



# UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION

## Board Meeting Minutes



<b>Meeting Date:</b>	3 March 2025
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	Utah Olympic Oval
<b>Chaired By:</b>	Geoff Fischer
<b>Minutes By:</b>	Don McFarland
<b>Minutes Status:</b>	Initial

Agenda Item:	1	Topic:	Roll Call / Quorum Confirmation		
Name	Representing	Present	Name	Representing	Present
<b>Executive Board Members</b>					
<i>Geoff Fisher</i>	<i>UAHA President</i>	Y	<i>Chuck Dorval</i>	<i>Exec. Vice President</i>	Y
<i>Adam Bailey</i>	<i>Treasurer</i>	Y	<i>Don McFarland</i>	<i>Secretary</i>	Y
<i>Cody Madsen</i>	<i>VP Adult / Disabled</i>	Y	<i>Anna Erickson</i>	<i>VP High School</i>	Y
<i>Jacob Hickman</i>	<i>VP Youth</i>	Y	<i>Bryce Mannek</i>	<i>VP Discipline</i>	Y
<i>Melissa Mossberg</i>	<i>VP Girls</i>	Y	<i>Tim Odell</i>	<i>VP Tier</i>	Y
<i>Steve Picano</i>	<i>VP Growth</i>	Y	Quorum Achieved (Requires X)?		Yes
<b>Board Appointed Staff</b>					
<i>Vacant</i>	<i>Webmaster</i>	N/A	<i>Mandi Berim</i>	<i>Safety Coordinator</i>	Y
<i>Wendy Radke</i>	<i>SafeSport Coordinator</i>	--	<i>Robyn Eyre-Long</i>	<i>Utah Registrar</i>	Y
<i>Michael Strahan</i>	<i>CEP Rep / ADM Coord.</i>	--	<i>Reid Jacobson</i>	<i>Goaltending Dev.</i>	--
<i>Tim Tate</i>	<i>Utah Referee in Chief</i>	--	<i>Andy Van Wagoner</i>	<i>President WIHOA</i>	--
<b>Other Attendees:</b>					
<i>Kathlee Smith</i>	<i>RMD Director</i>	--	<i>Erin Drecksal</i>	<i>Jr Grizzlies</i>	Zoom
<i>Byron Sessions</i>	<i>CVAHA</i>	Y	<i>Paul Amidon</i>	<i>CVAHA</i>	Y
<i>Kevin Bailey</i>	<i>CVAHA</i>	Y	<i>Louie Steinbach</i>	<i>Utah Lady Grizz</i>	Y
<i>Josh Anderson</i>	<i>Utah Olympic Oval</i>	Y	<i>Sara Smith</i>	<i>Utah Olympic Oval</i>	Y
<i>Parker McBrier</i>	<i>SL Lightning</i>	Y	<i>Sandy Davis</i>	<i>SL Lightning</i>	Y
<i>Audra West</i>	<i>PC Ice Miners</i>	Y	<i>Randy Abbey</i>	<i>Jr. Grizzlies</i>	Y
<i>Brooke Burton</i>		Zoom	<i>Shawn Heckman</i>	<i>Utah Dawgs</i>	Zoom
<i>Walter Wooton</i>	<i>AVAHA</i>	Zoom	<i>Stuart Wilde</i>		Zoom
<i>Braden</i>		Zoom	<i>Tim B</i>		Zoom
<i>Stuart Wilde</i>	<i>Dawgs Parent</i>	Zoom	<i>Shau Kelly</i>	<i>Jr. Mustangs</i>	Zoom
<i>Scott Grant</i>		Zoom	<i>Nicki Jones</i>	<i>Wasatch Wild</i>	Zoom
<i>Mariko Rollins</i>	<i>Ogden Sr / Jr. Mustangs</i>	Zoom	<i>Lee Smith</i>	<i>Renegades</i>	Zoom
<i>Kristen Bowness</i>	<i>Utah Hockey Club Youth</i>	Zoom	<i>John Howe</i>	<i>Park City Ice Miners</i>	Zoom
<i>Frank Monestere</i>	<i>Utah Lady Grizz</i>	Zoom	<i>David Cook</i>		Zoom
<i>Che Arguello</i>	<i>Renegades Parent</i>	Zoom	<i>Brooke Burton</i>		Zoom
<i>Braden Day</i>	<i>ULG Parent</i>	Zoom	<i>Angela Maas</i>	<i>Jr. Mustangs</i>	Zoom
<i>Angela Steinbach</i>	<i>ULG</i>	Zoom	<i>Adam Diamond</i>		Zoom
<i>Jeff Krieger</i>	<i>Jr .Mustangs</i>	Zoom	<i>Jacob Garcia</i>		Zoom
<i>Kristi Taylor</i>	<i>Off Ice Officials</i>	Zoom			

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	2	<b>Topic:</b>	Review of Jan 2025 meeting minutes
Presented by:	Don		
Discussion(s):	Minutes were presented and Geoff asked if there was a motion. This was made by Adam and seconded by Chuck, with no further discussion.		



