

**USTA Northern California  
BOARD RESOLUTIONS  
12/31/2015**

| DATE       | COMMITTEE        | ACTION   |
|------------|------------------|--|
| 11/11/2015 | ADULT<br>LEAGUES | <p><b>Amendment to LLAR #31 - NTRP Grievance timeline</b></p> <p>Amend LLAR #31 as follows:</p> <p>An NTRP grievance may be filed at any time prior to 48 hours after the completion of Sectional Championships. <b>NTRP grievances will not be decided within 7 days of the start date of the players and/or captain's local league playoff and/or within 21 days of the start of the player's and/or captain's District or Sectionals Championship, and will be administered after the event unless the section authorizes the administration of the grievance prior to that time. If the grievance is not administered until after the event, points won by the player will stand.</b></p> <p><b>Please refer to the "Protocol for Filing a Self-Rate Grievance" &lt;link&gt; for more information on claim standards that have to be met for a self-rate grievance to be accepted.</b></p> <p><del>A grievance against a player shall be sent to the player and the player's team captain, and both shall be considered parties to the complaint. All information provided by parties to the committee will be shared with all other parties involved in the grievance except for information of a non-public nature such as dynamic ratings, self-rate and/or self-rate appeal forms, and the player background history form. Any information of a proprietary nature for USTA will not be shared with the other parties but may also be submitted to the grievance committee.</del></p> <p>A player who has an inaccurate or inappropriate self-rating is subject to a rating adjustment by the NTRP Grievance Committee. If a rating adjustment is made, all eligible matches played prior to the rating adjustment will be reversed due to the ineligibility of the player. A player who has inappropriately self-rated as well as a captain or others who participated in or condoned this action are subject to further penalties which may include, but are not limited to, disqualification and suspension [ULR3.03E(1)a].</p> <p>NTRP grievance committee decisions made after 24 hours of the completion of local league play, a playoff weekend, or a District or Sectional Championship event will not be retroactive and match results will not be reversed for that segment of play. NTRP grievances may be filed but will not be decided during a championship event.</p> <p>The decision of the NTRP Grievance Committee may be appealed by any party.</p> <p>The procedure for filing an NTRP grievance is referenced in the <a href="#">League Resources</a> under Disqualifications/Grievances. Appeal information will be contained within the grievance decision.</p> |

---

Failure to comply with any procedural rule for filing a grievance or appeal may result in such grievance or appeal being dismissed.

This motion was approved.

**Rationale:** NTRP Grievances decided in the final days prior to playoffs and championships create undue hardship on all teams affected. Playoff standings change which disrupts the already determined home match dates. Teams who have lost multiple players to grievance have pulled out of championship leaving a hole in the schedule or they default matches, all of which affects all of the teams in their championship flight.

Grieved players have been notified the night before championship that they can no longer play with their team, after already taking time off work and have lost a hotel deposit. They are also not afforded due process as an appeal cannot be heard until after championship.

Some captains have used the NTRP grievance process to gain an advantage at championship. They have never played against the people they are grieving, just going after any self-rated player with a winning record. Captains are still welcome to grieve any self-rated player they feel is out of level but it will not be decided until after the next championship per the newly established timeline.

**Addition to LLAR 8. Format – Descriptions of All Leagues**

Add format requirement for the 2.5+ daytime leagues.

*Q: What does (+) mean for NorCal 2.5+ Daytime?*

*A: NorCal 2.5+ is open to all players rated 2.5 or 3.0. There is no limit to the number of 3.0 players on the roster. However, only three "Plus" players (3.0) may play per team match and the "Plus" players may only play in the #1 singles or #1 doubles position.*

**Motion made and seconded, affirmed by a vote of 7-0.**

**Rationale:** The 2.5/3.0 daytime leagues are intended to serve entry level players. Some teams formed with all 3.0 players and dominated the 2.5s. By adding a format requirement, similar to other + leagues, teams will be required to have at least 3 2.5s in each match.

---

7/8/2015

ADULT  
LEAGUES

It was moved and seconded that starting with the 2016 Adult Leagues, USTA NorCal will automatically issue a registration credit minus the \$3 Tennislink processing fee at the end of the local league to every player who did not play a match.

**Discussion:**

Staff fields many phone calls and emails from players and captains who miss the deadline for receiving a registration credit. The

---

---

conversations are often negative as all want an exception to the posted deadline and process. Changing to an automated process takes the onus off the captain and is more customer friendly. The processing of automatic the credits will include an email to the player thanking them for joining the team, letting them know that they have a credit towards a future league and providing information for future involvement.

The ALC and staff conclude that the future lost revenue is offset by the time savings for staff, the gesture of good will and increased customer satisfaction.

