

DRAFT
Rocky Mountain District Winter Meeting¹
Santa Fe, New Mexico
January 4-6, 2002

Attendees:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Bob Nolen	NM	President
Bruce Karinen	District	Registrar
Charles Callaway	District	Director
Kelly Grover	District	Risk Manager
Kathy Bryant	District	Director
Bob McMann	District	Referee in Chief
John Cole	CO	
Mike Holmes	UT	President
Mike TenEyck	ID	
Tom Lampl	ID	
Larry Schloss	AZ	President
Gail Bowman	WY	President
Caithlin Grimes	WY	
Bruce Bekkadahl	MT	President
Mark Shephard	TX	
Karen Martinez	NM	LOE Affiliate Secretary
Roger Newall	NM	LOE Affiliate Ref. in Chief
Susan Massari	NM	SFTR Associate Registrar

Absent:

Al Bloomer	District	Director
Graig McAlister	District	IP Administrator
Dave Delozier	District	Coach in Chief
Bryan Irely	CO	President

Welcome by Bob Nolen

Introductions

Proposal for secretarial support for district meetings. If an affiliate wants to host a district meeting it would now be a requirement to provide secretarial services for the meetings.

Moved: Bruce Bekkadahl, MT
Seconded: Larry Schloss, AZ

¹ Respectfully submitted by Karen J. Martinez, Land of Enchantment Amateur Hockey Association Secretary

Discussion: Who pays for these services? It is a volunteer position and required as part of the agreement to host a meeting. Who will update the policy manual? Suggested that the responsibility be assigned to the president of the council of presidents and move with the position. The concern was raised that continuity would be lost if it is a different person at each meeting. Discussion closed

Aye: 1

Opposed: 6

Motion failed – search will continue for a new secretary

Meeting process – trying to have a motion on the table that we work towards defeating or approving.

Discussion: When do things need to happen? What should we be doing at the 3 different meetings held each year? Future planning. Get away from dwelling on minute details in every discussion. Many felt that they system or methods currently used (open forum) is working well. Flavor of the meetings has deteriorated significantly over the past few years. It is becoming increasingly difficult to communicate what the problems are; people are less inclined to speak freely.

How are we doing?

Ground rules: Respect each other and make comments in a positive vein.

Discussion opened: 9:06 AM

Loss of 2 or 3 major resources indicates that something is wrong. They are leaving because of the abuse and lack of support. This body has a responsibility to bring them back and fix the problems that have been created. This is from long-term abuse. We need to be part of the solution not the problem. Who will pick up the pieces when these 3 leave? So far no one has stepped up. We need to respect people for the knowledge and experience regardless of our personal feelings towards specific individuals.

Roger Newall – Observed that years ago this was a group of individuals that came together to work on the operations but now the operations have become secondary and we appear to have become more of an administrative structure rather than a working structure.

Mike – when council of presidents was created and policy was written for structure. It was created with the best interest of the district in mind. He has some concerns with the statement that the directors work for the presidents. He believes that the directors have an obligation to follow whatever is agreed to at these meetings; the presidents need to respect the directors and allow the directors to run with the decisions that are made and implement them. We need to let the staff do their business but they must be held accountable. The directors are removable; they are the only people that can be replaced.

Does everyone feel that the policy and procedures manual is the authority that you delegate and hold everyone accountable to? We all need to become familiar with this manual.

USAH direction of what a director does, the biggest duty a director has is to represent our district at USA hockey as a voting member. The funds to USAH directors are in the budget of Bruce Karinen. 3 accounts – 1) expenses for affiliates out of pocket travel expenses, etc..., 2) USA hockey account pays for meetings, 3) *player development account-this money was segregated after the last audit. The only paid positions are at the association level, but there are no district staff members that are paid. The money is strictly to reimburse out of pocket expenses only.