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



Approval:	Motion By:	Adam	Second By:	Chuck
	For:	All	Against:	0
			Abstain:	0

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	3	<b>Topic:</b>	Review of Feb 2025 meeting minutes		
Presented by:	Don				
Discussion(s):	Minutes were presented and Geoff asked if there was a motion. This was made by Adam and seconded by Bryce, with no further discussion.				
Approval:	Motion By:	Adam	Second By:	Bryce	
	For:	All	Against:	0	Abstain: 0

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	4	<b>Topic:</b>	Old Business – State Selection Camp update		
Presented By:	Steve				
Initial Discussion:	<p>Steve provided an update for the state selection camp. Registration is now closed. Schedule is released and evaluators are lined up. The jerseys are ordered and have the numbers put on them now.</p> <p>We have the highest number of registrants ever, with 37 girls and 179 boys.</p> <p>There is still a need for volunteers to help with locker room monitors, scorekeepers, and bench coaches. Lady Grizz, Park City and Renegades have stepped up, but need more. To volunteer, email Ally (<a href="mailto:AllyAbby@me.com">AllyAbby@me.com</a>) or Steve and get Robyn your IMR number. All volunteers have need to have SafeSport and background checks. There is a chance for USA hockey to perform audits on this. It was clarified that bench coaches do not need their age module, since they are not coaching, but just opening doors.</p> <p>Need to get flyer started for 2012 girls that will attend the camp in Ogden, with the dates of 27 – 29 June.</p> <p>Goalies will go first, so they do not get too beat up through camp and show poorly in the session on Saturday. Jordan Parise will do the goalie session, because of a conflict with Reid.</p> <p>It was asked if the girls will be playing all together and the answer was yes, given the limited number of people involved.</p> <p>Steve needs to get the referees arranged this week.</p>				
Motion:	Motion By:	N/A	Second By:	N/A	
	Motion:	N/A			
Discussion(s):	N/A				
Approval:	For:	N/A	Against:	N/A	Abstain: N/A

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	5	<b>Topic:</b>	Old Business – Hockey Week Across America and Try Hockey for Free Update		
Presented By:	Steve				
Initial Discussion:	Thanks to all that participated in the Hockey Week Across America.				



# UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION

## Board Meeting Minutes



The main item was the Try Hockey For Free, with Ogden doing a Try Goalie for Free event too. Tina from USA Hockey said it was a huge success across the entire state.

<i>Rink</i>	<i>Seats Taken</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Attended</i>
Peaks	149	107	42	123
Bountiful	62	46	16	60
West Valley	58	48	10	37
Steiner	63	24	39	37
Ogden (Goalie Only)	9	17	2	13
Logan	45	33	12	45
<b>Total</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>315</b>

Geoff wanted to know the next steps / hand offs. Steve said they are in the system and get blasted a message from the USA Hockey side. He believes the program hosting should provide information as they get off the ice.

Geoff wants us to get the handoff and follow-up / information sharing part nailed down, now that we have the registration numbers. In addition, nailing down the “next steps”, in terms of the local rink programming to keep folks involved over the summer.

This retention / conversion is the weak spot nationally, so it is important for us to get that figured out.

Motion:	Motion By:	N/A	Second By:	N/A
	Motion:	N/A		
Discussion(s):	N/A			
Approval:	For:	N/A	Against:	N/A
			Abstain:	N?A

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	6	<b>Topic:</b>	Old Business – Team Utah Update		
Presented By:	Geoff				
Initial Discussion:	<p>Going back to January, the tier team was tasked with coming up with a representative team, comprised of kids from any org in the state, who might be looking for a higher level of play. After the proposal in the Feb meeting, a sub-committee was formed, including representatives from a few orgs around the state. This group worked through the logistics and sponsorships, to create “Team Utah”. Because of the age of these teams, they cannot be operated at tier, but will play in higher level (e.g., AA) in two tournaments coming up. The Teams were originally being offered at U10, U12 and U14 coed / youth, but u12 and U14 girls only were added due to an overwhelming response.</p> <p>The registrations were opened this week, with a cost of \$45 to register. Through this tryout / selection process, the team will be identified and all other players will be put into a 3 v 3 tournament sponsored by UHC. Those</p>				



# UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION

## Board Meeting Minutes



	<p>selected will get charged \$350 for the team, which includes the costs for 2 tournaments (1 away and 1 locally). This will likely be girls in Vegas over memorial day and Anaheim for the coed teams. The coaching staff is being selected by UAHA, from a pool – currently 22 for the youth teams and ~10 for the girls teams. UHC will provide the soft goods for the team.</p> <p>It was reiterated that girls were not excluded from the original registration, since these were coed / youth teams, but the girls only opportunity was created due to response. At this time, there is no plan to extend this into older ages for the season.</p> <p>Geoff commented that he has been involved in these teams before and helped parents from teams that are “enemies” to get together and realize that they are not that different.</p> <p>Registrations were originally limited to 56, but there are creative ways this is being done to accommodate more kids. It was clarified that registration was extended to higher level kids first, as it was sent to travel coaches first, then worked its way down through the entire state.</p> <p>Looking at future opportunities for this, although this will be limited for the inaugural season.</p> <p>Clarified that the registration will run through UAHA and UAHA will facilitate the team, although the actual registration will be handled through the RMD Registrar site.</p> <p>Current totals are:          10U - 43          12U - 83          14U - 86          Girls 12U - 16          Girls 14U - 17</p> <p>Anticipate a few of the coed registrants to move registration to girls only, since they registered female players before the girls only option opened.</p> <p>It was reiterated that this is a limited life team, and tryouts will be required for future teams / opportunities. Additionally, it was clarified that the team is 100% administered by UAHA and UHC is only a sponsor, so all concerns need to be directed to UAHA.</p>					
Motion:	Motion By:	N/A	Second By:	N/A		
	Motion:	N/A				
Discussion(s):	N/A					
Approval:	For:	N/A	Against:	N/A	Abstain:	N/A

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	7A	<b>Topic:</b>	Old Business – Org Team Request Approvals			
Presented By:	Geoff / Robyn					



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



Initial Discussion:	<p>The requested teams were compiled into a spreadsheet and sent to the board members on the 21<sup>st</sup> of Feb.</p> <p>There was initial discussion about how to attack this, with Robyn providing some guidance on how it was done last year. As a result of this, Jacob made a holistic motion for approval, although the original motion included a carte Blanc approval for all travel A orgs. This motion included some travel A teams under DCYHA for girls, which would require policy change. To avoid this need on the initial pass, Jacob amended the motion to exclude the requested girls travel B teams (See Motion 7A).</p>					
Motion 7A:	Motion By:	Jacob	Second By:	Tim		
	Motion:	<p><i>“To approval all requested youth and girls house / rec teams, all youth and girls travel B teams and all youth travel A teams requested from the organizations.”</i></p>				
Discussion(s):	<p>Chuck asked why the Jr. Mustangs were not requesting girls travel B for the year and Mariko indicated that there was success using the those / rec roster, so this is where they plan to leave the girls team. Chuck asked if OJM would come back to the board later on and the answer was that were not planning on it.</p> <p>There is no specific number for house / rec, as denoted by the “M”.</p> <p>Anna clarified that there would be no local travel B teams at 16U and 18U. Jacob reiterated that the travel B teams under the UAHL will be paired into a like division within the league play, so they could be playing the “travel A” teams under the UAHL.</p> <p>Robyn clarified that UHC did not want Travel B for this coming season and the requested matrix was to be corrected to reflect that this was not requested by them. Chuck amended the motion and Jacob agreed with the concept, but believed that his original motion was sound because it as based on the “as requested” condition.</p>					
Approval:	For:	All	Against:	None	Abstain:	None

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	7b	<b>Topic:</b>	Old Business – Org Team Request Approvals			
Presented By:	Geoff / Robyn					
Initial Discussion:	<p>The next conversation was about the remaining girls programs. There was discussions about the competitive landscape of the girls teams within the state. Melissa reiterated that there were only 8 girls for the 19U travel team this year. The 14U was a large age group and then there was also a 12U travel A team under ULG. Chuck confirmed that there was not a 16U travel and this was confirmed, there was only a 16U tier 2 team under ULG. The 16U and 19U girls only amounted to 8 girls. It was requested if there was a conscious request for 4 19u teams by Davis (two at A and two at B). It was confirmed that they currently have 2 teams – 19U and 14U, but Don shared that their current 19U is a competitive B team but is not a travel A level club. There was discussion on the need to ensure the pyramid is there. Melissa was adamant</p>					