**Financial implications:**

Based on prior years data, the loss of future revenue is estimated to be **no more than approximately \$35,000 annually. That maximum estimate assumes every player who had not received a credit in the past would now receive an automated credit and would use it for registering in future leagues. It is not expected (as has been the case in the past) that all credits issued will be used.**

---

|            |                     |   |
|------------|---------------------|---|
| 5/13/2015  | ADULT<br>LEAGUES    | It was moved and seconded to adopt the 2016 League Calendar as presented. This motion was approved.   |
|            |                     | Discussion: The Calendar and Court Utilization sub-committee (comprised of ALC members and facility representatives) recommended and the ALC has agreed to keep the 2016 calendar the same as the 2015 calendar. All felt that providing players with consistency for 2 years was important to growing leagues and will provide trends for considering future change.   |
|            |                     | The staff requested administrative oversight to adjust specific dates to maintain smooth league operations and to accommodate National deadlines. As with the 2015 calendar, the four major league seasons have no local league play overlap.   |
| 3/5/2015   | ADULT<br>LEAGUES    | It was moved and seconded that \$10,000 of league revenue be allocated to modify and enhance the leagues smoothing software algorithm. The work will be done by Elder Research, the same company who created the original program. USTA NorCal will integrate this program into our existing league scheduling program as has been done in the past. The motion passed via email.   |
| 11/30/2015 | ADULT<br>TOURNAMENT | <b>1. Grand Tournament Program Renaming</b><br>The Committee was reminded that the title of Grand Slam Tournament Program needed to be renamed. A list of player and staff suggestions for renaming the program from presented. It was also noted that marketing suggested creating a series to include the Grand Prix in which the winner of all of the events in the series would be recognized.<br><br>After discussion, on a motion duly made, seconded and carried, the Committee approved the following resolution: |

---

---

RESOLVED, that effective immediately the former Grand Slam Tournament Program be renamed "NTRP Gold Cup Series".

This motion was approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That effective immediately, any player who wins all of the designated NTRP Gold Cup Series tournaments, including the Grand Prix within the same season, in the same event, would be recognized with an appropriate prize determined by staff.

This motion was approved.

Rationale: The NTRP Grand Slam Tournament Program needs to be renamed. The new "NTRP Gold Cup Series" name and the new series will hopefully grow more interest and excitement in current and new tournament players giving players something else to follow up to the Grand Prix and the end of the season.

## **2. 2016 Grand Slam Tournament/ Tournament of the Year Designations.**

The recommendations for the 2016 NTRP Gold Cup Series Tournaments and Tournament of the Year Designations were presented to the Committee.

Following discussion, on motion duly made, seconded and carried, the Committee approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED: that the following 2016 NTRP Gold Cup Series Tournaments and Tournaments of the Year be approved:

### **2016 NTRP Gold Cup Series Tournaments**

Bay Club SF Tennis Open Singles and NTRP Mixed Doubles  
Jan 15-17, 2016  
Natomas NTRP Adult Tournament  
March 18-20, 2016  
Los Gatos Swim & Racquet Club NTRP Doubles Challenge  
May 13-15, 2016  
Tahoe Donner Eight Annual NTRP Tournament  
June 3-5, 2016  
\$3,000 Sam Linder Monterey Bay Open, Senior and NTRP  
July 9-10; 16-17, 2016  
Silverado Resort and Spa End of Summer NTRP  
August 26-28, 2016

---

---

## 2016 Tournaments of the Year

|                            |                            |                      |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 2.5                        | 3.0                        | 3.5                  |
| Napa – July                | South San Francisco - June | Napa – July          |
|                            | Yuba City – June           | Sutter Lawn - August |
|                            | Johnson Ranch – July       | Stockton - September |
|                            |                            |                      |
| 4.0                        | 4.5                        | 5.0                  |
| Bay Club SF – February     | Central Cal – May          | Johnson Ranch - July |
| Central Cal – May          | Yuba City – June           | Tahoe Donne – August |
| South San Francisco – June | Lakeridge – July           | South Bay - August   |

This motion was approved.

### 3. National Top 500 List

Adult Tournament staff presented the recommendations for the Men's and Women's open tournaments as determined by 2 Adult Tournament Committee members. She noted that these tournaments count toward the National Top 500 List. She also noted that each section is allowed to submit up to 4 Men's and 4 Women's Open Tournaments for such purpose.

After discussion, on a motion duly made, seconded and carried, the Committee approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the following 2016 Men's and Women's Open Tournaments will be submitted to National to count in the National Top 500 ranking list.

#### 2016 Men's Tournaments

1. \$25,000 The Heritage Bank of Commerce Open Tennis Championships (Aug. 2-7)
2. \$3500 2016 Mountain View Open (May 27-30)
3. \$2500.00 Los Gatos Men's Open (Apr. 16-17; 23-24)
4. LD Micro Open (Jun. 9-12)

#### 2016 Women's Tournaments

1. \$25,000 The Heritage Bank of Commerce Open Tennis Championships (Aug. 2-7)
2. \$3500 2016 Mountain View Open (May 27-30)
3. Johnson Ranch Round Up \$5000 Open and NTRP (Jul. 22-24)
4. LD Micro Open (Jun. 9-12)

This motion was approved.

