

2/18/04

USTA NorCal Board of Directors Meeting
February 18, 2004-as corrected March 17, 2004
Club Sport Fremont

Board Members Present: President Paul Kepler, Betty Cookson, Terry Cossette, Dwight Johnson, Rick Kepler, Linda Peltz, Bill Schoen, Bill Simons, Shar'ron Smith, Dave Sperry, Fred Tierney, Alvin Hom, Jean Hassoun, Philip Stromer, Brian Cory, and Margie Peterman.

Past Presidents Present: John Frank, Kim Fuller, Don Jacobus, Mark Manning and Gary Lee.

Parliamentarian Present: Rosie Bareis

Staff Present: Executive Director Bruce Hunt, Bob Manalo, Sarah Robinson and Mike Friedman,

Guests Present: Carrie Bell, Bill Hansen, Robert Young, Dennis Kanemitsu and Sandi Kaney

Meeting: The regular meeting of the USTA Northern California Board of Directors was called to order by President Paul Kepler at 6:35 p.m. The guests and staff were introduced.

Public Comments:

1. Carrie Bell spoke against the input of social match scores into TPI.
2. Robert Young stated that Walnut Creek Racquet Club will not input any scores into TPI because no one has stepped forward to be administrator. He stated that there is talk within his organization to start their own league.

Minutes: The minutes of the last meeting were approved as amended. The amendment is to remove the last line of the minutes: "Penalty: If player does not input all scores – they cannot play league."

The Board was reminded that all Executive Sessions are not to be aired to the public and as such are not printed for the public's eyes. The Executive Session minutes of the last meeting were inadvertently included in the Board minutes.

Board went into Executive Session at this point. See attached
Board resumed the regular meeting at 7:15 pm.

Executive Committee Activities: To extend the date through the end of February for the use of TMS if a tournament director has problems with TDM. Bruce to use his discretion on any further extensions of using TMS. The Board will review the use of TDM at the March Board Meeting.

President's Report:

1. The Community Development Workshop held in Las Vegas was a dynamite conference. Well worth attending for all who went.
2. Bruce and Paul are working on a presentation to nationals asking for a waiver for TPI for the leagues.

Executive Director's Report:

1. Bruce passed a kit around that all Tennis Welcome Centers would be receiving.
2. Siebel Open was a smashing success. Karen Hirtzel sold more than 170 new memberships (only 20 last year) and over \$3,900 in the fast serve booth (\$3,000 last year)
3. Passed out USTA Membership data by Sections and noted that NorCal is #5 on the list of members.
4. Board Member Manual passed out to each Board member.
5. Explained about the 2004 Section Funding with ½ of the fund slated to be received in January and the other ½ in May. The US Open bonus of \$28,541 will come to us in March and is not tied to any specific use. Participation funding is already included in our budget and that Team Tennis fund and certain grants are restricted in their use.
6. 12-page inserts into magazines (\$300,000 worth) re TWC will be done in April, May, June, and July in key market areas of S.F –Oakland and San Jose. There is an additional \$40,000 for use in other areas.

Question asked – How were key markets selected? Answer – probably ad agencies. Bill Simon – Is this

fair? Board reminded that NorCal controls only about \$65,000 of key market \$. Paul will follow through with nationals on how specific magazines were selected.

Treasurer's Report:

1. All 2003 expenses have been booked and only the auditor's report is needed to close the 2003 books.
2. Monthly budget going forward should reflect a better forecast as specific seasonal expenses have been placed in those months.
3. Reminded all committees to check if the \$ that they spend are new \$ or have already been committed in the budget.

New Action Item: Paul presented a New Action on the Agenda to be discussed before all the other Action Items. New Action Item was for the ALC to make a TPI presentation to the Board.

Motion made to change the Agenda passed 14 for vs 4 against.

Alvin Hom, ALC Chair, deferred to staff to make the presentation of the TPI Pilot Program. Bob Manalo and Mike Friedman made the presentation:

1. Lots of time and \$ have already been spent on TPI
2. The Pilot is only for the Combo League
3. The Program is to give organizations a tool to handle self-rated players
4. The Committee understands the issues but want players to understand that it is a pilot program.