**Bruce* – would like to see more volunteer as team leaders in the 15, 16, 17 type teams. This is a rewarding but somewhat time consuming position. If someone wants to find out what player development is all about and is willing to work for one week this is an excellent opportunity. This opportunity should be offered to all members of each affiliate.

Larry – we all need to reflect on part of the process of coming to these sessions. Part of our responsibility to our affiliate is to advocate for our affiliate on a particular topic. In that process those comments are generally meant to be personal if a program is critiqued it isn't necessarily a critique of the individual performing the position and we should all be respectful of each other in this process. We have made generational transfers of duties and responsibilities in the past and there is little doubt that if and when people leave we will find others to step up and fill the positions. The P&P manual is a guide that everyone should follow, review regularly and bring to each of these meetings. We need to push aside our own egos and also not take things so personally and move on to the next item on the agenda. It isn't what we do but how we do it.

In all organizations, business or volunteer, there is a natural attrition rate. What we are facing here is not part of the natural attrition rate. When 3 key individuals leave at once it is a clear indication that something is wrong and there needs to be some internal assessment of what the problem is.

Some people feel that they are clueless as to what the problem is? The point of this discussion is to bring everyone together and up to speed on what the problem is. The fact that people feel clueless is a major part of the problem.

P&P - Al Bloomer needs to be the leading and guiding force behind this organization not the council of presidents. We had one out of control member who was abusing his power and things were changed. We don't want one person in control; everyone wants to have their input heard.

Directors are elected out of the districts by the council of presidents.

Player development is not a district function it is a youth council function.

Put the right people in and allow them to do their job and if you don't like what they are doing you can remove them. It takes 5 of the 8 votes to remove a director.

Utah doesn't see any problems with the district player development camps. They see Al Bloomer as the man in charge. Where is the complaint?

The checks and balances need to take us back to a workable arrangement. We need to get back to the real elements of why we are here. It's the players and their money that is funding all of this. The overall equation needs to keep the players as a key element. We need the chain of command consistent at every level. We need to make sure we know what our money is being spent on and that it is being spent appropriately.

It is very difficult to function in volunteer positions when you don't feel that you have the support. There is an undercurrent here that everyone doesn't address and that is that there isn't the support that the outside perceives.

Is there a problem whether perceived or real?

Discussion closed 10:09

Parking Lot Issues: (Flip chart)

District reports:

District Director – district tournament planning process underway for Tier 1, Women and Tier 2. High School is underway for SLC.

District Registrar – if your team attends a district tournament you must have this matrix filled out your team will be bumped to the bottom of the list for credentials etc...Copies distributed.

<p><i>Action Item: Affiliates distribute this matrix to all teams that participate in any district tournament. Make it clear that this is mandatory.</i></p>

District Risk Manager - we are at the end of a 5 year contract on the insurance and we should expect changes and modifications to the current contract. The current one is good but has taken a big hit, our district has traditionally been about 3rd in cost output but we are not 3rd in size. We are an expensive district to carry. Costs will almost invariably go up. Adults and Juniors are what is really hurting us. Their numbers don't offset the cost output.

USAH puts out a guidebook for insurance. How many people have seen this guidebook and are you getting new one's each year? Overall response is no. These need to be passed out to every team and should be used as a resource. These are sent directly to the state registrar and that person should be distributing them.

District Coach-in-Chief - Dave DeLozier has submitted his resignation effective when his replacement is named. This is a USAH position that is assigned. Dave did not indicate why he has resigned. Written report handed out to affiliate presidents. Dave has taken more than was expected in the past and this will be a large loss to the district. The decision was not made lightly.

Should we recommend a replacement? It was noted that anyone can make a recommendation. This person needs to be someone who is currently within the coaching education system. Please send your recommendations to Bob Nolen by 1/9 and he will have the directors submit a formal written recommendation to USAH.

Is someone from within this group willing to talk to Dave about withdrawing his resignation? It is believed that Dave is doing quality work and this body needs to show him that he will be supported if he were to choose to stay. If he decides to leave can we provide some type of token of our appreciation?

