

NORCAL Hockey Board Sign-In Sheet
October 22, 2005 Meeting

Pete Toft	NORCAL President	P
Ann Wade	NORCAL VP/Penalty Review	P
Carla Dickerson	NORCAL Secretary	P
Deanna Branski	NORCAL Treasurer	P
Chuck Collins	NORCAL Scheduler/Webmaster	
Jennifer Clark	NORCAL M.A.L.	P
John Hamer	NORCAL Gen. Manager	P
Open	NORCAL Girls Chair	
Mike Donahue	NORCAL Roster Manager	P
Melissa Fitzgerald	CAHA Director	P
Mark Mauro	NORCAL Referee In Chief	
Open	NORCAL Director of Coaches	
Todd Llewellyn	IHONC President	P
NORCAL Club Representatives		
Liesl Songer-Nelson/M. Fitzgerald	1. Berkeley Iceland	
Chris Hathaway	2. Cupertino – Pres.	P
Bobby Barlow	3. Fresno – Pres.	P
Todd Morgan	4. High Sierra – Pres.	
Emery Lykins	5. Oakland Ice Center	P
Ray Monks	6. Sacramento/Roseville Skatetown	P
Joe Lundy	7. Santa Clara – Pres.	P
Stephanie Richardson	8. San Jose – Rep.	P
Deanna Branski	9. Santa Rosa – Pres.	P
Anna Lane	10. Stockton – Pres.	P
Mike Stoley	11. Tri-Valley - Pres.	
Jennifer Clark	12. Yerba Buena/S.F. – Pres.	P
Shane Hicke	13. Vacaville Skating Center	P
Others in attendance		
Aaron Olson, Mark Balsi	Oakland	P
Mark Balsi, Bill Munroe	Oakland	P
Frank Lang	USA Hockey Director	P
Karen Frank	Tri-Valley VP	proxy
Mike Holmes	Tri-Valley Director of Coaches	P
Paul Bates	Tri-Valley	P
Kevin Collins	San Francisco	P
Scott Scherer	High Sierra	proxy
Cyril Allen	Berkeley	proxy
Andrew Frojelin	Santa Clara Blackhawks	P
Non attendance notations		

NORCAL BOARD MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 22, 2005

General session called to order at 10:10am with introductions.

Some items may not be reported in the order by which they were presented.

REPORTS

1. President – Pete Toft

- Thank you to Oakland for hosting the meeting today. **Action Item:** *Pete is looking for a new meeting location for the 12/3 meeting. Any club willing to provide space and accessibility to provide lunch (compensated by NORCAL) please email Pete ASAP.*
- Scholarship Committee – Pete reported that the Scholarship Committee will meet immediately following today's meeting to discuss applications received and possible disbursements.
- CAHA Meeting – September 16-18 meeting notes were sent out via email. Pete particular noted the importance of accuracy on scoresheets. CAHA just heard and ruled on suspending the adults associated with a team, for inadvertently turning in inaccurate scoresheets.
- CAHA Select Camp dates are 1/27-29 in Lakewood.

2. GM – John Hamer

- No bids were received by the October 15th deadline for Pre-Select Camp (12/17-18), Mite Jamboree (3/4-5) or any of the NORCAL playoffs (3/18-19 and 3/25-26). There was some discrepancy as to receipt noted by some of the club presidents. **Action Item:** *Club President's were given an extension to get bids in to John. New deadline date is November 1st. John will re-send bid packets for consideration.*
- Scoresheet Update – John mentioned that 85-90% of the scoresheets received to date have been good. Some turned in are still missing game numbers. Those are problematic, they're difficult to record and some of them aren't even entered in the database. Those that are received that aren't entered in the database, I have a pile of blind scoresheets. Those end up not counting for games played in terms of minimums, they don't count toward suspensions served, etc. So, please compliment your volunteers who are doing the recording and at the same time give them a polite reminder about the importance to make sure they are completed properly.
- Stephanie noted concern about those games not counting if you happen to be the visiting team. Pete noted that the managers need to check the scoresheet when the game is complete. If neither team reports a problem, then everyone assumes it's completed properly. Anna suggested that all the club president's would be grateful if John could inform them of scoresheets received with errors. **Action Item:** *John obliged a courtesy to email those clubs to notify them of scoresheets being turned in with missing information.*
- There was then some discussion about protocol in completing scoresheets. When managers receive scoresheets for pre-game preparation, they should be sure that the coach has signed and note players that are injured (INJ) or absent (ABS). Injured players who are

properly suited up and on the bench, will receive standings credit towards games played.