Discussion:

Don't fight what the players are saying. Don't put in social matches. Why start the program in a mandatory fashion, approach from the opposite side. (90% of players will not input data in an Honor System) More data will give better ratings for those who have played little or no league matches. System administrators will be inputting data so there is less possibility of false data. What part does practice matches play in player's overall experience? What does the staff feel about those organizations that don't want to participate? What happens to those players whose organizations opt out but the player wants to play? TPI is not valid for Nationals and is only for Combo League. How can we force the input of scores?

Kim Fuller answered many of the questions with the following:

1. The system failed during the original test with only voluntary input.
2. The system failed again the second time it was tested with voluntary input
3. The system worked with mandatory input of all players
4. In the first test – social matches were not included.
5. The players asked for the input of social matches.
6. The players asked for additional categories on matches
7. Many players still don't like to input scores but all agree the system is accurate.

Motion to go ahead with the implementation program that:

1. All league players will be in the system
2. All non-league players may opt out of the system
3. All Combo league players must enter ALL their scores
4. Any further changes to the implementation plan approved at the October 2003 Board Meeting will mean that USTA NorCal will bear the total hard and soft costs not to exceed \$80,000.
5. Kim's technical team will implement the system for \$40,000.
6. Vote to approve 15 for vs 4 against. Kim Fuller abstained.

Note: Operations Committee to check with nationals regarding the visibility of NTRP ratings.

Note: Whenever the minutes refer to TPI, they are referring to the Pilot Program only. Since most of the

Action Item pertained to TPI, in many cases they had already been discussed.

Action Item B – no further discussion than what had already taken place under the TPI presentation.

Action Item C – Motion to reconsider 4 for vs 10 against 2 abstentions

Action Item D - withdrawn

Action Item E - not discussed

Action Item F – Referred back to committee for further discussion.
TPI Tech team cannot get system ready by July.

Action Item G – No specific action taken. It was explained that the 30 match protection encourages posting of scores. The weighted order of matches from least to greatest are:

1. Practice/Social
2. Competitive Daily
3. Challenge
4. Non-USTA League
5. Non-USTA Tournament
6. USTA League
7. USTA Tournaments

Meeting Adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectively submitted by Margie Peterman

BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, Feb. 18, 2004

ClubSport Fremont
46650 Landing Parkway
Fremont, CA 94538

Directions: Driving South on 880, take the Mission Blvd/Warren Ave Exit.
Continue on W. Warren and turn right on Landing Pkwy.
Driving North on 880, take the Gateway Blvd Exit. Continue on Gateway Blvd
and turn right on Bayside Pkwy. Bayside turns into Landing Pkwy.

- I. Food and Refreshments—6 PM
- II. Call to Order—6:30 PM
- III. Introductions
- IV. Public Comments-10 minutes, 2 minutes per speaker
- V. Approval of Minutes
- VI. Action Item A-Inside Tennis (Blue) Kurt Kamperman on call
- VII. Executive Committee Activities
- VIII. President's Report
- IX. Executive Director's Report
- X. Treasurer's Report
 - A. Variance Report (Green)
 - B. Monthly Grants (Red)
 - C. Budget Requests (Purple)
- XI. Committee Decisions/Meeting Schedule (Yellow)
 - A. Community Tennis
- XII. Special Meeting (Change of Date)
- XIII. Action Items (Blue)
 - 1 Requirement of Belonging to a USTA Member Organization
 - 2 10-Match Requirement for Qualifying for Leagues
 - 3 Set Aside ALC Decision about Protecting Players with 30 Matches
 - 4 Requirement for Mandatory non-USTA Matches Recording
 - 5 Combo Season Start Date

6 Fiscal Impact of Making Changes to TPI Implementation

XIV. Old Business

XV. New Business

XVI. Adjournment of Meeting

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 17, 2004 at ClubSport Fremont.