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



	that we need to growth the ULG program for travel A, although there was some conversation within the board on if it was best to consolidate this with a single org. Adam asked what the difference is between travel A and Travel B. Don clarified that this was nothing more than a letter designation – Ogden’s team competed with the ULG 14A this season. Adam concurred that there is no benefit to play ULG A over B for another org, since they are competitive and go to the same tournaments. The OJM team hasn’t played the 19U travel ULG team this year, but had played them last year and games were getting more competitive, with the OJM B losing by a couple of goals and not blow-outs. With that, Don agreed that we not grant DC the travel A status for the 25-26 season.					
Motion:	Motion By:	Chuck		Second By:	Melissa	
	Motion:	<i>“To deny the DCYHA Request for travel A girls team an limit travel A for girls to ULG for another year”</i>				
Discussion(s):	No further discussion					
Approval:	For:	All others	Against:	None	Approval:	Jacob

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	7c	<b>Topic:</b>	Old Business – Org Team Request Approvals			
Presented By:	Geoff / Robyn					
Initial Discussion:	The next discussion was to approve ULG for all requested ULG tier 1, tier 2 and travel teams. Geoff asked if the ULG can really do 10 teams under the ULG. The belief was no. Geoff wants to set up a girls meeting. Frank from ULG clarified that there wont be much in the way of growth in number of teams, but the focus is on trying to get the teams viable. Geoff expects a little more flexibility with the girls, because we just wont know until we see what talent shows up. Geoff wants the girls to discuss the size / composition of teams going forward. (Motion 7c was made)					
Motion:	Motion By:	Steve		Second By:	Melissa	
	Motion:	<i>“To approve ULG for all requested tier 1, tier 2 and travel A teams, with the understanding that they will not fill ll of these teams”</i>				
Discussion(s):	None					
Approval:	For:	All	Against:	None	Approval:	None

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	7d	<b>Topic:</b>	Old Business – Org Team Request Approvals			
Presented By:	Geoff / Robyn					
Initial Discussion:	The next topic was related to the tier 1 youth teams, under the Wasatch Renegades. (Chuck made motion 7d)					
Motion:	Motion By:	Chuck		Second By:	Steve	
	Motion:	<i>“to approve the Wasatch Renegades for the 5 requested tier 1 teams – 13O, 14U, 15O, 16U, 18U”</i>				
Discussion(s):	Geoff asked Lee about the number of teams they fielded for the year. Lee clarified that they have 14U, 16U, and 18U currently. They believe they will have enough for the 13O and 15O next season, but wont know that until their					



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



	<p>registrations are open and they see what talent shows up. They expect high retention with the 18U team, so they are not sure on the 150 team.</p> <p>Chuck clarified that they have always approved the teams that they could.</p> <p>Tim abstained from the vote, on the basis of his involvement with the renegades.</p>					
Approval:	For:	All others	Against:	None	Approval:	Tim

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	7e	<b>Topic:</b>	Old Business – Org Team Request Approvals
Presented By:	Geoff / Robyn		
Initial Discussion:	<p>The Tier 2 requests included.</p> <p>14U – 4</p> <p>16U – 5</p> <p>18U – 5 teams requested.</p> <p>Jr. Aggies are the new team, and it was confirmed that CVAHA meets the state P and P requirements for a tier 2 team.</p> <p>Tim started with a recap of the history. Two years ago, there were 4 teams and then it went back to 3. Last year, the Utah Dawgs were introduced into the tier 2 landscape. The playoffs just ended, with the outcome of:</p> <p>18U – 2 teams – Ogden Jr. Mustangs beat the Oval Dawgs – Ogden won both games with shutouts and Tim believed this probably came down to a couple of players that made a big difference. Tim believes the number of 2008 birth year kids make this a larger birth year and should become a viable and competitive division next year.</p> <p>14U – Ogden dominated, with Park City being the one that struggled. Believe the Ogden team will largely move to the Renegades next season.</p> <p>16U – Jr. Grizz won but believes there were no blow outs through season and all teams were fairly competitive.</p> <p>The time was turned over to the reps from CVAHA, who articulated that their 16U A team had a record of 13-0 against in-state teams and outscored them 88-8. The kids played a few AA teams and had a winning record against them. They believe they are ready to take the next step. Being in Logan, there is a significant distance to the next closest teams and they have the talent in Logan to stand this program up with kids they have developed in the area. They have some high-level coaches.</p> <p>Steve asked why they were late applying for tier status. Kevin B articulated that the motivation was because their team was “uninvited” to the UAHL playoff tournament, it identified the need for them to pursue another avenue for the team to play a competitive level of hockey. It was clarified that this decision was agreed upon by the UAHL committee, including the rep from Logan (who consulted the coach of this 16U team – Paul Amidon) and he agreed that it would not be beneficial for them to play.</p> <p>Robyn spoke to this further, by clarifying that Logan was not going to apply for tier until they were uninvited and this occurred after the deadline.</p> <p>Jacob clarified that under My Hockey rankings reflect that the Aggies 16U A</p>		



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



team is ranked as the 4<sup>th</sup> best team in the state and is above 2 other current tier 2 teams. The next highest tier 2 is within a tenth and Logan clarified that they had tied the Oval tier team twice.