3. Vice President – Ann Wade
 - Ann reported there would be one hearing following the meeting today. She circulated a sign up sheet for all clubs to provide contact information on their designee who could be called for any future review hearings. Once again she reminded all the club presidents how important this role was and their participation is appreciated by the board.
4. Treasurer – Deanna Branski
 - Presented financial statements as of September 30, 2005. Current balance in checking account is \$90,527.79.
 - Deanna noted that her recollection was that \$3,000 was the number the Scholarship Committee had to work with today. **Correction:** *Following the meeting, it was determined from reviewing past minutes that the committee had \$4,000 allocated for 05-06 disbursement. This leaves approximately \$1,300 in reserve.*
 - Noted correction that will be made on the P&L statement for Constantine clinic. The \$18,712.69 figure was accidentally doubled. Constantine clinic reimbursements were disbursed today for those clubs who had coaches attend and requested reimbursement up to 5 coaches.
 - Deanna will discuss offline with Carla to make sure budget amounts are in alignment with the previous minutes when the budget was approved.
 - Invoices will be emailed directly to your treasurer or who ever you designated will receive your bill for your club. This will be a new system. The invoice will come as an attachment monthly. Everyone should have received a bill already.
 - Shane asked about reimbursing coaches who attended other clinics other than Constantine. Deanna responded no, Constantine is a NORCAL sponsored event.
5. Secretary - Carla Dickerson

Asked for approval of the minutes from the September 10th meeting with the noted corrections reflected in the 10/10/05 draft.

Motion to accept 9/10/05 Minutes as presented, by Joe Lundy, 2nd by Bobby Barlow. Jennifer Clark noted an omission in the minutes reflecting the way the teams will be evaluated in the Midget 16 division. It should be **5** preseason games and then they will be ranked and divided into two groups. **Motion** to accept the correction as noted made by Joe Lundy, 2nd by Jennifer Clark, motion to accept amended minutes carried unanimously.
6. Scheduler/Webmaster – Chuck Collins – not present
 - Carla reported Chuck's 10/21 email send out:

Webmaster

1) New facility on web site to post club-approved announcements is operational. People always ask me if I'll post their clinics or tournaments. I can now easily post such announcements, but only if sent to me from a club rep. I'd particularly like to see tournaments posted. Plain text descriptions are best, 30-60 words with a headline.

2) Split standings for 16A may be a while in coming.

3) Score reporting is going well. Every score last weekend was reported before I logged in Monday morning.