Action Items

February 2004 A

Presenter(s): Mark Manning, Tony Silveria, Brian Cory

Statement of Action Item: To create the opportunity for the Board to amend the previously adopted January resolution regarding Inside Tennis.

Rationale for Action: The presenters of the action item do not feel the current resolution should be changed but they want every Board member to have the opportunity to amend the previously adopted resolution if they desire.

Fiscal Impact: Dependent upon the actions of the Board.

Staff Comments: The advertising that USTA White Plains places with Inside Tennis on their own is like any other organization or individual that advertises with Inside Tennis. That would be a separate business arrangement of no bearing on the agreement between USTA NorCal and Inside Tennis. The only advertising that is part of the resolution is the matching \$5,000 from the USTA that will be combined with the \$5,000 from USTA NorCal. I recommend that the January resolution about Inside Tennis and USTA NorCal should stand as passed.—Bruce A. Hunt, Executive Director

February 2004 B

Presenter(s):

Philip Stromer, Jean Hassoun, Betty Cookson

Statement of Action Item:

Change the current TPI mandatory requirement for player participating in TPI to record all their practice matches to be eligible to play in the NorCal Sectional Leagues, to the following:

It is strongly recommended to all players participating in the NorCal Sectional Leagues to record all or most of their non-USTA matches into TPI for optimizing the computation of their actual ratings.

New players (without a computer rating) entering the leagues shall be required to record 10 practice matches before being qualified to participate in the leagues. Players with a current computer rating are exempt from that requirement and will enter the new system with their rating.

Rationale for Action:

This change has three main justifications:

1. It would support a softer player-friendly NorCal policy in its TPI introduction and get acceptance on the product values, and not from a mandatory rule which is already alienating many in NorCal and could cause an important drop out from participation in the NorCal Sectional Leagues, and potentially in all leagues if TPI is used for all leagues in '05. That risk could cause catastrophically damaging financial consequences in NorCal by minimizing league revenues.
2. It has not been proven that TPI would not work if non-USTA matches were not recorded. There hasn't been, perhaps except at LVTC, any piloting of DCTR in any way which could provide data for what could work for NorCal. Some claims were made of documents "proving" that only a mandatory recording would work, but not only no one was allowed to verify those claims, but just the concept that a local club environment (for which that program was designed) could be expanded to cover a while USTA section makes no sense. If TPI cannot function just as well as DNTRP, and better for new players (self-rated, with a requirement of entering 10 matches before qualifying for the leagues), that project should be stopped now as poorly designed. NorCal should not define a policy to satisfy a poorly designed program, but should have a program designed to satisfy a market need. It should be assumed that voluntary practice match recording will improve the quality of the computed ratings.
3. As there is no safeguard to control the reality of those practice matches, it's an easy avenue for

cheaters to enter dummy matches to protect low ratings.

Until such safeguards are defined and implemented, NorCal is imposing a burden on the players (for some unacceptable) without providing any protection against those cheaters.

TPI, as it stands, provides a much easier environment for cheaters to manage their ratings and to avoid being caught. While some could point out weaknesses in DNTRP (i.e. handling of mixed leagues), its process of hiding the actual dynamic rating allows the 3-strikes system to handle people going out of levels.

The TPI value of providing a better way to handle new players (self rated in DNTRP) is very secondary to its terrible weakness of being cheater friendly.

Fiscal Impact:

Not supporting the motion could have very damaging financial problems in NorCal if league revenues are lower than in current years. (Presenters)

If the implementation process is changed now, the current technical support staff may withdraw from the project and pay the \$30,000 committed to the project. This could require the hiring of additional staff, 1 – 2 full-time positions, to finish the project. The estimated cost would be \$40 – 100,000.

Staff Comments: Voluntary reporting of match scores may cause the project to fail.

February B 1

About the TPI Requirement for Mandatory non-USTA matches Recording

Sponsored by: Philip Stromer, Jean Hassoun, Betty Cookson

Statement of Action Item:

Change: the current TPI mandatory requirement for players participating in TPI to record all their practice matches to be eligible to play in the NorCal Sectional Leagues.