Motion: \$200 to Dave DeLozier for an appreciation gift if he chooses to leave
Moved: Mike – Utah
Second: Mike -Idaho
Passed Unanimously

District Referee in Chief – Numbers are improving, less people are failing the tests because participants are more knowledgeable and prepared. Thanks to New Mexico for lobbying for help with the officiating program. A development clinic was held in October and was very successful. It was a nice environment to work within and everyone was treated very well.

FYI – in Utah the county rinks did not register their house teams with USAH, but they want to use USAH officials, rules, training programs, etc. The decision was made that youth officials will be allowed to work these non-USAH games to give them a place to work and learn. The rationale was that if we don't allow them to work these games they may be lost and will never return to officiating.

Comments:

Short term we are helping a few kids in referee training, but long term we are hurting USAH. We are making it that much easier for people and organizations to walk away from USAH.

We probably can't prevent the individual from officiating, but we can prevent the officials from wearing their USAH crest during non-sanctioned games. By wearing that crest you create an expectation that the event is USAH sanctioned.

Bob will be heavily involved with the Olympics from start to finish. This will require a large time commitment which infringes on his ability to be involved in both district tournaments and the responsibility will be delegated to either the local supervisor or to

someone who can travel to oversee the responsibilities. Bob will take care of these delegations in conjunction with the host affiliates.

Nationals in CO, this is the 3rd year that the national tournament is in CO. A letter has been sent outlining what is going to be required to support that tournament. 22 people will need to travel to CO in support of these tournaments. Room support will be needed from the host organization.

Development camp has been a slow progression to get it to the stage it was last year. Concerns are length of day, human resource strain, costs. Can we cut back on the number of officials participating in games? It isn't realistic or practical to do it with full coverage. If participation can be limited then the host can decide how it should be done, if it can't be limited then it probably can't be done.

Question was raised about the differences in officiating girl's games.

Review and acceptance of minutes from last meeting:

Moved: Mike - Idaho

Second: Charles Calloway

Discussion:

Page 2 name needs to be changed to Craig.

Page 3 player development program fikas

Page 7 two motions for affiliate assistance grant – clarification requested was this two motions or just one. This was two motions, first was to assist presidents at the meeting. The second was to provide if another individual needs to attend and to help cover their costs.

Page 8 exception was taken to the word interrogated.

Purpose of minutes is not to reflect emotions but just summarize the going on.

Modification: change word interrogated to questioned and remove the word strongly.

Page 1 add that Richard DeHaas was in attendance for NM and Scott Wenning for Texas.

Minutes approved as amended unanimously.

Reports from Affiliates:

Montana – Creating an A level league to keep the select teams in state instead of going to Canada. Butte Montana put in a new covered sheet of ice, will provide more opportunities. Butte now has 2 sheets of ice.

Will have another woman's team playing in the district tournament, this is the first year they have a full roster but haven't seen much more growth in women's than this.

Having the same problems with coaching certification as everyone else. Concern about the response they are getting from teams and parents to attend district tournaments. The expense is causing them to lose interest in district events.

Idaho – 200 coaches participated in the coaching education program. Every team that is registered in Idaho has a coach that meets the coaching education requirement for their age and play level. Paperwork wise Idaho is 100% compliant. 2723 players are registered for 01-02; most of these are at the youth level.

If a team wants to participate in the District play-offs the team must provide a \$1700 deposit. If they re-nag the fee is forfeited, if the team participates then the fee is refunded. If a team re-nags then that team cannot participate in districts for 3 years.

Scheduled to host district play offs in 2004 most likely in Boise.

Utah – Programs are over for the year. The Olympics are having a major impact on everything in the area. It has been good for hockey as 8 new first class rinks have been built as a result of the Olympics. The downside is that growth in hockey is stagnating. State board organization is falling apart but efforts are being made to put things back together. High School play offs will be held at the speed skating oval.