---

9/28/2015

ADULT  
TOURNAMENT

#### Intersectionals Stipend

The Committee discussed the stipend amount given to the NorCal Intersectional players to cover their expenses for going and competing in this event.

After discussion, the following motion was duly made and seconded:

**RESOLVED:** Effective immediately, a stipend of \$200 will be distributed to each Intersectionals player competing on the team

---

---

to help them offset the cost of their travel expenses. If a player withdraws from the team then the stipend will not be issued.

This motion was approved.

Rationale: By having a set amount for the stipend in place the players would be aware of what they are receiving when signing up to be on a team and NorCal can also budget more accurately when doing the budget.

---

2/2/2015

ADULT  
TOURNAMENT

### 1. Competitive Wheelchair Events and Tournaments

**RESOLVED:** That, effective with the 2015 event, the North-South Wheelchair event shall be included in the USTA NorCal rankings provided that the North-South Wheelchair event become a USTA NorCal sanctioned tournament and is in line with the USTA NorCal Sanction Rules and Adult Tournament Rules.

This motion was approved.

---

2/2/2015

ADULT  
TOURNAMENT

### 2. Grand Slam Tournaments

The ATC discussed the Grand Slam Tournament Designation rules that were reviewed and tabled at the December 2014 ATC meeting. Chrissie informed the Committee that she and Summer discussed with USTA NorCal staff expanding the regions to match of the designation areas to the TSR regions which everyone agreed would be beneficial.

After discussion, the following motion was duly made and seconded:

**RESOLVED:** That, effective with the 2015-2016 NTRP tournament season, the USTA NorCal Adult Tournament Ranking Rules be amended as follows (new language is underlined, deleted language is stricken through):

- 6. NTRP Grand Slam Tournament Designations.** Each year, up to 9 NTRP tournaments, one of each would represent each of the TSR regions, would be designated as a one NTRP Grand Slam Tournament ~~shall be designated in each of the following regions: Bay Area, South Counties, North Bay, Reno/Tahoe, and Sacramento. An NTRP Grand Slam Tournaments are designated by tournament and is the tournament in each region that receives the highest average rating by participants on the player evaluation.~~ Tournaments that meet the following minimum criteria shall be considered first for Grand Slam designation:
- A minimum of 15% of the total participants must have completed a player evaluation;
  - The Pre-Tournament Checklist is completed by the Tournament Director no later than the date entries open;
-

- The Post-Tournament Report is completed no later than 7 days after completion of the Tournament; and
- The tournament has complied with all applicable USTA NorCal sanction and tournament rules.

Player results in all divisions shall be 2 times the All Other Tournaments point value as set forth in the Point Table. All champions of NTRP Grand Slam Tournaments shall receive a special piece of USTA NorCal logo wear or other item commemorating their win.

This motion was approved.

|            |                |   |
|------------|----------------|---|
| 10/21/2015 | BOARD          | Motion approved to remove the membership requirement from the HITS program and the Play Days for 2016.  |
| 2/18/2015  | BOARD          | Amended motion to approve \$5000.00 to create the Action Plan which would then be presented to the Board for further discussion. Those who proposed and seconded the original motion accepted the amended motion.   |
| 5/4/2015   | DIVERSITY      | The following motion was duly made and seconded: RESOLVED, to stipend up to 18 coaches at \$50 each for a total of up to \$900 to attend the 2015 Fall USPTA Conference. This motion was approved.  |
| 2/18/2015  | DIVERSITY      | The following motion was duly made and seconded: RESOLVED, to support sponsorship of <i>Queens at Court</i> at the Sonoma Film Festival in the amount of \$2,500 and in the amount of \$1,000 for creation of dedicated LGBT collateral because we have not previously created LGBT specific collateral, the created LGBT material could potentially be re-used. Total budget for event is \$3,500. This motion was approved.   |
| 1/5/2015   | DIVERSITY      | The following motion was approved: RESOLVED, to participate in the Azteca Mexica Festival in March.   |
| 1/5/2015   | DIVERSITY      | The following motion was duly made and seconded: RESOLVED, to adopt the updated College Scholarship parameters and volunteer requirements. This motion was approved.  |
| 5/12/2015  | JUNIOR COUNCIL | <p><b>4. Coed Round Robins: Passed</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That effective with the July 2015 Coed Round Robins (the next Coed Round Robins on the schedule), the USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Rules be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the name of "Coed Round Robins" to "UTR Round Robins;"</li> <li>• Make the tournaments single-gender boys' and girls' 18 and under division round robin tournaments.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rationale:</u> It recently came to NorCal's attention that TennisRecruiting.net (TRN) will no longer import the results of Coed Round Robins into a player's record to be used when calculating a TRN ranking, and unless and until the USTA has more coed tournaments, TRN has no plans to change the policy. To date only three of the divisions from the boys' July 2014 Coed RR</p> |

---

in Stockton have been imported into TRN. Council concluded that players have the expectation that their results would count in TRN and that TRN is and will remain for the foreseeable future an important tool used by college coaches for recruitment. For this reason, and concerns raised by staff about the labor-intensive back end work required to hold mixed-gender tournaments, that the Coed Round Robins should become single-gender tournaments renamed UTR Round Robins.