Melissa asked if they plan to return most of their kids to the team and Paul indicated that about 2/3 of their team would be moving up next season, making their 18U fairly solid. In addition, their 14U A has some solid players that are moving up. All this will do is move their talent from the UAHL travel ranks to the high school teams for next season. The Cache Valley high school teams (CVI and Sky Canyon) are both competitive, with Sky Canyon playing that night for the state championship.

Anna asked if these are all kids from Utah and Paul confirmed that only one comes from the other side of Sardine but are otherwise all Cache Valley kids. He also clarified that there are a few kids from Cache Valley (confirmed by Lee Smith to be 5) that play tier 1 with the Renegades, across all the age groups. Geoff's frustration is that we don't have a place for them to play in the state tournament and they are not eligible for the tier 2 level play. The point was made that the older age groups really thin out and the competitive spheres become more disconnected.

Adam asked about the requirement for two tier 2 teams, and it was confirmed that this is a USA Hockey rule.

It was again reiterated that the Cache Valley program is not cannibalizing other tier programs given the number of kids they have available to them and their competitive level. The statewide level of competition would not really degrade, since the current talent can remain with their current team.

Chuck reiterated that he does not have issues with Logan having a team, but his daughter has played with 4 girls from Logan that came to SL for Lady Lightning and Lady Grizz. He is concerned that the "centrally located" team is being neglected, and we are starting to build the teams in the extremities of the state. His concern is that we are adding another mediocre tier 2 team in state, albeit quite an accomplishment for an A level team to compete with the in-state AA teams. This only further dilutes the AA talent for Utah's teams as they compete out of state. Cache Valley also confirmed that most AA teams would not play them.

Anna asked a question, on Mariko's behalf, which was related to the pyramid, to show that there were enough kids to sustain the tier programs. Logan mentioned that they have gone from 90 to 180 over the last 3 years. Anna asked if they had any concept of their team composition and the degree of this being sustainable. Paul commented that no one really knows if programs / teams will be viable in 5 years, although the emphasis is on the development of players through improving the quality of coaching and resources available to them.

Bryce asked how long these kids have played together and Paul clarified that they've really been together since squirts.

Josh Anderson suggested that the board consider a different approach and invest in the programs that have built a repeatable model to sustain the continued growth of hockey in the state, rather than the easy way of buying or attracting kids from other programs. He commented that it took 4+ years to grow kids from entry level to the point where they are able to compete at the



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



tier level. He applauded Logan as a program that has taken the time to invest in their kids and grow them from the ground up. He strongly believes this is the right way and the board should reward the programs that are investing in their kids, rather than in programs that are banking on the top talent coming to their program for some reason. The question was asked if it makes sense to reward programs that are taking the talent from others, rather than building their own base to sustain other programs.

Adam pointed out that we really have two approaches to fix this problem:

- 1) Grant them tier 2 status and afford them with a more competitive environment to play.
- 2) Holistically grant fewer tier 2 teams and force the travel A teams to become more competitive across the state.

Adam went on to say that the discussions about tier teams not being competitive out of state is not fixed by the status quo, including Logan playing at an appropriate level. The measure of success for a tier 2 team should be more about their performance against teams out of state, since that is how we get attention on the programs we offer and our players.

Anna asked about the knowledge within CVAHA for managing the finances of a tier program and they are certain that Kevin is capable of complying with the rules. Adam vouched that no one responds to email quicker than everyone else.

The board asked for the input from the tier team and Tim reported that the tier committee has not had an opportunity to discuss the Logan team request, but there is enough split that it would have come to the board for discussion anyways.

Josh asked if there are other tier programs that have not lived up to the level of responsibility they have been afforded. The board's answer was yes, although it is different by team and year. There was clarification that competitive is not the same as "in good standing". Chuck commented that there are programs that are good about growing programs from the ground up and then there are others that will "steal" an entire year of kids.

Unfortunately, there is not much that can be done about this.

Randy asked if the pyramid is sustained if these tier programs are not forming travel teams.

Paul added clarity that the kids they are seeing in Logan are becoming more athletic and the talent pool is responding well to the model established in Logan. They have won most of their games at the older ages, including the high school team, based on how the brackets were established. Chuck suggested that High School should really re-evaluate how the tiers are done to ensure this is a more competitive environment.