Motion: The recording of all non-USTA matches is optional.

It is strongly recommended to all players participating in the NorCal Leagues to record all or most of their non-USTA matches into TPI for optimizing the computation of their actual ratings.

Before the start of the mixed and senior seasons, this issue will be revisited and based on actual match recording history, and the analysis of the data then recorded in TPI, the requirement could be changed to mandatory for some or all non-USTA matches in any coming league.

A recommendation (Andrea Norman) would be that if more match recording is critical, we could first make mandatory the recording of all official club activities (club tournaments, non-USTA leagues), and only in a later phase organized tennis as Interclub and ladders matches. Fun matches would be considered last.

Rationale for Action:

This change has three main justifications:

1. It would support a softer player-friendly NorCal policy in its TPI introduction and get acceptance on the product values, rather than from a mandatory rule which is already alienating many in NorCal and could cause an important drop out from participation in the NorCal Sectional Leagues, and potentially in all leagues if TPI is used for all leagues in '05. That risk could cause catastrophically damaging financial consequences in NorCal by minimizing league revenues.
2. It has not been proven that TPI would not work if non-USTA matches were not recorded. If TPI cannot function just as well as DNTRP, and better for new players (self-rated, with a requirement of entering 10 matches before qualifying for the leagues), that project should be stopped now as poorly designed. NorCal should not define a policy to satisfy a poorly designed program, but should have a program designed to satisfy a market need.
3. As there is no safeguard to control the reality of those practice matches, it's an easy avenue for cheaters to enter dummy matches to protect low ratings. NorCal must design and provide such safeguards. Otherwise, TPI has the potential to increase, rather than decrease the problem of people playing out of level.

Current requirement is not enforceable:

There is no practical way to enforce this rule.

A strategy to get a buy in is likely going to be much easier to introduce.

Risk for a TPI failure if we adopt that proposal? *** None!!! ***

Worst case scenario: we don't get enough information and the leagues would run just like they do today, with a rating computing just based on USTA matches, but now dynamically visible, so some players will cross the thresholds and get penalized.

The mixed and seniors seasons would then be under mandatory recording.

Risk for a Downturn in League Registration? *** Yes!!! ***

The current reaction is quite strong against mandatory practice match recording.

An initial approach would allow people to see the TPI benefits and to get used to it.

I would expect many of the opposing people to be willing to give TPI a chance

Fiscal Impact:

None from the proposal.

Yes for leaving things as they are:

1. Losing league players will hurt the \$750k league revenue critical to NorCal.
We were told that we could lose (and were willing to lose) 20 to 30% of the current league players. This would represent \$150k to \$225k of lost revenue.
There is no planned revenue for the non-league players registered in TPI.
NorCal should not knowingly cut its revenues without identifying a new replacement source.
2. The potential creation or expansion of alternative leagues could badly hurt the leagues programs and its revenues.

February B 2

About the TPI Requirement for a 10 match recorded history before qualifying for the Leagues

Sponsored by: Jean Hassoun, Philip Stromer & Betty Cookson

Statement of Action Item:

Change: the current TPI requirement to qualify for league play by first recording 10 matches prior to being allowed to play in the USTA NorCal Leagues.

Motion: Players with a USTA computer rating will be able to qualify for league play by registering in TPI with their DNTRP rating, without having to record any non-USTA matches.

Note 1: New league players (currently called "self-rated" players), without a computer rating, will still be required to record 10 matches before qualifying for league play.

Where: "league" is referring to any league controlled by TPI (for now the sectional leagues and later on all leagues if the waiver requested to USTA National is granted).

Rationale for Action:

The large majority of the current league players have a computer rating which fairly represents their current level of play.

There is no reason to cause aggravation to these players pre-qualified by the existing USTA rating system. The top priority for NorCal is to get a maximum number of players in TPI to quickly reach critical mass, so most non-USTA matches could be recorded (all players in each match need to be in the system, or the match cannot be recorded on TPI).