---

5/12/2015

JUNIOR  
COUNCIL

## 5. Sportsmanship Initiatives: Passed

**RESOLVED:** That Andrea request that President Margie Campbell submit for review by NorCal legal council the following two sportsmanship strategies to determine if such strategies are advisable and if they are how best to implement them:

- The USTA Southern California Spectator Policy that sets a zero tolerance standard for certain behaviors of parents, coaches, and other persons associated with players and specifically vests with tournaments and the Section the authority to remove spectators from the playing area or facility; and
- The USTA Texas suspension point system policy that gives authority to certain individuals (such as staff and Junior Council members) to report acts to the Section in a manner that does not interfere with play and that may result in the assessment of suspension points, creating a scenario whereby the absence of an official does not mean that unsportsmanlike behavior will go unnoticed and unpunished.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That effective with the June Sectional Championships, NorCal shall pilot the taking by tournament participants of the USTA Junior Player Oath and have participants do post-match peer evaluations of their opponents on how well the opponents adhered to the oath. Implementation shall be as follows:

- The Oath and Peer Evaluation shall take place at all Sectional Championships, Excellence Tournaments, and such other tournaments as determined by NorCal staff.
- A peer evaluation card shall be developed and distributed to all tournaments that will be piloting the Oath and Peer Evaluation.
- All Peer Evaluation cards will be returned by the Tournament Committees to Junior Council for review with the goal of gaining better understanding of the state of sportsmanship in NorCal junior tournaments, and to determine whether the Peer Evaluation is a tool that can aide in promoting a culture of good sportsmanship. Feedback will also be solicited from the Tournament Committees.
- Peer Evaluation cards may not be used as evidence in a Grievance Committee hearing.

Rationale: In December 2014 the USTA NorCal Board determined that sportsmanship in NorCal junior tennis needed to be addressed, but agreed with Junior Council that final approval of the Sportsmanship Committee's resolution to double the officials requirement for implementation in January 2015 was not advisable, especially given its immediate impact on tournament

---

---

administration. The Board unanimously approved to send the resolution back to the Sportsmanship Committee to collaborate with other committees on solutions to the problems we're facing.

Although Junior Council had not yet been approached by the Sportsmanship Committee to collaborate on a solution, President Campbell asked that Junior Council begin a discussion immediately given the significant feedback that came from the coaches at the recent NorCal Junior Coaching Summit and the Team USA meeting regarding problems with sportsmanship. These resolutions represent the Council's recommendations to begin changing the culture related to behavior at NorCal junior tournaments.

For informational purposes, below is the USTA Junior Player Oath: *I recognize that tennis is a sport that places the responsibility for fair play on me. I promise to abide by the rules of the game, which require me to give the benefit of the doubt to my opponent. At all times I shall strive to compete with the true spirit of sportsmanship, recognizing that my behavior on the court is a direct reflection of my character. Whether my matches end with my victory or defeat, I promise to conduct myself in a way that honors my opponents, those who support me, and the game of tennis.*

---

5/12/2015

JUNIOR  
COUNCIL

## 6. Videotaping Policy: Passed

**RESOLVED:** That USTA NorCal shall adopt the following position on videotaping:

Videotaping and photography for personal, non-commercial purposes, of any portion of a sanctioned USTA NorCal event is permissible under the law, much like any event in a public place. If a player, parent or other person affiliated with a player objects to that player being videotaped or photographed, that player, parent or person may ask, or request that a Tournament Director or Certified Official intercede on their behalf to ask, that any videotaping and photography stop, or that the camera be repositioned to exclude that player. Other than optional compliance or respectful consideration, there are no grounds to deny anyone the right to videotape or photograph.

Notwithstanding this position, facilities used for sanctioned events may have videotaping and/or photography policies of their own pertaining to events within the boundaries of their property, which may supersede the position of USTA NorCal stated here.