Melissa asked Steve for his opinion. Steve commented that he believed the Logan teams would not impact the competition of the current tier 2 teams, given how far out they are. The board followed along. Teve asked if they don't have a competitive 16U team, would they still designate them as tier, just to maintain their status. The board reiterated that they have to, in order to maintain a second tier 2 team. Randy commented that this is what other orgs



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



are doing as well, and we can't criticize them for it. Randy commented that if the concern is with the competence of the Logan club, the Jr. Grizz will mentor them.

Chuck asked if Logan plans to have a tier 2 and A level team at the 18U and 16U levels. The comment was that they didn't believe there would be enough kids or ice time to make this happen.

Don asked how many currently approved 16U and 18 tier organizations have a travel team under them? It was clarified that Utah has two 18U tier teams and Logan had the only 18U travel team. Additionally, there are 4 16U tier teams, with Jr Grizz and Dawgs fielding a 16U travel team. Don lamented that Logan should not be held to a standard that other orgs are not.

Melissa commented that there are current tier orgs who are playing in travel tournaments, in order to provide for more wins. The Logan contingent reiterates that this is a concern they are trying to address, because they are a group of competitive people that want to play competitive games and be pushed. They do not want to win any more 10-0 games, because they would rather lose and learn.

Anna asked who the coaching staff is for these 2 teams, and they clarified that they have differing staff for the two teams.

Geoff called for a motion, with 2 topics:

- 1) Do we allow Logan?
- 2) Do we contract the other organizations within the Salt Lake Valley?

There is a belief that the diluted talent pool in SL Valley would not be impacted by Logan, so these are separate issues. Again, Geoff asked for a motion Melissa moved to approve Logan for 16U and 18U tier teams." There was no second, and Chuck connected that he believed the two topics are connected and need to be treated as such. Melissa amended her motion to include "...and remove one of the tier organizations down in the valley." Again, there was no second for this.

The Logan contingent commented that their kids were playing in the high school championship, that starts in 1 minute, so they had to leave. They tried to get a commitment from the board to their approval and were told this could not be given until we conduct the proper discussion and vote.

Adam shared his opinion that we constantly hear the dialogue that our teams were not competitive out of state, but how often do we hear about orgs that come back to share that their kids are frustrated and quitting because it wasn't fun. The question was if we are trying to govern something that shouldn't be governed, because of our ego to win out of state? Randy commented that by that argument, everything should be dubbed tier 2, because they bounce from organization to organization to chase the jacket. Anna commented that some of this comes from the parents, who are seeking the jacket and notoriety of the level. Anna commented that these parents are often the ones making the most noise and burning out the organization volunteers. Adam commented that PCs A level team had pretty bad record (~4-30-0) this year, yet they still submitted for approval as a tier organization. Randy commented that orgs make the decisions, not the kids...there are still coaches that want to coach, and the good kids want to advance teams, in order to play with better kids.



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



Randy charged the board to help make hockey better, through organizations that are causing the most concerns. Robyn added that there is an organization who is constantly having roster issues and playing in non-sanctioned tournaments without approvals. She knows who she would get rid of. Chuck commented that there is another organization who he believes has a number of problematic issues year after year, and they continue to get approved. Chuck commented that even with the confidential issues we have this year, he doesn't have an organization that he is prepared to "kick off the island". Geoff asked if there is a way to get cooperation and collaboration between the existing orgs, to decide which teams should remain. The consensus was that it would not work.

Jacob commented that he believes we should reward organizations that are getting creative with growth (e.g., splitting practices with tier orgs, growth programs, etc.).

Geoff commented that he does not want to contract an org without representation and all orgs were present. He then asked if there were any ideas.

Chuck asked about the motion on the table, and it was reiterated. Geoff said he believes these issues are separate and that we need to withdraw the motion. Melissa withdrew her motion.

Chuck asked if existing board members have an organization in mind to contract. Geoff asked for a straw poll on the need to contract and the consensus was no. Anna asked about the historical info and where board members can be made aware of it. Chuck commented that the question is how far back we go. If we look at performance from this year, PC had a bad record and would be the candidate, although they have historically been contenders for high levels (two teams to nationals last year) and just won the state high school title. The question was asked if we should care more about the issues an org causes the board (like Robyn was talking about) over their record for the season.

Randy asked what the "punch card" looks like for an org to be awarded a new tier 2 team. He suggested that this is the criteria that should be used to determine what org(s) are not playing by the rules and cannot maintain this status, year over year. He also commented that there was a previous belief that Utah should be limited to just 2 teams at the tier 2 level, which would drive some talent down to the A and B levels, forcing more competitive kids. The criteria, for a "tier-ready" org, is too loose at this time, so there is not an objective criterion for what we expect as a state.