This will go a long way in preserving the spontaneity of how teams get formed (last minutes, calling friends and inviting them, and ease of jumping in and registering to a team).

For new players, to minimize problems similar to what happened in the DNTRP system with self-rating, the 10 match recorded history will still be required

This issue is one of the top issues raised by current league players.

Risk for a TPI failure if we adopt that proposal? *** None!!! ***

First a set of 10 practice matches is not likely to affect a computer rating based on USTA matches (they count for much more versus non-USTA matches in the rating computing).

Fiscal Impact:

None from the proposal: Making it easy to register for computer rated players is a clear component of avoiding losing players as TPI gets introduced.

Yes for leaving things as they are: Losing league players will hurt the \$725k league revenue critical to NorCal.

We were told that we could lose (and were willing to lose) 20 to 30% of the current league players. This would represent perhaps \$145k to \$217k of lost revenue.

Are we really willing to lose that much critical revenue when a simple and fair accommodation could help

prevent it?

Staff Comments:

February C

About the TPI Requirement of belonging to a USTA Member Organization to Play in the Leagues

Sponsored by: Jean Hassoun, Philip Stromer & Betty Cookson

Statement of Action Item:

Change: the current TPI requirement is such that to be able to register in TPI and then qualify to for league play, a player needs to belong to USTA member organization (an organization with USTA paid dues).

Motion Part 1: Only USTA member organizations (with their USTA dues) will receive the benefit of TPI as a registration system (copy of TPI on a computer, automated player registration process after qualification).

Motion Part 2: Players will be able to register in TPI on the web without being associated with an organization.

Rational for Action:

Until today, a team could be formed anywhere, with the only requirement of having access to courts. Players had to be USTA members and paid their league registration fees.

With TPI, they are now denied that right, and are now required to either belonging to a member organization or to create one for the sole purpose to be allowed to play in the leagues.

This would especially hurt and exclude teams based on public courts and low income players.

Also, many organizations were identified as proper sites for league play, but were not required to pay USTA dues. With TPI, they would no longer be allowed to field teams in the USTA leagues.

Many of those organizations are not current in their USTA dues.

Instead, what is proposed here is to identify TPI as a benefit much worth the small cost of the USTA membership for the organization.

Still, organizations could operate just as they did in the past, or could elect to become a USTA organization and take full advantage of access to TPI in their clubs.

Important: The current TPI setup would be very damaging to NorCal (even potential legal issues) as it excludes many of our public park players.

Risk for a TPI failure if we adopt that proposal? *** None!!! ***

None. In fact this would facilitate the registration in TPI and accelerate the process in getting a critical mass of players in TPI.

Fiscal Impact:

Almost none from the proposal: The actual revenue for USTA from the organizations is tiny versus either the player membership revenue or the league registration.

Yes for leaving things as they are: Losing league players will hurt the \$725k league revenue critical to NorCal.

We were told that we could lose (and were willing to lose) 20 to 30% of the current league players. This would represent perhaps \$145k to \$217k of lost revenue.

Are we really willing to lose that much critical revenue when a simple and fair accommodation could help prevent it?

Staff Comments:

February 2004 D

Presenter(s): Dwight Johnson, Dave Sperry, and Fred Tierney

Statement of Action Item: Review of fiscal impact of passing Action Item C at January 2004 board meeting.

Rationale for Action: Due to time constraints we believe the additional funds to implement TPI were not properly addressed at the board meeting.

Fiscal Impact: According to Action Item C: an additional \$16-76,000. Further discussions lead us to

believe that \$174,000 will be needed.

Staff Comments:

Realignment of Lower Peninsula and South Bay League Areas

February 2004 E

Presenters: Jean Hassoun, Andrea Norman & Philip Stromer

Statement of Action Item:

Realign the Lower Peninsula and South Bay League Areas in a way that:

1. Generally splits the geographic area encompassing both League Areas horizontally
2. Places the Mango USTA Member Organization in the Lower Peninsula (LP) League Area
3. Places the Sunnyvale Tennis Center USTA Member Organization in the South Bay (SB) League Area

Mandate for Sunnyvale Tennis Center: Sunnyvale Tennis Center agrees to move some of its teams so that they are registered under the Mango USTA Member Organization.