Rationale: Several times in the last year, the question as to whether the USTA or NorCal has a policy the videotaping of junior matches at sanctioned tournaments has arisen. Staff believes that the lack of a policy or position on videotaping has lead to NorCal being unable to provide definitive answers when people inquire about what is and is not permitted. Board President reached out

---

---

to NorCal legal counsel for advice should the section want to adopt a policy and learned that there appears to be no legal authority in California to expressly allow or prohibit videotaping of minors playing tennis. Legal counsel recommended a policy should include:

- Videotaping of one's own child is permitted, so long as it is limited to their own child;
- Relatives, family, friends of a players must follow the same policy;
- Videotaping of someone else's child requires the permission of that child;
- No video can be used for commercial purpose;
- Video posted to the internet which include someone else's child must be "neutral," i.e. just show the match and not be offensive, make fun of another child's actions or play;
- Parents, relatives cannot use video during (or after) a match to in any way dispute or confirm points or calls; and
- These rules would apply whether the match was at a private club or public facility.

Council discussed the enforceability and feasibility of a comprehensive policy restricting videotaping and requiring permission should that be what is ultimately determined. It also reviewed the practices of USTA Texas, that has a position statement on videotaping, but does not prohibit it, and USTA Central Arizona (a district of USTA Southwest) that permits it only after written release forms are signed. The USTA's regulations related to video were also reviewed - the USTA reserves all video rights for certain tournaments, effectively giving it control over video should a problem arise.

Ultimately Council favored a position statement that acknowledged videotaping and photography are permissible, provided instruction on how to request (but not demand) videotaping and photography stop, and stated facilities may have their own policies that supersede NorCal's position.

This resolution was submitted for review by Margie Campbell and Legal Counsel on May 13.

---

4/28/2015

JUNIOR  
COUNCIL

**1. Endorsement of Teams to USTA Boys' and Girls' 16 & 14 National Doubles Championship and Performance Awards to Participants: Passed**

**RESOLVED:** That effective immediately, USTA NorCal shall put in place the following policy for endorsing a team in to the USTA Boys' and Girls' 16 and 14 National Doubles Championships:

**Endorsement of Teams to USTA National Doubles Championship**

The USTA National Doubles Championships accepts one endorsed team from each Sectional Association into each division (Boys' and Girls' 14 and 16), provided a timely entry

---

has been submitted. NorCal shall place the teams finishing 1st through 4th place in doubles at the June Sectional Championships in these divisions on its endorsement lists in place finish order. If one or more teams are not planning on playing the USTA National Doubles Championship, a team comprising at least one of players in the top four finishing teams may submit a request to appear on the endorsement list with another player. These teams will be listed below any place finish teams in an order to be determined by the combined doubles rank of the players comprising the team.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That effective immediately, the USTA NorCal Performance Award Program shall be amended to allocate the up to \$2,000 in performance award money previously added to the program for the USTA National Doubles Championship participants as follows:

**USTA National Doubles Championships \$250 Performance Awards**

No later than 30 days following the completion of a USTA National Doubles Championship, the highest accepted USTA NorCal endorsed team that competed in the tournament, and who meet the residency, play to completion, and sportsmanship criteria listed above will be notified that they have received a \$250 performance award, and payment will be made as soon as possible thereafter. The limit of two USTA National Championship Performance Awards per year does not apply to the USTA National Doubles Championships Performance Award.

Rationale: In 2011, NorCal established a Performance Award Program to help support the expenses of its top players to compete in the USTA National Championships and the USTA National Doubles Tournament. In 2013 the doubles tournament converted to a Gold Ball USTA National Championship and eliminated the endorsement of a team into the competition. In 2015, the USTA re-instituted the selection of one endorsed team from each Section and in the fall Junior Council voted, and the Board agreed, to reinstate the Performance Award for this tournament. At the time Junior Council did not specify how teams would be endorsed or selected to receive the Performance Award. These resolutions finalize these two outstanding issue to implement endorsement and awarding of the Performance Awards.

4/28/2015

JUNIOR COUNCIL

**2. Super Series Ranking Points: Passed**

**RESOLVED:** That effective with the July 2015 Super Series Tournaments, USTA NorCal the point table for the Super Series shall be amended as follows (stricken through points show the points that are being changed):

| Super Series Ranking | Flight A | Flight B | Flight C | Flight D | Coed RR | % of Winner Pts |
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|-----------------|
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|-----------------|

| Point Table                |         |         |            |              |     |           |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|------------|--------------|-----|-----------|
| Percent                    | 100%    | 70%     | 50%<br>55% | 35%<br>41.7% | -   | TTL %     |
| 1st (WWW)                  | 600     | 420     | 300 330    | 240 250      | 186 | 100%      |
| 2nd (WWL)                  | 480     | 336     | 240 264    | 168 200      | 124 | 80%       |
| 3rd (WLW)                  | 360 420 | 252 294 | 180 231    | 126 175      | 124 | 60% 70%   |
| 4th (WLL)                  | 240 300 | 210     | 150 165    | 105 125      | 62  | 50%       |
| Consolation Points Per Win | 90 200  | 63 140  | 45 110     | 32 84        | -   | 45% 33.4% |
| 5th (LWW)                  | 480 400 | 426 280 | 90 220     | 64 168       | 124 |           |
| 6th (LWL)                  | 90 200  | 63 140  | 45 110     | 32 84        | 62  |           |
| 7th (LLW)                  | 90 200  | 63 140  | 45 110     | 32 84        | 62  |           |
| 8th (LLL)                  | 0       | 0       | 0          | 0            |     |           |