Scheduler

- 1) Schedules for the upcoming week will be out for review by Monday night.
 - 2) Schedules for subsequent weeks will be published as they become ready. Unlikely to take longer than 2 weeks.
 - 3) Please explain to the parents about how the process works. I get emails that imply it's a personal affront to parents everywhere that I post the games so late.
 - Deanna noted is it an issue. Because now that we're pre-season during Halloween, parents don't have a clue where they're going to be next weekend. Pete noted think about it, remember we have 8 pre-season games and with all that he's trying to do, waiting to the last minute to figure out where teams belong and what Chuck's always tried to do is get the first weekend out and then get the next two or three out and then you can get the rest of the season out. It's partly based on our own request to hold the schedule as long as we can to look at pre-season games to make sure the teams are right. The first weekend of regular season games is based on pre-season and there's nothing we can do. Chuck has been great about getting the full schedule out pretty quickly after the pre-season is concluded. Ray noted he thinks Chuck is doing a great job.
 - *Deanna noted that she'd like to table a conversation for a future meeting about what we can do to change the pre-season process to possibly a tournament style pre-season. Where we do like say 4 PeeWee games all in one weekend in one location.* When we as a club look at why parents are leaving the sport, one of the considerations is that parents don't understand why there's such a delay in knowing where they'll be next weekend.
7. Roster Manager – Mike Donahue
- Mike noted that we have just under 1,400 players rostered on 87 teams. This number excludes any special teams. He normally communicates only with the registrars of your clubs. Will involve club president's if necessary.
 - CAHA has no responsibility for A/B teams at the state level. He works primarily with Therese Phillips and Betsey Crandall to keep each other informed. When we come to December and January deadlines the league has to be prepared to do that itself, so that's something to look ahead to.
 - The NORCAL rule that seems to come up most often is the 48-hour waiting period rule. This is important, because if a player who is ineligible appears on a scoresheet that that game could be subject to forfeit. We've come close in a couple of instances in the last few weeks. My practice is that I'm working off of 48-hours back from the network time stamp on the email. It's the coach's responsibility to make sure that no players on that roster who are ineligible. Part of being ineligible is the notification didn't get to the Roster Manager in time. The rule says that the Roster Manager needs to receive it. If you send it within a few hours, your relying on the performance of the network. It was suggested that fax be used. Mike doesn't have a fax machine. **Action Item:** *Carla will check with Lori Diaz regarding obtaining fax machine*

that NORCAL owns and providing it to Mike for a secondary means of communication.

- Stephanie noted her understanding regarding tier teams that there was no 48-hour waiting period. The signed supplements have to be in Betsey's hand and they can play.
 - Pete noted that the 48-hour rule was put in place to keep players from moving around over a weekend. Stephanie noted that if we're talking about an hour, that's just not right. Mike noted there's no way to have a rule enforced without having a precise definition about what counts and what doesn't. *Any recommendations for rule changes on the 48-hour waiting period for next year should be presented later in the season.*
 - PDR – Mike noted that based on research of teams from last season in the records provided by Lori Diaz all NORCAL teams meet PDR. The lowest count was 6 on a team and the numbers are from 5 down to 3, but no team had lower than 6 players who qualify. This only applies to PeeWee, Bantam and Midget level A and AA teams. No PDR for B teams.
 - Emery asked about allowing a PeeWee player to play today when the notification time was 1.5 hours less than 48-hour waiting period. Mike's answer was no and he would speak to the parents. He felt the PR statement was the most important at this time. Emery said that he would notify the parent's.
 - Pete personally thanked Mike for all his diligence in stepping in at a crucial time to get things moving in the right direction.
8. Referee in Chief – Mark Mauro – not present
9. Director of Coaches - none
10. USA Hockey Report – Frank Lang
- Will be attending a USA Hockey meeting January in Florida. Addressed rule changes again that were discussed at the district level, specifically off sides. If you have recommendations for rule changes that you want taken for consideration, they need to be proposed and presented through NORCAL, then get support through CAHA at the state level.
11. CAHA – Melissa Fitzgerald
- Pete mentioned that he sent out a summary of his CAHA meeting notes in his email dated October 18th to all club presidents.
 - Melissa highlighted CAHA concerns over reorganizing the growth of hockey as new membership numbers are decreasing. Discussed how to get the message out to people who don't play hockey. One possibility is through the CAHA website by first identifying by zip code then directing them to their local rink. We talked about identifying a better CAHA website, possibly linked through the USA Hockey website.
 - We need to bring in more players. It's the best way to make money and it's the best way to grow the sport. We're working on structuring goals for future discussion. Chris Hathaway noted promoting youth hockey in the bay area. We will possibly purchase a group of tickets where all NORCAL players can wear their jerseys to the game. **Action Item:** *Pete will be following up with discussions with Rob Jaynes which includes a list of things that came out of the CAHA meeting.* How can

we get NORCAL Jumbotron time at the NHL Sharks games advertising NORCAL hockey.

- Discussed organizing tier hockey and looking at fielding higher quality teams, particularly at the AAA level.
- Next meeting is November 19th in San Jose somewhere. ***Action Item: Board notification will go out as soon as the location and time is published.*** Melissa noted that the more people that attend the meeting the better unity we show for our concern over issues being decided at the state level. It was suggested that each club send at least one representative.