All but the oval will be municipal arenas. The Olympic committee will leave an endowment that will prop up and support the facility. It isn't clear what will happen to the facility after the Olympics. It will be turned over to the Utah Amateur Sports Association.

Colorado – Hockey is good. Not enough ice for the number of kids playing so kids are skating at odd hours (i.e. 1:30 AM). CO has begun to enforce a rule stating that in the case of Match penalties the player will serve a mandatory 30 day suspension with no hearing. The problem isn't the players but rather the parents and the coaches that feel they can do whatever they want or bring legal action to avoid the suspension.

Texas – Curtis Chalmerr resigned just before Christmas. Keith Andreson has taken over as the acting director of TAHA. Texas would like to see all Presidents, VP's and Treasurer's copied on all email messages. This insures that all the information does get disseminated.

Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming would like this same thing to happen. The flip side to that would be that when someone resigns then it would be helpful to share that with at least the affiliate presidents.

New Mexico – Last year registered 1100 players and 106 teams up from the previous year's numbers of 80. This is due in part to getting registrar's to do their job correctly. Ice is scarce in the state; we all have problems getting enough ice allocated for hockey. Vast improvements have been made in coaches' certification. We still have a few exceptions but things are getting better at compliance. We have a small increase in

referees and the quality of the officiating is getting better. We are growing at a fast clip. We eliminated Midgets this year because we cannot support both High School and Midgets. We are considering a JV program for High School hockey next year to accommodate the anticipated growth at this level.

District Player Development Camp – Will be held in Phoenix most of the details are coming together. A preliminary schedule has been prepared and will be posted on the website once it is approved by the rink. Off-ice time still needs to be integrated. Budget to be submitted was handed out. Some numbers are firm others are not. Fee has been increased to \$190 per player; this increase covers the cost of transportation from the 5 hotels. Increase will only net about \$4500 to use towards the festival teams which will be a shortfall.

AZ moved to approve this budget
UT seconded
Passed

When will allocations be sent out? Allocations are based on your Bantam team registration last year. Concerns were raised that Bantam team registration is dropping and more JV teams are being registered.

Motion: If Bruce can find the time he will base allocations on Bantam age head count not team count and for this year and in subsequent years.

UT so moved
MT seconded
Passed

District Tournament – Handed out information outlining what is required for credentials for district tournament. It is suggested that you require your teams to comply with this and even require your teams to use this same format for your state tournaments.

Declarations – commitments from last meeting passed out and reviewed.

Tier 1

Midgets – no change
Bantams – no change
Pee Wee – no change

Tier 2

Midgets – no change
Bantams – no change
Pee Wee – no change

Girls/Women

Adult B – no teams

U19 – Texas changes to 2 teams no other changes

High School

Idaho is out/no other changes

RMD DISTRICT
TOURNAMENTS
YEAR 2002

<u>TIER I</u>	<u>AZ</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>ID</u>	<u>OK</u>	<u>MT</u>	<u>NM</u>	<u>TX</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WY</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	Littleton 3/6-10
MG		2					1			3	4 team RR w/ final
BA		1								1	none
PW										0	none

TIER II Dallas 3/13-17

MG	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	8	5 team RR & 4 team RR w/ CO and final
BA	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		7	5 team RR & 4 team RR w/ CO and final
PW	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		7	5 team RR & 4 team RR w/ CO and final

GIRLS/WOMENS Littleton 3/6-10

ADULT B										0	none
U-19		1			1		2			4	5 team RR w/ final
U-15		1					1			2	3 team RR w/ final
U12		0					1			1	best of 3

HIGH SCHOOL SLC 3/21-24

PURE	1	1		1		1	1	1		6	2 div of 4 RR w/ CO and final
------	---	---	--	---	--	---	---	---	--	---	-------------------------------

TOTALS

TEAMS	4	9	3	4	4	1	9	4	1	
DEPOSIT	\$800	\$1,800	\$600	\$800	\$800	\$200	\$1,800	\$800	\$200	

B bracket - Fill in for the B bracket needs to be a team of comparable level to the other teams in the bracket. The director needs to be careful about what team he chooses to fill out the bracket. The understanding seems to be that the fill in team will be chosen from one of the 5 affiliates in the B bracket if at all possible.