Geoff asked again if there was consensus from the board, in terms of 6 votes, to reduce a team from the center of the state, taking this from 4 to 3. Jacob mentioned that we need performance measures made by the board.

The question was asked what makes us believe that Logan will be a better org next year? While the myhockey rankings are an indicator of the teams, the question is centered around the org's performance, so we can reward the orgs that are doing it right.

Adam commented that it is tough to approve Logan, if we are talking about contracting another central org. Under the current structure, Logan's team



# UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION

## Board Meeting Minutes



	<p>would have been middle of the road (3 of 5) for tier 2 orgs. The contraction would drive the competitive level of the other teams up, without impacting Logan’s competitive level, so they would drop to the bottom with their current comp.</p> <p>Another question was on why kids / families are driving past other programs to play somewhere else. Some of these may be orgs, but this is believed to be largely tied to coaches.</p> <p>Jacob and Bryce commented that they still view Logan as being a different geographical area, so these are different issues. Chuck reminded that both issues need to be voted on tonight.</p> <p>The consensus was that there are no performance metrics / objective criteria on what makes a good program. The board decided to take a 15 minute closed / exec session, to discuss confidential details.</p> <p>The meeting then went closed for a period of time, with the zoom left muted.</p>			
Motion:	Motion By:	Don	Second By:	Tim
	Motion:	<p><i>“to approve Logan for 16U and 18U Tier 2, approval all existing organizations (Park City, Oval, Jr. Grizzlies and Ogden) to be approved for their requested tier 2 teams and for the tier committee to identify objective organizational metrics and have approved by UAHA board by 1 Sept 2025 for use in determining 26-27 tier teams.”</i></p>		
Discussion(s):	<p>Approx 20 min later, we reconvened as an open session, with all parties present. Upon restarting the meeting, a motion was made by Don:  <i>“To approve Logan’s 16U and 18U tier 2 teams, and all existing tier 2 organizations (Oval, Park City, Ogden and Jr. Grizzlies) for their requested teams, with a task issued to the tier committee to identify a set of objective metrics for the monitoring of these organizations against for next year, along with a moratorium for new tier 2 organizations next year.”</i> Second by Tim, with a proposed amendment for the metrics to be completed by 1 Sept. Don amended with Chuck as the second.</p> <p>Jacob requested another amendment, for the metrics to be completed by the exec board rather than the tier committee, on the basis of the perception of the tier committee being conflicted on the proposed metrics for their orgs.</p> <p>Don commented that the tier committee is to identify the first round of it, but it then comes to the board for approval, since the tier committee cannot vote on it. Jacob understood and agreed.</p> <p>Shawn Heckman asked if there is any consideration for orgs that remove their tier status for a year and incentivize them on this scorecard for the following year. The tier committee was asked to consider this as something to impact the metrics, to reward teams giving their tier spot back for the year when they are unable to field a competitive tier team.</p> <p>Tim said this has been done in the past, with Provo stepping back from tier 2 when they didn’t have enough talent. Shawn suggested that if a team volunteers, they should be guaranteed a team for the following year. Geoff didn’t agree and tabled the side discussion, since this will be determined through the tier committee and brought back to the board.</p> <p>Geoff asked to have the final motion re-read, for all to be aligned. It was read as, <i>“to approve Logan for 16U and 18U Tier 2, approval all existing</i></p>			



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



	<p>organizations (Park City, Oval, Jr. Grizzlies and Ogden) to be approved for their requested tier 2 teams and for the tier committee to identify objective organizational metrics and have approved by UAHA board by 1 Sept 2025 for use in determining 26-27 tier teams. Also, a moratorium for the approval of new tier 2 organizations in 2026.”</p> <p>Geoff commented that he didn’t believe the moratorium to be necessary for the approval of this motion, and that was removed by Don, to have the motion read, “to approve Logan for 16U and 18U Tier 2, approval all existing organizations (Park City, Oval, Jr. Grizzlies and Ogden) to be approved for their requested tier 2 teams and for the tier committee to identify objective organizational metrics and have approved by UAHA board by 1 Sept 2025 for use in determining 26-27 tier teams.”</p> <p>Robyn asked about the timeline for the teams to be viable and the belief was that we should follow the existing policies for this.</p> <p>Another question was asked about limiting the number of tier 2 teams for the 26-27 season, and Don indicated that he did not include it in the motion because he believed the number of teams should be dictated by the registration numbers and there is far too much in flux, with the UHC campaigns coming. Jacob said that this should also be a consideration for the metrics.</p> <p>Geoff asked for the motion to be reviewed one more time and it was read as: “to approve Logan for 16U and 18U Tier 2, approval all existing organizations (Park City, Oval, Jr. Grizzlies and Ogden) to be approved for their requested tier 2 teams and for the tier committee to identify objective organizational metrics and have approved by UAHA board by 1 Sept 2025 for use in determining 26-27 tier teams.” It was confirmed that Tim was still willing to second the surviving motion. Robyn asked about the deadline, and it was confirmed that this was sufficient players by start of season (Labor Day). The vote was called and all were in favor.</p>								
Approval:	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;">For:</td> <td style="width: 25%;">All</td> <td style="width: 25%;">Against:</td> <td style="width: 25%;">None</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Abstain:</td> <td colspan="3">None</td> </tr> </table>	For:	All	Against:	None	Abstain:	None		
For:	All	Against:	None						
Abstain:	None								