12. IHONC – Todd Llewellyn

- Noted IHONC is done with seminars for the year with the exception of one final make-up seminar scheduled for 11/5 in San Jose. 24 spots remain at this clinic which will have 60 attendees.
- 125 registered officials to date. 275 estimated certified for the year.
- IHONC is growing into Santa Rosa and Stockton adult leagues and in discussions venturing some SOCAL adult leagues. By next year they should be known as IHOC not IHONC.
- Have been contacted by ECHL Stockton Thunder to provide officials for their practices and camps with the possibility of sending some senior officials for future games.
- Online evaluation process encouraged for coaches to give constructive feedback.
- Incident reports only go to John Hamer and Pete Toft and will be distributed to club presidents only if penalty review is required.
- Explained the difference between the NHL and USA Hockey crease rules.
- Todd noted that he's getting ready to send out mass communication to all their officials and will be addressing the following items. Safety issues, crease violations, mouth piece reminder, checking from behind, high hands and sticks and pre-game responsibilities.

13. Sharks Fan Development – Rob Jaynes – not present

OLD BUSINESS

1. Team Placements – Pete reminded that at the last meeting, club presidents as a body, voted that what John puts out today is final. There will be no debate. John then distributed a hand out of team placements.
 - With the exception of Fresno, I've communicated with all the clubs if their teams ended up where their initial declarations were. He noted that there were 4 teams that were moved up and there were 3 teams that were moved down.
 - The one puzzling thing that you may notice is the Bantam B division. Based on the way that the placements broke out, we did not have 9 and 9, we had 8 and 10. A 10-team division is a challenge to schedule. He noted that he personally does not like a 10 team division because there's too much gap between the top and the bottom. So he's presenting a random division into two 5-team groupings. The alternative to that would be to have a 10-team division, but to play a balanced schedule would require breaking the ice budget and each team would need to provide an additional ice slot. Then that division would

play an 8 game regular season. Alternatively, if it was divided into 5 and 5 like this it could be play 3 rounds within your conference and then 4 of the other 5 teams in the other conference to make up the 16 games. So those are the two options. There was no direction from the board as to how to divide the B's there, so those two possibilities are out there.

- The goal we started with was first of all to preserve A and B divisions if at all possible, which it is with the exception of what we voted on last time about the Midget 16's. We used the team declarations at a starting point and then moved things around at a minimal level. I talked to a number of presidents and coaches, got input from a number of people, looked carefully at the standings and this is what I declare as team placements. So then there needs to be a decision made about the Bantam B, how that group is divided.
- Shane noted that he was never contacted regarding his Bantam team moving from B to A. He said that he had parents who will pull out when this comes out declaring they are an A team.
- Anna asked why the Girls 19 team was in this division. Pete noted that this was discussed at a previous meeting. Melissa noted it was partially decided on maturity as well.
- John noted that he understood that this wouldn't meet with the satisfaction of everyone, but this was his best judgement. There were serious considerations against every one of the other options.
- Stephanie asked if for the Bantam B divisions could be ranked as we plan to rank the Midget 16's? Rank them 1 through 10? John said that would be fine. He's not saying that this is random not ranked in order. He has a reasonable level of confidence though in the breakdown between the A and the B division. If the board wants a 10-team division, the board could do that, but it would require an additional game. If you want to have it broken down into 5 and 5, John would recommend that we do it the same way as the 16's, which is to have an unbalanced schedule between the conferences with a cross-over round and then the top team from each conference and then the 3rd and 4th best teams where they end up.
- Jennifer noted that ranking them like the Midget 16's are. The pre-season schedule wasn't set up to look at it that way and for instance San Francisco played a few A games, so therefore they're at a lower ranking than they might have been if they played B games, which is something to consider.
- Scott noted he would favor the 10-team division and their club put up the additional ice. But if not, then he'd suggest since they are one of the more remote clubs, we look at try and do have things split up more geographically.
- Stephanie commented that all the club presidents voted to reduce the season. You all knew there was going to be a shorter pre-season that was going to have an effect on this. Don't come back now and ask for more games. I have two teams in that division and I say no. I'm suggesting try to rank them 1 through 10 and doing something similar to what we did...we budgeted so much. It's not a matter of available

ice, it's a matter of we're doing it again, we're going to change our minds because it didn't work the way we wanted it. My unused ice gets returned to Logitech...it's not mine.

- Melissa noted one other alternative that hasn't been discussed is to have one round of games that count. There would be one round of games that count.
- Chris suggested that we need to just vote on it. Joe noted the other potential to have a non-balanced schedule. John said that would mean that 10 teams would play 16 games, but there's one team that you won't play twice.
- Ray asked what is the huge opposition. The way it is now what does everyone see is the huge downfall with the way John has presented it. Chris thinks that there's a lot of teams who got put in that B division based on how they performed against A teams in the pre-season vs. seeding teams in one division. The 16's there is no A and B...everyone is going in that same division. Ray noted that we counted on John's judgement of watching games and seeing the level of play and ranking them accordingly.
- John explained it would be very difficult in any of the divisions to make a more fine grading among the B teams with them playing different number of games. So, these are somewhat random in terms of the division. If there was a clear-cut 1 and 2 within the B division, I'd be happy to do that, but I don't feel there is.
- Shane voiced his displeasure again about his Bantam team moving to A. Suggested moving the girls out of the A division. John noted with all due respect to the conversation, he was chartered by the board to make the best shot that he could, which he's done. The discussion now is what's the best way to arrange the division.
- The divisions would be divided for instance eastern and western. There would be 3 rounds within your division (12 games) and then you would play 4 out of the 5 teams in the other division, so it becomes unbalanced because you won't play one of the other 5 teams. Top 1 out of each, plus the next two best records. It will be an unbalanced schedule.
- Pete then outlined the 4 options that he heard discussed:
 1. 10-team division plays an unbalanced schedule, all 16 games count.
 2. 10-team division with every team providing one additional ice slot for an 18 game schedule where every team plays every other team twice and all games count.
 3. 10-team division, where you play an unbalanced schedule but only 1 game against each of the other teams counts towards standings.
 4. 2-5 team divisions with two options within that.

Motion on Option #1 presented by Deanna Branski, 2nd by Stephanie Richardson. With a vote of 2 in favor (Berkeley and San Jose), 2 abstentions (Fresno and Vacaville) and 9 opposed, the motion is defeated.

Motion on Option #2 presented by Scott Scherer, 2nd by Ray Monks. With a vote of 1 opposed (San Jose), 3 abstentions (Fresno, Santa Clara and Vacaville) and 9 in favor, the motion carries.

Motion on Option #3 died for lack of a motion.

Motion on Option #4 presented by Stephanie Richardson, 2nd by Anna Lane. With a vote of 2 in favor (San Jose and Stockton), 2 abstentions (Berkeley and Santa Clara), and 8 opposed, the motion is defeated.