Rationale for Action:

Sunnyvale Tennis Center has experienced massive growth in the number of teams it is able to field for league play in the wake of the league rules allowing players to compete on multiple teams. The experience of Sunnyvale illustrates the enthusiasm with which many of our Section's members commit themselves to USTA Leagues in NorCal - an enthusiasm that should be nurtured and replicated throughout the Section.

The explosion of team registrations at Sunnyvale has had some negative impact on the SB League Area that the presenters believe will be solved by the proposal:

- Diversity of Club Representation in League Areas. One of the benefits of playing on a USTA League Team is the ability to play in a number of different club environments throughout the season. The current alignment of the SB and LP League Areas has resulted in approximately twice as many USTA Member Organizations fielding USTA League Teams in the LP League Area than in the SB League Area.

Currently teams registered for the 2004 Adult League Season in the SB League Area come from 6 USTA Member Organizations, one of which is Sunnyvale Tennis Club and one of which is Mango Park, a facility that fields teams associated with Sunnyvale Tennis Club. In comparison, currently teams registered for the 2004 Adult League Season in the LP League Area come from 13 USTA Member Organizations.

To illustrate the lack of diversity on competition at various NTRP levels, in 2003, the 3.5 Women's League had two flights of 9 teams. There were 4 Sunnyvale teams in each flight. Every non-Sunnyvale team played Sunnyvale in 1/2 of their matches. Another example would be the 2003 8.5 Combo Women's League that had 4 teams, 3 of which were Sunnyvale. The round robin format had each team play the other teams three times. The one non-Sunnyvale team played all 9 matches against Sunnyvale. In contrast, the LP 8.5 Women's Combo League had 6 teams, only 2 of which were from the same organization.

Members from several organizations in the SB League Area (San Jose Swim & Racquet, Silver Creek and Almaden Swim & Racquet Club) have expressed their dissatisfaction with the lack of diversity. Additionally, the AVAC member-run tennis committee has unanimously agreed that more equitable distribution of organizations was necessary. The presenters believe that improved club representation in the League Areas would be created for realignment.

- Minimizes Driving Times to Matches. The current League Area boundaries do not optimize travel times to matches. The boundary is generally divided along north-south along Highway 17/Interstate 880. Some organizations that are only a 5-minute drive from each other are in separate League Areas. For example Almaden Valley Athletic Club and Almaden Swim & Racquet Club are in a separate League Area from Los Gatos Swim & Racquet Club, JCC and Courtside. The same is true for Decathlon and Sunnyvale Tennis Club. Redrawing the boundaries east-west would better optimize driving times between organizations.

- Supports League Growth. Much of the growth in the number of teams fielded at Sunnyvale has been from players who belong to clubs that have limits on the number of teams they can field. These limits relate to both to the number of courts at a facility and the number of courts a facility reserves for lessons and non-league play. Sunnyvale believes it has the capacity to field a significant number of additional teams. This continued growth will further impact the diversity of the SB League Area and the number of matches a non-Sunnyvale team plays against one organization.

Providing for means for Sunnyvale to continue to file additional teams will facilitate the growth of league competition in the geographic areas that make up the LP and SB League Areas.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Staff Comments:

February 2004 F

When should the Combo Season be in the NorCal Calendar?

Sponsored by: Jean Hassoun, Philip Stromer & Rick Kepler

Proposal: Bring the Combo season early in the year by a few weeks to minimize the court problems linked to the TWELVE weeks overlap between the Combo and the Mixed and Seniors Seasons, causing an AVOIDABLE DRAIN on club court resources.

Why do we need to free up court resources? Court resources are of course a key element in supporting tennis growth, being the leagues themselves, and/or the junior tournaments and/or for other adult activities.

