we ought to be pretty optimistic," McCaffrey said. "If you feel it's hopeless, you turn off the TV set, walk away from athletic competition and do something else."
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The task force also is studying the potential health impacts on adolescents of nutritional supplements marketed as muscle builders and endurance boosters. Sold over the counter and Internet to customers of any age, one of the most popular supplements is androstenedione or "andro."

A University of Iowa study published last month in the Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism found ingestion of 100 milligrams of andro three times daily by men increases estrogen up to 80 percent, causes enlargement of the prostate and can cause a 10 percent to 15 percent increase in heart disease.

To help speed Food and Drug Administration review of andro as a potential controlled substance, the Healthy Competition Foundation of BlueCross BlueShield Association on Tuesday announced a clearinghouse to collect independent anecdotal evidence of adverse health effects from dietary supplements. Doctors and sports medicine officials can submit suspect andro case information via e-mail to AndroEvents.Healthy Competition@bcbsa.com.

"We're reaching out to medical organizations, pediatricians and endocrinologists to help us gather more evidence, particularly as it relates to children," said foundation director Iris Shaffer. "We have an opportunity to try to make it more difficult to obtain these dietary supplements, which is our goal."

Added Bernard Griesemer of the American Academy of Pediatrics: "Unregulated dietary supplements such as andro may be causing harm to children and teens, but today's users may not feel the full effect of that harm until they are adults."

McCaffrey said much of the problem lies in the federal law that allows sale of dietary supplements without prior scientifically validated proof of no ill health effects.

"We are selling substances in grocery stores that you ingest as a legal product and excrete as an illegal product," he said. "Why would we tolerate that?"

e-mail: csmith@sltrib.com
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