- Kevin Collins noted that he has Midget 16 player in San Francisco. He voiced his concerns with the potential fallout from a one team division. Stephanie interjected with asking if Kevin knew there was going to be a B playoff. Jennifer noted that she would like to see if any other clubs would like to declare B. Anna asked for an informal poll of club presidents. Pete called for a show of hands and San Francisco was the only club wishing to move to B. Bottom line is if we don't have teams who want to play in a B division, there is no B division. We don't force teams to play B who want to play A. There has to be a minimum of 4 teams.
 - Jennifer noted that the rankings still need to be completed since all teams have not played their 5 pre-season games. Those games will be completed after this weekend and then teams will be ranked.
 - John reminded everyone of what was voted on at the previous meeting with regard to this division. He was bound by the vote that this would be a single division. The breakdown of that division would be looked at at the end of a period of games and then let the chips fall where they may. Rule 5.06 says the placement should be made next to the last weekend of pre-season, so this is why we're making the recommendation today.
2. Chicago Showcase - .Pete reviewed Ed Tar's email dated September 21st that was previously distributed to all club presidents. After board discussion it was decided that NORCAL prefers to recognize their own players who choose to tryout and who advance on to Chicago Showcase without funneling money through CAHA. ***Action Item: We have a player who went from NORCAL last year that we still need to revisit any compensation.***
3. Playoff, Mite Jamboree and Select Camp Bids - See Item #2 under Reports.
4. Grass Roots Program Update –
- Pete prefaced information distributed from Chris Hathaway with a variety of ideas presented in his email dated 10/18/05. He noted that we're not in a position to making any decisions yet. There are a variety of things on the table including the survey results.
 - Ray mentioned that he needs to get the surveys out to the board that were collected. It's pretty much a split with regard to the boundary question. Everyone wants best for their kid. Other ideas need to be presented other than boundary's that could potentially achieve the same results.
 - Chris noted the biggest thing was kids getting shuffled around. We need to follow up on the previous discussions about the Mite restrictions.
 - Pete noted that some of these recommendations are focused directly at the player directly. There's another section on this that doesn't address the player directly, it addresses how we can form teams and clubs with PDR and things like that. I would suggest that there are things you can do team and club wise as far as rallying changes in PDR and percentages, that are not specifically focused on "you're signing on this

line". Because then it makes the clubs and teams on their own start to develop feeder systems on their own rather than mandate what specific players have to do. I'd say that's two very different approaches to it that might end up starting to get to the same end result that's maybe not so focused on the signed commitment.

- Emery noted that maybe we need to hold the club liable for certain things like maybe you have to establish an in-program or you have to establish a certain coaching level at that facility. As it is right now there's no minimum requirement.
- Pete noted just to piggy back on what Melissa mentioned about the CAHA program, what I wasn't aware of is that northern California hockey is tremendously different than southern California. We actually have a lot of in-house programs up here. Down there they have no in-house programs that are related to their hockey clubs. There are like two rinks that have in-house programs, but they don't even have travel hockey at those two rinks. So their first introduction to hockey is B. For us we talk about house, B, A, AA and AAA. In southern California it's very different. Although we think we have issues, CAHA is looking at mandating feeder programs and intent is to stay away from clubs who field one AA team. I think there are things in the rules here and we can discuss in a rule change to put requirements on clubs to develop better hockey players.
- Chris noted if you don't have feeder programs, where are you going to get your kids from. Those that have feeder programs should be able to keep the kids they invest in. On the PDR thing is the problem with kids going from tryout to tryout, if they knew that only 3 kids on that ice were allowed to be selected to that team that didn't play in that organization the year before, I guarantee they wouldn't travel all over the place to tryout. Shane commented on PDR.
- Jennifer commented that she was surprised that every program didn't have a feeder program, so I guess I'm a little behind there. She noted that their director of coaches has a clear decision that they do not want to play Squirt travel or lower for the simple reason they shouldn't be traveling at that age level. They get more ice time practicing.
- Ray noted that he thinks that if we're going to do these types of things, we almost need to look at minimum requirements in place. He also noted that PDR needs to be reversed. It should be 75%. If a kid could only register at one club to tryout. If the kid can only register at one club to tryout at that's it...they get one tryout...they're staying there. My whole point is if we all made an agreement, we all had, these are our tryout dates, that's it. Every club would agree to a make-up tryout weekend for all those kids who get cut.
- John commented that he's baffled. He could not believe that we would so willingly put limitations on people that none of us would for a second accept on ourselves in any other realm of our life. Ray would not accept a situation where he had to buy the first car that he looked at or where he had to take the first job offer that was given to him and then not only had to take it, but had stay there for 6 years. Who's going to write that letter to the parents that says when you sign up with my Mite

travel team, you are here for 6 seasons. I cannot conceive who's going to write that letter. Which one of us, which family, what parent in this room would sign that letter for your own 7 year old. It would not happen. Tryout...listen to the word tryout for just a second. Where does it say that it's the player trying out? It's the club trying out just as much. It's the club competing for players just as much. It's not fair to say "you try out for Santa Clara, you're screwed, you're with Santa Clara until they're done with you". Or whatever...let's compare this to Pellegrino, we give a release to Pellegrino...which club in here will raise their hand and say under no circumstances will I accept Pellegrino coming to my club because I believe he belongs in Stockton.