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	9	<b>Topic:</b>	New Business – Non-sanctioned tournament play by USAH teams and UAHA Waiver			
Presented By:	Don					
Initial Discussion:	This topic was tabled, in the interest of time					
Motion:	Motion By:	N/A		Second By:	N/A	
	Motion:	N/A				
Discussion(s):	N/A					
Approval:	For:	N/A	Against:	N/A	Abstain:	N/A

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	10	<b>Topic:</b>	President’s Agenda			
Presented By:	Geoff					
Initial Discussion:	<p>Where are we with the webmaster</p> <p>– Anna provided a report that our budget was certainly not aligned with the bids received. Now we need to go back to applicants and see if the new budget is acceptable or if there is a new proposal on the service level.</p>					



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



	<p>If no candidate agrees, then we will need to go back to the bd process.</p> <p>Steve has put forth a candidate and should be considered for service offering too.</p> <p>Need to analyze the dollar amount for the service and determine if there are things we need vs things we want.</p> <p>Melissa reiterated that we need to ensure that future offerings are provided with a budget, because it is pretty insulting to get the bids for what we want, then tell them we are willing to pay a fraction of what their bid is.</p>					
Motion:	Motion By:	N/A		Second By:	N/A	
	Motion:	N/A				
Discussion(s):	N/A					
Approval:	For:	N/A	Against:	N/A	Abstain:	N/A

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	8	<b>Topic:</b>	<p>New Business – Org announcements of tryout dates / team announcements prior to team approvals in Mar Meeting (formalizing what was discussed by board email on tryout announcements and registrations prior to team approvals)</p>			
Presented By:	Geoff					
Initial Discussion:	<p>Reminded orgs that team are permitted to post a “save the date” for tryouts, but not open tryouts or take money for tryouts before teams are approved. This was discussed and the board decided this in email, so this was intended to clarify this “ruling” with the public.</p> <p>Adam mentioned team approvals need to be done in Feb meeting, with Jan 15 becoming the deadline for team declaration / application submission. This will be in the amended policies.</p>					
Motion:	Motion By:	Adam		Second By:	Jacob	
	Motion:	<i>Move the deadline for tier and travel teams up to Jan 15 and to vote on teams in the Feb board meeting.</i>				
Discussion(s):	While this was motion was made, a point of order was made that we need to have this into a policy amendment, which requires advance notice. The motion was withdrawn, with it being clear that we have a board consensus on this.					
Approval:	For:	N/A	Against:	N/A	Abstain:	N/A

UAHA Committee Section Reports		
Section	Owner	Discussions
VP High School	Anna Erickson	<p>Park City is affiliated champion Independent champion game is happening now.</p> <p>Robyn asked if we have another slot for nationals.</p>



## UTAH AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION Board Meeting Minutes



		Geoff wanted to forego the rest of section reports for the month, unless there was something urgent. A motion to adjourn was made.
VP Girls	Melissa Mossberg	N/A
VP Adult / Sled	Cody Madsen	N/A
VP Youth	Jacob Hickman	N/A
VP Tier	Tim Odell	N/A
VP Growth	Steve Picano	N/A
VP Discipline	Bryce Mannek	N/A
Registrar	Robyn Eyre-Long	N/A
CIC/ADM	Michael Strahan	N/A
Goaltending Development	Reid Jacobsen	N/A
SafeSport	Wendy Radke	N/A
Safety Director	Mandi Berim	N/A
Webmaster	Vacant	N/A
Treasurer	Adam Bailey	N/A
Secretary	Don McFarland	Need to respond to the USA Hockey Assessment activity.
Executive VP	Chuck Dorval	N/A
President	Geoff Fisher	N/A

End Of Meeting: Closing				
Next Meeting Date / Location:		7 April 2025 / Maverik Center		
Adjourn Meeting:	Motion By:	Geoff	Second By:	Tim
	Discussion:	Geoff decided to forego the section reports for the month.	Time:	9:56 P