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That if approved by the USTA NorCal Board in May, the following avenues of communication will be used to inform the players:

- Super Series tournament website posting(s);
- USTA NorCal website posting
- Announcement on USTA NorCal Juniors Facebook Page
- Announcement in NorCal E-Newsletter on junior tennis
- Materials will be provided to the Super Series tournaments to have available at their tournament desks

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That no change(s) to the tournament structures of the Coed Round Robin or the Super Series shall be made implemented before 2017.

Rationale: These resolutions address feedback that Super Series point allocations may be skewed in a way that better rewards play in the Coed Round Robin as opposed to the Super Series D Flight and whether we have a proper distribution of points to all Flights. At question is whether we have set up a table that properly awards points for wins at both of these tournaments that are intended to be level based competition. Council concluded the existing tables did not properly distribute points and believes the new table approved by the Council addresses these issues as follows:

- Awards more equitable points among players in a Flight with the same win/loss records. For example, more points go to 5th place finisher with a 2-1 record than the 4th place with a 1-2 record.
- Awards more points in Flight D to create a greater spread to the Coed RR points.

4/28/2015

JUNIOR  
COUNCIL

**3. NorCal 2016 Tournament Calendar: Passed**

**RESOLVED:** That the 2016 calendar of tournaments (except Open and Challenger Level) shall be as set forth on Exhibit A;

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the proposal includes the elimination of the Sectional Open Jamborees in 2016 and therefore all references to these tournaments shall be eliminated from the USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Rules;

---

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That effective January 12, 2016, USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Rules related to the singles-only Championship Age Division Tournaments shall be amended to:

- Decrease the draw size from 40 players to 32 players;
- Eliminate the use of block seeding;
- For clarity and to distinguish them from the other form of Championship Tournaments, re-name the tournaments Championship Singles-Only Tournaments.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That effective January 12, 2016, the USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Rules related to the Championship Age-Up Tournaments be amended to:

- Change the selection process so that players are selected only from the NorCal Final Ranking List of the division of the event.
- Change the singles draw format to Single Elimination, but give the option to the organizers to run a singles consolation;
- For clarity and to distinguish them from the other form of Championship Tournaments, re-name the tournaments Championship Singles & Doubles Tournaments.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Excellence Tournament to be held in January and that includes the Martin Luther King weekend shall start on the first weekend with singles; doubles shall start on the second weekend. If rain impacts the tournament schedule on the first weekend and it is determined that doubles can not be played to completion if started on the second weekend, the doubles event shall be cancelled and the Championship Tournament scheduled to begin April 30 (and similar dates in future years) shall be designated as the national L4 tournament for national ranking purposes. Players shall not be entitled to an entry fee refund if they entered doubles.

Rationale:

- The structure implemented in January 2014 is less family friendly than in previous years as the concurrent tournaments often lead to one child in a family not being able to play in a date block; the proposed calendar alleviates this slightly by eliminating the Championship that is concurrent with the March Excellence and creates two stand alone Coed Round Robins (note resolution below regarding Coed Round Robins changing to single-gender). Other changes noted below to the Championship Age Up Tournaments and Championship Age Division Tournaments will also promote the holding/sanctioning of more than divisions at a location.
  - Despite the overall increase in the number of high level tournaments on the calendar in 2014, making events concurrent with national tournaments, and the placement of certain tournaments on the calendar has resulted in a reduced opportunity for players aspiring to play national events the ability to prepare, gain confidence and rhythm in advance of these tournaments. To address this, the new calendar adds new Championship tournaments on the schedule that are not concurrent with national tournaments, and moves one of the Excellence tournaments to January.
-

- The Sectional Open Jamborees are eliminated. They have struggled to attract sanction applicants and fill draws. Additionally, the concept of bringing all Open Level players together multiple times a year is not consistent with the national push to decentralize, localize, and increase the number of Open and Challenger Level tournaments.
- To facilitate the creation of new Championship Tournaments, the age-up aspect of the selection process for the Championship Age Up Tournaments (48-draw, 4-5 day tournaments) is being eliminated because most events are not filling, a very small number of players are needing the benefit of selection from the next-younger age division to gain access to these, events, and the selection process takes significant amount of staff time. This included a review of events filled - only 7 of 24 age divisions filled since the beginning of 2014. The proposal also changes the draw format to single elimination. By still requiring doubles, the events guarantee at least two matches. This will result is less demand on court usage will better enable NorCal to sanction more age divisions in one location.
- The Championship Age Division Tournaments (3-day singles only tournaments) are proposed to be decreased in size from 40 players to 32 players because demand doesn't warrant the larger size and this will better enable organizers to plan for running these tournaments.