- Chris noted the problem is integrity in the whole thing.
- John noted don't blame the kids. I move into the neighborhood, I go to the NORCAL website and I see, San Jose Sharks, I see Cupertino Cougars, I see Santa Clara Blackhawks and then I see the thing that says where you sign is where you are for the next 6 years. I'm an intelligent parent, so I'm going to San Jose, because it's the biggest place and I'm going to be there until hell freezes over.
- John is raising a completely opposite side to the conversation, he's made some interesting points...I'm not saying any one is right.
- Paul Bates(had trouble hearing what he said in transcription).
- Pete noted there are lots of things that can be looked which is why we're discussing this. We have to be extremely careful, which is what I said before you can restrict individual players or you can look at it from a club or team perspective based on PDR and those kinds of things.
- Ray noted John and he were on the opposite side of this for a very long time. The thought behind registering for a single club was an attempt to discourage parents from driving 100 miles from their home. We have to do something. Every other sport has some kind of boundaries.
- Chris noted the strict release process in other states. That's something to look at and consider.
- Scott asked about changes on PDR requirement, would it just affect A and AA or would it affect B teams as well? Pete noted that you can't violate CAHA rules, but you can generally tighten it up some more.
- Emery made comments... (had trouble hearing what he said in transcription).
- ***Action Item:*** *Get your suggestions and ideas to Chris including problems and how you present to solve them. Chris said we need to get this seriously moving by January, in order to inform all the parents.*
- Anna noted her concern over this agenda item always being left at the end of the meeting, therefore not allotting appropriate time for discussion. Pete noted the only way that we can accomplish that is if we devote an entire meeting to this topic.
- Stephanie asked about Jon Gustafson expressing interest in being a part of this committee. He has some ideas that he'd like to share.

Got so loud after this....I couldn't hear anything.....

NEW BUSINESS

1. Stockton Play-up Request – Anna presented her player-up request for Andrew Pellegrino. She distributed supporting materials including letters for review. After questions, answers and discussion a **Motion** to allow Andrew Pellegrino to be rostered on the Stockton PeeWee B teams was presented by Anna Lane, 2nd by Deanna Branski. With a vote of 4 in favor (High Sierra, Santa Rosa, Stockton and Tri-Valley), 3 opposed (Oakland, Sacramento and Santa Clara, 5 abstentions (Berkeley, Cupertino, San Jose, San Francisco and Vacaville), the motion carries. Emery expressed his disappointment in clubs abstaining from voting. Pete then instructed Anna that the request now has to be presented to CAHA and will most likely be heard at the November 19th meeting. In the meantime, the player is to remain with the Squirt B team and he cannot participate in any capacity with the PeeWee B team.
2. Jordan Kocian Award – Pete reminded the board of the criteria which he will forward to all the club presidents. The selection process will be earlier year as Melissa noted at a previous meeting that this is preferably awarded during the New Year's tournament when the family is there to present. Cyril echoed those sentiments. **Action Item:** *Carla will send out criteria. Nominees are due to Pete no later than November 15th.*
3. Ace Coordinators – This is the USA Hockey (Achieving Coaching Excellence) program. In my view USA Hockey has not done a lot in taking this program forward. I understand that there are a tremendous amount of materials available for coaches and supposedly someone as an ACE Coordinator would know how to access this information. I need a name from each club of someone who's willing to get involved in this program. **Action Item:** *Submit name, address, phone number and email contact information on your Ace Coordinator to Pete by October 31st.*

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting made Joe Lundy, 2nd by Emery Lykins at 2:10pm.

Next meeting – Sat. December 3rd, location TBA

ADDENDUMS

See correction notation under Item #4 Reports.

Respectfully Submitted by Carla Dickerson, NORCAL Secretary
First Draft 10/28/05