Tier 1 Midgets - 4 teams Colorado Springs is the host.

The host team will not impact the outcome of who advances to the national tournament. The 2 high point teams will play in the championship game. The only team that can be declared the district champ by a clean sweep.

AZ moves that we adopt the format proposed for this year's tournament
UT seconds
Passed

Tier 1 Bantams – 2 teams

Tier 1 Pee Wees – gave slot back

Tier 2 Midgets – if host association wants a team it will be a 5 team bracket.

Tier 2 Bantams – same situation

Tier 2 Pee Wees – same situation

Women –

U19 – 5 team tournament (6th team from TX is a remote possibility)

U15 – 3 team tournament

U12 – best of 3 games

High School – 8 team tournament with 2 brackets of 4 with a cross over.

6 teams plus a host, looking for an 8th team to fill out the bracket from Montana.

Tier 2 – Where is it going to be held? AZ did not have the support of the affiliate. Dallas Stars and the Dallas Storm have both said they would take on this responsibility. Since then AZ has negotiated a swap with UT which is allowed in the policy and procedures. The swap time is addressed in the policy and procedures manual. The tournament director is responsible for that tournament, he was given notice, he reacted, and he made arrangements prior to anyone else notifying him that anything else was being done. Trade time was over as of the September meeting when the tournament director was appointed. The tournament director did what was necessary to ensure that the tournament would happen.

When Montana couldn't swap last year they lost their slot and must wait for their next turn in the rotation (9 years?).

Motion: After the fall meeting it became up to the tournament director to make sure the tournament happens for 2002 only.

Moved by Charles Callaway

Second: Idaho

Yay 6

Nay 3

Motion passed

Al Bloomer will make the decision and can choose between Texas or Utah. Al spoke to TX on 12/20 TX committed on 12/21.

Discussion: What are the consequences for canceling? If a state commits then must back out the question arises whose job is it to find a new venue and how should it be done? Who bears the burden of extra costs on teams when changes are made? Where is the deadline for the decision?

Motion: In the event that an affiliate backs out of its host responsibilities in an untimely fashion, (after the August meeting), the district director will find an alternative venue by going down the rotation list in order. The first affiliate willing to accept will be awarded the tournament. Friendly amendment: There will be no penalty made against the accepting affiliate by loss of their spot in the original rotation.

Moved: Montana

Second: Utah

Yay 6

Nay 3

Passed

Discussion: The director will notify all affiliates that the slot is up for grabs and any affiliates interested can put their name in the hat for consideration. The rotation will still be followed and selection but the final right of decision belongs to the director. Another is that the next team on the list be prepared as a back-up to host the tournament if they are the next affiliate on the list. It should be noted that the cost of the tournament needs to be a consideration in hosting. The past two years the tournaments have lost money and that burden has to be born by the host affiliate. Combination of the list and bid process. There needs to be something to address an emergency situation so that the director knows what he has to do and can step in and deal with the situation quickly.

Amendment to Policy and Procedures manual submitted by Bruce K.

Section 5 – Rocky Mountain District Tournament

3. Host

At the end of the first sentence **Add the following:**

The Affiliate Host must submit USA Hockey form N-1 (Application to Host a National Tournament) completed and signed by the affiliate and association presidents, naming the Host Association and city/cities. This form must be submitted to the President of the

*Council of Presidents on or before 1 August of the year before the District Tournament.
This application will be reviewed at the District Annual meeting.*

Add the following new paragraph:

3.C Girls'/Women Tier Teams – The host state shall be determined by vote of the Affiliate Presidents. No Affiliate may host two consecutive Girl's/Women District tournaments, unless otherwise not possible.