#### EXHIBIT A: 2016 USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Calendar

| Month | 2016 Dates and Tournament ( <i>National Tournaments Show in Italics</i> ) |   |
|-------|---|---|
| Jan   | 9, 16<br>23, 30   | Excellence Tournament (Doubles begins 2nd weekend - Jan 16 in 2016)<br>Championship Singles & Doubles Tournament (48)   |
| Feb   | 13<br>27  | Championship Singles-Only Tournament (32) [ <i>Concurrent with National Segment</i> ]<br>Coed Round Robin   |
| Mar   | 5<br>12, 19<br>26   | [ <i>USTA National Spring Team Championships</i> ]<br>Championship Singles & Doubles Tournament (48)<br>Super Series/Coed Round Robin   |
| Apr   | 2, 9<br>16, 23<br>30, 7   | Championship Singles & Doubles Tournament (48) [ <i>Overlaps with Easter Bowl</i> ]<br>Excellence Tournament<br>Championship Singles & Doubles Tournament (48)  |
| May   | 14<br>28  | Super Series/Coed Round Robin<br>Championship Singles Only (32) [ <i>Concurrent with National Segment</i> ]   |
| Jun   | 11, 18  | June Sectional Championships  |
| Jul   | 7<br>9<br>16<br>23<br>30  | <i>USTA Zone Team Championships</i><br><i>USTA Intersectional Team Championships</i><br>Coed Round Robin [ <i>Overlaps with USTA National Clay Court Championships</i> ]<br>Championship Singles & Doubles Tournament (48)<br><i>USTA National Warm Up Tournaments and USTA National Team Championships</i> |
| Aug   | 6<br>25<br>27, 3  | <i>The USTA National Championships (Hard Courts)</i><br><i>USTA National Doubles Championships</i><br>Excellence Tournament   |
| Sep   | 16<br>17<br>24, 1   | <i>National L2 at Stanford</i><br>Super Series/Coed Round Robin<br>Fall Singles Sectional Championships   |
| Oct   | 8<br>15, 22   | Championship Singles Only (32) [ <i>Concurrent with National Segment</i> ]<br>Excellence SG/DB  |

|            |                |  |
|------------|----------------|--|
| <b>Nov</b> | 12<br>19<br>26 | Doubles Sectional Championships<br>Super Series/Coed Round Robin<br><i>Thanksgiving National Segment</i>     |
| <b>Dec</b> | 3<br>27        | NorCal Masters & Championship Singles & Doubles Tournament (48)<br><i>USTA National Winter Championships</i> |

*Unless changes are made, the same calendar dates shall be used in future years.*

2/24/2015

JUNIOR  
COUNCIL

## **1. Fall Singles Sectional Championships 2015 Sanction Dates: Passed**

**RESOLVED:** That the sanction dates for the Fall Singles Championships in the BG14 and 12 divisions shall be changed to September 26-27 and October 3-4.

Rationale: In 2014 NorCal sanctioned the inaugural Fall Singles Sectional Championships and was also awarded by the national USTA Junior Competition Committee a National Level 2 at Stanford in the BG12/14 singles divisions, 16-player compass draw. When the national sanction happened, NorCal worked with the national Committee to make sure it didn't overlap with any NorCal tournaments that count for National ranking.

In 2015, NorCal sanctioned the Fall Singles Sectional Championships on the same calendar weekend - the 3rd weekend in September. NorCal learned in December that the L2 at Stanford was unintentionally sanctioned on overlapping dates because it is tied to the weekend following the completion of the US Open that floats based on the date on which Labor Day falls. This is a result of an adjustment that happens every several years of the calendar Monday of Labor Day and has resulted the L2 overlapping with the first weekend of Sectionals.

By the time the overlap was recognized, the L2 at Stanford had already begun significant negotiations for courts and hotels. It should be noted that the L2 at Stanford has been expanded to include the BG16/18 divisions, with 16 players in each event selected off of the National Standings Lists. In 2014, the lowest ranked player selected was G14 #52 and 10 total NorCal players competed. The NorCal BG12 and 14 Sectionals are able to move back one week (Sept 26-27, Oct 3-4), but the BG18 and 16 are not.

To address this conflict the best it could, Junior Council is proposing to move the BG14 and 12 divisions to the following weekends.

