

**Attachment: Additional Questions for the Record**  
**Mana Shim, J.D., Chair, U.S. Soccer Federation Participant Safety Task Force, U.S. Soccer Federation**

**The Honorable Jan Schakowsky**

1. In the final report of the Commission on the State of U.S. Olympics & Paralympics, the Commission states “[The United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee (USOPC)] charges each [National Governing Body (NGB)] or [Paralympic Sport Organization (PSO)] a baseline contribution fee toward the statutory annual SafeSport funding requirement of \$20 million each...each NGB or PSO is also charged a “high-use contribution” fee per case in addition to this baseline contribution—even for those in which SafeSport declines jurisdiction and sends the case back to the governing body.” The Commission found that a “Low Cost Case” which is a case resulting in a deferral of jurisdiction or administrative hold, would cost \$150, a “Medium Cost Case” which is a case resulting in an administrative closure, would cost \$1,500, and a “High Cost Case”, which is a case resulting in a decision by SafeSport, would cost \$3,000.
  - a. Ms. Shim: can you confirm that a fee per case structure still exists or has existed between the USOPC, NGBs, and PSOs?

**The fee structure is still per case.**

- b. If so, do you believe this risks disincentivizing some NGBs and PSOs, particularly smaller ones, from doing all they can to report cases and pursue safety to the fullest?

**Yes, I do think this fee structure could pose the risk of disincentivizing some NGBs and PSOs from reporting cases. The potential for risk is exacerbated by the fact that cases often linger and do not end up with a final decision on the merits, so the spent resources on case investigations seem wasted. This fee structure is particularly burdensome for smaller organizations with limited resources.**

**The Honorable Raul Ruiz, M.D.**

1. Are SafeSport investigators and employees trained in trauma-informed practices?

**My experience, as well as anecdotal evidence that I’ve gathered from other athletes, leads me to believe that SafeSport’s investigators are not adequately trained in trauma-informed practices. I do not know what trauma-informed training SafeSport requires of its investigators and employees, but I believe it is insufficient.**

2. Could you share the measures undertaken by the Center to adhere to its own timelines for resolving cases resulting in formal resolutions?

**We do not have information about the Center's internal guidelines for resolution of cases in a timely manner, so we are only able to answer this question based on firsthand experience. The allegations in my case were reported on 9/30/21, and we still have not received a formal decision. The Center may have more information about its own standard for timely resolution and what it has done to comply with that standard.**