Motion to amend the P & P manual to incorporate the changes.

Moved: Utah

Second: Charles Callaway

Callaway moved to table motion until everyone has an opportunity to review.

Yay 8

Nay 1

Motion tabled until 1/6

Wyoming is next in the rotation and was asked are they prepared to host in 2003?

Answer is no for the entire tournament but they can host 1 division. Wyoming should now begin looking for an affiliate to swap with or the next affiliate on the list will host.

District summer meeting: Utah would like to host

Motion: Utah holds meeting

Idaho moved

Colorado second

Yay 9

Passed

Discussion: When?

Motion for date September 6-8, 2002

Moved: Idaho

Second: Utah

Passed

District Director Elections:

Page 32 in guide #1B has been changed no affiliate may have more than one active director in an affiliate.

Timing of Winter Meeting – Charles Calloway would like to propose that we hold this meeting the week after the national meeting which would be January 24-26, 2003. This decision can be made at the fall meeting.

Motion to hold the 2003 winter meeting on January 24-26, 2003.

Moved: AZ
Second: MT
Yay 8
Nay 1
Passed

Presentation of new USAH web page by Al Canfield.

Sunday

District P & P Manual – Schedule for updating the P & P manual. AZ suggests that at the annual meeting all suggested amendments will be addressed rather than bringing something up at every meeting.

Another suggestion is to have the full time secretary update the manual as motions are made. The concern is that motions are being made that affect this manual but the manual is not being updated in a timely fashion.

Put this up on the website with the revision date updated each time.

Motion: The RMD P & P manual be put on the annual meeting agenda for review and update and that any revisions to that document be provided in written form to the attendees of the meeting with the agenda and that the webmaster be responsible for updating the guide and noting revisions immediately after the meeting. **Amendment:** The procedures will be reviewed twice a year at the winter and summer meeting.

AZ Moved
CC second
ID friendly amendment
Yay 9
Nay 0
Passed

Discussion: Why do we want to only do this once a year? Once a year simplifies things procedurally. Many prefer to have the opportunity to bring up amendments at any meeting. It should be noted that there isn't a procedure that spells out how to amend the P & P manual and at some point we need to do this.

Motion: A committee of 3 will review P & P manual for items that need attention. Committee is AZ, Bruce K. (chair), & Charles Calloway.

Moved AZ
Second CO
Yay 9
Passed

Motion: AZ moves to approve the Rocky Mountain District Tournament amendment host section with the noted changes.

Moved AZ
Second CC
Yay 8
Nay1
Passed

Discussion: Is waiting until August too long? The fact that we are now requiring the application raises the standard and things will probably alleviate many of the current problems. A compromise is that the topic could be made an agenda item at the Winter Meeting asking the host affiliate where things stand. If things are iffy other affiliates can submit an application for “just in case”.

Motion: Section 5.3.E accept as written

Amendment: add – “unless otherwise not possible” to end of last sentence.

Remove – “fielding Tier teams”

Change – Affiliate presidents to “Council of Presidents”

Moved AZ
Second Kathy
Yay 9
Nay 0
Passed

Discussion: Because of the size of the women’s tournament it is very reasonable to believe that the tournament would need to be hosted by the same affiliate two years in a row. This was disputed that there are at least 2 states that have enough double sheet facilities it can easily be moved each year without duplicating.

District Mini-Meeting – ID would like the meeting moved to earlier so that the directors will have the feelings and concerns of the presidents to take to the vote on Saturday. This meeting also precludes people from participating in the social events of the Congress. This isn’t supposed to be a formal meeting but rather an informal lunch to just visit and get a feel of what is going to be discussed and where the directors stand. There isn’t supposed to be any pressure to attend this informal meeting. Most don’t feel pressured to attend. Call it the RMD Luncheon which gets away from the formality of calling it a meeting.

Motion: Thursday, June 6, 2002 is acceptable date for luncheon.
AZ moved
Second MT
Yay 8
Nay 1
Passed

Parking Lot Issues:

Issues of USAH referees working non USAH games. Kelly Grover will address this to all referee supervisors from a Risk Management standpoint.

- 1) Team backing out of a district play-off spot
Idaho uses the following - \$1700 deposit when committing to district tournament if team drops out after 12/15 then the \$1700 is forfeited. Once a team backs out the host association is prohibited from participating for 3 years at any age level.
Is \$1700 enough?

Motion: Fine should be \$200 per player on the team
Moved UT
Second None

Fine should be \$100 per child
Moved Kathy Bryant
Second None

Motion: Deposit of \$1500 per team paid to and held by the affiliate and forwarded on to the RMD upon the team not participating in the district tournament.

Moved AZ
Second CO
Yay 1
Nay 7
Motion failed

Discussion: Each affiliate can decide how they want to administer this. \$1500 doesn't have enough teeth in it. Does a large affiliate like CO have to collect \$1500 in advance for every team that might possibly participate? UT believes there should be sanctions imposed on the individual players. The fine should not go the RMD but remain with the affiliate. The only two groups that are affected are the affiliate and the player. Intent of the motion was to set the fine and to allow the affiliate to determine how to administer the sanctions. It seems that the problem is tied to the smaller affiliates which historically have some financial hardships tied to their programs.

Motion: table discussion until September meeting.

Moved AZ
Second MT
Yay 6
Nay 3
Motion carried

Motion: Establish a committee to address affiliate/team lack of participation in tournament issues. Kathy will chair, UT and MT members, Tom (ID).

Action Item: Committee – Preliminary email report due in 3 months, final recommendations brought to September 2002 meeting.

Moved AZ
Second CO
Yay 7
Nay 0
Non vote 2 (MT and WY)
Passed

Criteria on High School District Play Off Participation :

Each state has it's own way of doing things. Need to try to standardize.

Attends high school playing in the play-offs, irrefutable proof which should have a date on it.

Report card

Student ID

Letter from the school stating that all player attend that school or home schooled would be eligible to attend that school

Question was posed to Bruce K and Charlie, what do you need to make the credentials process work?

Packet needs to be created telling every team EXACTLY what they need to submit at the credentials check.

Form 1-C rev 01 - should have the affiliate president signature on it.

From P&P manual

Dec 31 – Freeze roster

Credentials check at tournament

Only those players on the roster as of Dec 31 eligible to play

Minimum game criteria 10/12

Action Item: Mike from UT – will send out a memo that clarify's and reminds everyone what is required at the credentials check.

Montana – High School – Billing's team

Motion: We allow Billings to come in with a team without meeting the 10/12 criteria as long as they are a pure team.

Moved UT
Second AZ
Yay 8
Nay 0
Motion passed

Age birth changes – what is everyone doing?

MT – no thought
AZ – no thought
ID – no thought
CO – no thought
TX – no thought
NM – no thought

Suggestion that Midgets be broken into major and minor categories essentially creating 6 2 year age groups instead of 5.

2) Feedback on disabled hockey
Age birth date change

3) \$ Lost when holding tournaments

Affiliate re-nagging on commitment to hold tournament - committee will review

Motion to adjourn at 11:53 AM

Moved CC
Second CO
Unanimous

Summary of Action Items

Affiliates distribute matrix to all teams that participate in any district tournament. Make it clear that this is mandatory.

Committee – Preliminary email report due in 3 months, final recommendations brought to September 2002 meeting.

Mike from UT – will send out a memo that clarify's and reminds everyone what is required at the credentials check.

These minutes are not finalized until voted on at the September 2002 meeting in Montana.

Bob Nolen
President, Council of Presidents
Rocky Mountain District
USA Hockey