## **2. Guaranteeing Three Matches at the Doubles Sectional Championships: Passed**

**RESOLVED:** That effective immediately, USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Rule 11.J.v.a. be amended as follows (underlined language is new):

### **11.Junior Tournament Descriptions**

---

## **J. Sectional Championships**

### **v. Doubles-Only Sectional Championships.**

- a. Draw Size and Format.** The draw size shall be limited to 32 teams. A compass draw shall be played with a playoff for 3rd and 4th place. The draw format shall guarantee each team three matches:
- Non-main draw compass draw brackets with teams that have won their third match shall be played out to completion.
  - Once a team has lost three matches, it shall not play an additional match unless playing that additional match guarantees another team its minimum three matches.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to clarify the requirement for guaranteeing three matches at the Doubles-Only Sectional Championships.

In 2014 NorCal sanctioned the inaugural Doubles Sectional Championships, a 32-team compass draw with a playoff for 3rd and 4th place. When approving this format, Junior Council also stipulated that the tournament guarantee three matches for each team; however implementation was confusing due to two factors:

- Administratively, when the Junior Tournament Rules were updated to reflect the new 2014 tournament structure, the three-match guarantee was mistakenly omitted.
- There was no clarification as to what the three-match minimum required of the tournaments, especially when the draws were not full, which they were not in 2014.

The original intent of the three-match guarantee was, when draws were full, not to require the tournament to create compass brackets for teams that had already lost 3 matches.

## **3. Breaking Selection, Flighting and Seeding Ties at Super Series: Passed**

**RESOLVED:** That effective immediately, USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Rule 11.H.iii. and vi. be amended and new subparagraph vii. be added as follows (underlined language is new):

### **11. Junior Tournament Descriptions**

**H. Super Series.** Super Series Tournaments are ratings-based singles tournaments for advanced players offered in the 18 and 14 divisions. Players with similar ability are grouped into 8-player compass draws. Players that typically enter the 12 division should play the 14 division. Players that typically enter the 16 division should play the 16 division. Tournaments shall take place over a 2-day sanction period. All events use a yellow ball on a 78' court and a player's racquet may not exceed 29" in length.

**iii. Selection.** Players shall be selected based on the most recently available Universal Tennis Ratings as follows:

- a. 18 Divisions.** The top 32 rated boys and top 32
-

---

rated girls with timely entries, regardless of age, are selected for the boys' and girls' 18 division events.

- b. 14 Divisions.** The top 32 rated boys and top 32 rated girls with timely entries that meet the age eligibility requirements for a 14-and-under division tournament, shall be selected for the boys' and girls' 14 Division events. If a player has entered and been selected for the 18 Division, they must play the higher division. (See Concurrent Tournament Rule 6.B.iii. for entering two divisions).

In the event two or more players have the same rating, the tie shall be broken as set forth in Rule 11.H.vii. below.

- vi. Fighting and Seeding.** Players shall be flighted into 8-player compass draws using the most recently available Universal Tennis Ratings so that players with similar ratings are in each compass draw. These ratings shall also be used to seed the draws. In the event two or more players have the same rating, the tie shall be broken as set forth in Rule 11.H.vii. below.

**vii. Breaking Selection, Fighting, and Seeding Ties.** In the event two or more players have the same rating, a tie shall be broken based on the players' highest rankings on the most recently published Combined Sectional Final Ranking Lists as follows:

- a. 18 Divisions.** The players' highest rank on the 18 Division list shall be used. If both players do not appear on the 18 Division list, the 16 Division list will be used. If both players do not appear on the 16 Division list, the 14 Division list will be used. If both players do not appear on the 14 Division list, the 12 Division list will be used.

- b. 14 Divisions.** The players' highest rank on the 14 Division list shall be used. If both players do not appear on the 14 Division list, the 12 Division list will be used.

Rationale: When NorCal adopted the selection, fighting, and seeding procedures for Super Series, it did not also adopt a method of breaking ties when two or more players had the same UTR. Up until the February 2015 Super Series selection, this has not been a problem. This event, however, had two players with the same UTRs at the cutoff for selection. Absent a regulation, the criteria for breaking ties at the Excellence Tournaments was used because the two players were both ranked in the 18s division. This proposal creates a tie-breaking procedure for the future.

#### **4. Officials for Junior Grand Prix Invitational and USTA NorCal Masters: Passed**

**RESOLVED:** That effective immediately, USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Rules 11.K.vi. be amended to increase the entry fee for the USTA NorCal Masters from \$30 to \$35 and the amount budgeted for officials be increased from \$250 to \$1,025,

---

---

representing a net increase of \$455 for the event budget.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the entry fee for the Grand Prix Invitational be increased from \$30 to \$35 and the amount budgeted for officials be increased from \$500 to \$1,025, representing a net increase of \$205 for the event budget.

Rationale: The original budgets for the Grand Prix Invitational and the Year End Masters did not allocate adequate funds to fully staff the tournaments with officials. Junior Council, upon the recommendation of staff, is requesting the official's budget be increased and that this cost be partially offset by an increase in the entry fee by \$5 per player. The total proposed junior budget increase is \$660, representing a \$455 increase to the Masters budget and a \$205 increase to the Grand Prix Invitational budget

---