While I am not qualified to express here the benefits for the junior tournaments, I would like to state here that non-league activities like Team Tennis should provide tennis activities with a social focus, and the goal would be to provide year around programs, so the core element of this proposal is to try to flatten the court requirements throughout the year, with of course the same preferential access for the March to November time frame.

About the Combo League: Over the past two years, the Combo league came out as a clear success and is the fastest growing league in NorCal. It should be positioned in a time frame allowing it to grow without having to distract players from the other leagues, and to take advantage as good weather as much as possible.

The Issues:

1. For the organizations: court use is not optimized for the leagues as the current setup creates a high volume of matches two and half months starting on 9/15, right before and during the rainy season. The NorCal Combos Sectionals were rained out in 2003!!!
2. While planning for new programs like Team Tennis, we found that the target players are mostly not league players, and just like the league players, they want on-going, year around programs.
3. The combo season is a natural continuation of the Adult leagues, and mostly, we see the same players participating in both leagues.
The best time to start is soon after that season.
4. The long overlap is hurting the Mixed and Senior Seasons.
5. An existing problem that should be addressed now: the league calendar tries to account for players (a small minority for obvious reasons) going to Districts and Sectionals. Instead of delaying the next leagues, a better solution would be to have a rule allowing a match to be rescheduled when there is such a championship in another league (Today, the rules don't consider this as an acceptable reason).
6. The end of June and the early July are a very busy time for the League Department. There is likely going to be a need for some extra staff during that period.

About the 2003 League Matches History (See next pages):

1. The first page represents the actual 2003 year, while the next two represent that same year, but with the combo season moved to either 6/16 or 6/30.
2. The 2004 and 2003 Leagues Calendar are very similar (when each league starts and ends, so decisions for 2004 can be safely be made based on 2003 data (Source Bob Manalo).
3. We can ignore the Combo matches early in the year, as they only represent the end of the 2002

season which started late.

4. We can mostly ignore the Super-Senior matches which are in large part played during weekday in daytime. The last column named 'Practical Total' shows the match totals at prime times, without the super senior matches.

Comments on Bruce Hunt's email to the NorCal Board rejecting this proposal. That email groups comments from Alvin Hom and staff:

1. (From Alvin) The ALC considered and rejected that proposal as not having any merit, without looking at the actual seasons as presented here. This a clear additional demonstration that looking at issues in closed ALC meetings does not work: once again, the issue is decided without a dialog with the presenter. I would hope that an open meeting would have allowed a reasonable dialog and a better decision.
2. Whatever the intention was at the creation of the Combos leagues, the Combo league is very competitive, very much in the Adult league spirit. The extra fun comes because players are only playing ½ levels up or down. This is not a social league!!!
3. Many of the Combo players also play in the mixed/seniors. In 2003, the mixed/senior leagues did not grow as expected due to the overlap.
4. The argument of a potential conflict with the 50 mixed doesn't hold water as the 50 mixed and the combos address different market segments.
5. The analysis about "how to ease the pressure facilities faced dealing with court Availability" should be reconsidered with the data provided here, which was extracted by Michael Friedman from the NorCal leagues database.
6. The overlap diagram, as shown in the staff document should just be replaced by the tables included here and would support a different recommendation.

*** Recommendation: Start the Combo Season to 6/27! ***

A Big Thank You: The data presented here was collected by Michael Friedman with help from Bruce Hunt and Bob Manalo. Much appreciated.

February 2004 G

Presenters: Philip Stromer, Jean Hassoun, Fred Tierney

Statement of Action Item:

To set aside the 12/17/03 Adult League Committee (ALC) decision protecting players with 30 TPI matches from rating complaints, while still allowing the NorCal office to file such complaints.

Rationale for Action:

The opposing captain, as the eyewitness to the allegedly out of level player, should be the one to file such a complaint, but not by anonymously hiding behind the office. The office is not an eyewitness and would need the captain's testimony anyway, so there is no compelling reason to disallow the captain from filing a rating complaint.

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Staff Comments: