

5/18/2005

USTA Northern California Board of Directors
Minutes of Meeting of May 18, 2005
ClubSport Fremont

Attendees: Dave Sperry, Andrea Norman, Sandi Kaney, Fred Tierney, Terry Cossette, Don Jacobus, John Frank, Dale Evans, Dwight Johnson, Bruce Hunt, Margie Peterman, Bill Schoen, Rosie Bareis, Betty Cookson, Gary Lee, Bill Hansen, Deb Peterson, Jean Hassoun, Paul Kepler, Mark Manning, Lisbeth Blum, Phillip Stromer (board members); Bruce Hunt (executive director); and Pam Sloan, John Dicconson, Bob Manalo, Jim Coyne, Suzy Cossette, Summer Verhoeven, Francisco Ruiz, Jason Scalse, Valena Williams Jr., Akiel Lyons, Daryl Smith and Darel Smith.(guests).

Meeting was called to order by President Dwight Johnson.

Mark Manning and Akiel Lyons made a presentation to Rosie Bareis for her contributions and support at the MPC clinic, which took place in April.

Moved and seconded to approve the minutes as corrected. Changes were noted in the previous minutes.

Terry Cossette gave the financial report as Treasurer Jack Drimmer was not in attendance.

Andrea Norman moved to approve setting aside a budget amount to pay for luggage tags for juniors. Seconded by Sandi Kaney. Motion passed. The budget amount was initially approved by the Budget Committee.

Action Item A. Mark Manning presented.

Statement of Action Item:

#1. All monies classified as “diversity” such as donations, grants, etc., allocated to the NorCal budget, including funding from USTA National and/or non-USTA sources, are to be distributed to the “multicultural participation” budget unless specifically restricted to one of the following categories: culture, ethnicity, gender, beliefs, social economic status, sexual orientation, family status, physical ability, appearance and ideas.

#2. We propose that a separate and distinct budget classification of “diversity” be created to address initiatives regarding culture, ethnicity, gender, beliefs, social economic status, sexual orientation, family status, physical ability, appearance and ideas.

Moved by Mark Manning, seconded by John Frank to approve motion. Vote 13 – 1.

Action Item B. Bruce Hunt proposed that we continue to look for space to purchase a permanent facility to house the staff, with a meeting room for committee and board meetings. The facility would include tennis courts or be adjacent to a tennis facility.

His action item stated, “To determine if USTA NorCal should seek a permanent location for our section office that would allow the section to build equity through ownership or should we continue to lease our office space. Our current lease expires 2/28/2007.” Margie Paterman moved, Rosie Bareis seconded.

Motion to amend by Dave Sperry that “USTA NorCal should seek a permanent location for our section office that would allow the section to build equity through ownership.” Sandy Kaney seconded.

President Dwight Johnson will appoint a committee to study the feasibility of implementing this motion. He confirmed that Margie Peterman is chair of the location search committee.

Question called by Don Jacobus. Question called.

Motion passed 17-0.

Action Item C.

Paul Kepler presented, moved and Rosie Bareis seconded, “To require as part of the ED’s annual presentation to the Board regarding action steps he/she will take to promote and develop the growth of tennis, the ED will identify the three most important actions he/she intends to take. These actions need to be quantifiable and measurable in terms of their impact on tennis participation in the Northern California

section; and accountability standards need to be established for each action step.”

Moved to table by Andrea Norman and seconded by Patrick King. 11-9 to table.

Action Item D.

Phil Stromer presented a “challenge to the April 2005 Adult League Committee (ALC) decision giving the right of the Sectional League Coordinator (SLC) the right to interpret the Local League Area Rules (LLAR).” (rescind action of ALC) . Seconded by Jean Hassoun.

Question called by Dave Sperry. 12 – 8.

Vote 8 for rescission of ALC decision-10 against. Motion fails

Action Item E. Rescinding Junior Council decisions #4, #5, and #6 and establish an evaluation system for all junior tournaments.

Motion to bifurcate the four items in the action item into four separate action items.

Vote 13 –1.

First discussed Action Item E was the evaluation.

Paul Kepler moved, seconded by Brian Cory that,

Norcal shall establish an evaluation system for all junior tournaments that rates tournaments on a five-point scale, provides specific, objective consequences based on a tournament’s rating, and allows for a probation period of one year (or the tournament site’s next tournament, whichever period of time is less) except for an egregious violation of Junior Council sanction rules, so long as a written list of such egregious violations are available in advance to all tournaments.

Brian Cory moved to Table and Fred Tierney seconded. 17 – 1. Motion passes.

Action Item E 4. Mileage and Concurrent Tournaments (Sanction Rule #18.b.ii.)

Motion to rescind the Junior Council decision set out as follows:

ii. Challenger Tournaments. There are no mileage restrictions for sanctioning concurrent Challenger Tournaments.

Moved by Paul Kepler and seconded by Brian Cory.

Amended by Rosie Bareis, seconded by Jean Hassoun to change the mileage to 25 miles.

7 for, 9 against. Amendment failed.

Fred Tierney called the question 16-0.

Motion failed 4-12 (Junior Council decision stands).

Motion to rescind the Junior Council decision that “there be no mileage restrictions for sanctioning concurrent Open Tournaments.”

Moved by Paul Kepler, seconded by Brian Cory.

Motion failed 7 –11.

Motion to rescind the Junior Council decision that “only tournaments that have been found to be in compliance with all USTA Nor Cal Tournament Sanction Rules and the applicable Adult Tournament Rules or Junior Tournament Rules shall be eligible to tournament Sanction Priority.”

Moved by Paul Kepler and seconded by Brian Cory.

Question called 11 for 1.

4 for, 12 against. Motion fails.

Action Item F.

Motion to “establish a combined junior player ranking (weighted 100% singles and 25% doubles) as the only ranking to be used by NorCal for endorsement, seeding, and entry into limited draw tournaments for all sectional juniors.”

Motion by Paul Kepler, seconded by Brian Cory.

Brian Cory moved to amend to send back to Junior Council to consider implementation for 2007. Phillip Stromer seconded. Motion and second withdrawn.

Brian Cory moved to table the action item and send it back to Junior Council for further study for possible implementation.

8-7 vote for the motion. Roll call vote asked for. ReVote 8 yes, 10 no.

Motion to call the question failed.

Terry Cossette called the question. 15-1. Question called.

6-12 vote. Motion failed.

Sandi Kaney presented a motion, seconded by Andrea Norman, that "effective immediately, the USTA NorCal Volunteer Travel Assistance Policy for reimbursement of expenses related to travel to the USTA Annual Meeting and the USTA Semiannual Meeting be amended and restated in the form attached. This policy will be effective through December 31, 2005."

Question called by Patrick King. (No vote on the motion was taken as the building closes at 11 pm).

Meeting was adjourned at 11:02 pm.

Submitted by Bill Schoen, Secretary

BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, May 18, 2005

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 Beverage—6 PM
- II. Call to Order—6:30 PM
- III. Introduction of Guests
- IV. Public Comments-10 minutes, 2 minutes per speaker
- V. Approval of Minutes
- VI. Treasurer's Report
 - A. Monthly Financial Statements (Green)
 - B. Monthly Grants (Red)
 - C. Budget Committee Recommendations (Purple)
- VII. Committee Decisions/Reports (Yellow)
- VIII. Executive Committee Activities
- IX. Action Items (Blue)
 - A. Multicultural Participation Funding and Diversity Initiatives
 - B. Permanent Office Location
 - C. Annual Report by Executive Director About Action Steps to Grow Tennis
 - D. Challenge of Right to Interpret Local League Rules
 - E. Challenge Mileage Rules Set by Junior Council
 - F. Establish Junior Player Ranking System Using Singles and Doubles
 - G. Adjustment of Travel Policy to Annual and Semiannual Meetings
- X. President's Report—Integrated Plan and Strategic Plan
- XI. Delegate's Report
- XII. Executive Director's Report
- XIII. Old Business—Record date for organization memberships at Special Meeting
- XIV. New Business
- XV. Adjournment of Meeting

Next Regular Meeting: Wed., June 15 at ClubSport Fremont
Special Meeting of the Membership Occurs Beforehand, 6:30 PM
Mission: To Promote and Develop the Growth of Tennis
Vision: 30 Million Tennis Players by 2010

May 2005 A

Hard copy that is the same as April 2005 Action Item D carried over

April 2005 E/May 2005 B

Presenter: Bruce A. Hunt, Executive Director

Statement of Action Item: To determine if USTA NorCal should seek a permanent location for our section office that would allow the section to build equity through ownership or should we continue to lease our office space. Our current lease expires 2/28/2007.

Rationale for Action: We currently spend approximately \$78,000 on our annual lease. We also spend about \$3,500 annually for meeting space to hold Board meetings. In addition, we spend over \$10,000 for food and beverage at the Board meetings. If we owned a permanent location with an appropriately sized conference room, we could begin to build equity in our office and reduce our other meeting expenses. Other committees could use the conference room as well and eliminate or reduce their meeting expenses. We spend over \$80,000 every year for office and meeting space and we have no equity to show for the expense.

We currently spend over \$10,000 a year on court fees for adult league and junior team tennis events. We also spend about \$5,000 a year in lodging to travel to the events where the courts are located. If we had enough tennis courts near the office location or part of the office complex, we could save some of this \$15,000.

Four other USTA Sections, Midwest, Middle States, Southern and Texas, own their own offices. They do not have tennis courts on site.

Fiscal Impact: The objective would be to take the same annual amount of funds spent for office and meeting space and use that to fund a mortgage on a permanent office location. A down payment could be made using the excess funds above our required reserve amount. We would determine what type of property these amounts would allow us to buy and decide if that was adequate for our needs.

Staff Comments: It makes more sense to be an owner than a renter forever. We have been paying rent for over 50 years now. We should assume that we will be in business for at least 50 more years. The USTA is over 120 years old. A relocation of the office will result in staff changes if staff chooses not to travel to new office site.

April 2005 F/May 2005 C

From: WKepler@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2005 4:29 PM

To: hunt@norcal.usta.com

Subject: Action Item

To require as part of the Executive Director's annual presentation to the Board regarding action steps he/she will take to Promote and Develop the Growth of Tennis, the Executive Director identifies the THREE most important actions he/she intends to take. These actions need to be quantifiable and measurable in terms of their impact on Tennis Participation in the Northern California Section; and accountability standards need to be established for each action step.

In 2005, these three action steps will be presented to the Board on April 20.

Presenters: Jack Drimmer, Paul Kepler, Margie Peterman and Rosie Bareis (added April 14)

Rationale: To ensure the most important action steps the Executive Director takes annually to Promote and Develop the Growth of Tennis are highlighted and thoroughly discussed by the Board and that clear standards of accountability are established for each action.

Fiscal Impact: Unknown

Staff Comment: The mission of the USTA is to promote and develop the growth of tennis. The vision of the USTA is to have 30 million tennis players by 2010. The participation survey conducted by the USTA and the Tennis Industry Association identifies 3 R's of participation: recruitment of new players, retention of current players and recovery of lapsed players. The USTA has identified four programs as level one strategic priorities: multicultural participation, community tennis, high performance/professional circuits and US Open/US Open Series. I have selected five actions from the key performance indicators that our staff developed from the 2005 USTA NorCal budget as the most important actions that our staff intends to take.

Action: Multicultural Participation

Activities: Execute the 20 grants to individual players and programs serving the community; award 7 college scholarships to multicultural junior players; produce 3 outreach events, produce 5 workshops, provide funding to 4 emerging programs/coaches, provide funding to 3 players, managers or apprentices, provide funding to 5 established excellence programs and coaches. Sharon Smith-Mauney is the Director for this action. These activities will recruit and retain players.

Action: Community Tennis

Activities: Conduct school programs that introduce tennis to elementary, middle and high school students. These programs would include in-service training for teachers, assemblies for student and after school programs. The school programs would be linked to a Tennis Welcome Center or other tennis facility that offers continuing tennis programming for juniors. Craig Stephens is the Director for this action. These activities will recruit new players.

- In 2004 we did 154 School Tennis programs. Our 2005 goal is 169.
- In 2004, we estimate that we introduced tennis to 60,000 students via assemblies and PE tennis classes. Our 2005 goal is 67,000 students.
- In 2004, the CT conducted 15 USA Tennis School In-service Programs and trained 312 teachers to teach tennis. Our 2005 goals are to conduct 20 School In-service programs and to train 400 new teachers to teach tennis.
- In 2004 we had 54 after school programs for 1300 students as a result of the School Tennis programs. Our 2005 goals are 65 School Tennis programs and 1500 students.

Action: Community Tennis and Junior Tennis

Activity: Promote junior team tennis leagues using both teaching professionals and volunteers trained as recreational coaches to administer the leagues. We have identified 38 sites that hosted junior team tennis in 2004. Craig Stephens and Jim Coyne are the Directors for this action. These activities will recruit, retain and recover players. There are three pilot programs that are running volunteer-based junior team tennis with 80, 50 and 30 players respectively. We will take what we learn at those sites and apply the lessons to Fall youth and adult team tennis.

Action: Adult Leagues

Activity: Promote and market our 2005 leagues so that we meet our player and income numbers set in the 2005 budget. Bob Manalo is the Director for this action. The leagues will recruit, retain and recover players.

Action: High Performance/Pro Circuits and US Open/US Open Series

Activity: Conduct community awareness and outreach events at every Pro Circuit and US Open Series event held in Northern California. Sharon Smith-Mauney, Karen Leischer and Craig Stephens are the Directors for this action. These events will recruit, retain and recover players.

May 2005 D

Presenter(s):

Philip Stromer, Jean Hassoun, Deb Petersen, Rosie Bareis, Mark Manning

Statement of Action Item:

Challenge the April 2005 Adult League Committee (ALC) decision giving the right of the Sectional League Coordinator (SLC) the right to interpret the Local League Area Rules (LLAR).

Rationale for Action:

The board and its committees should set NorCal policy. Staff should implement that policy. The decision being challenged has several problems, including:

1. Staff is allowed per the league rules to file a grievance whenever they like. This makes staff the prosecutor. The prosecutor should not also be the judge (judges interpret the rules). This function should be left to the ALC.
2. The SLC is not under the jurisdiction of the board. The board gives the ALC the right to govern league matters. The ALC reports to the board. The SLC does not report to the ALC or board, he reports to the Executive Director.
3. The ALC's action item gives the false impression that this rule only applies to "time sensitive matters." However, no one has identified either a real or possible situation when a time sensitive issue would not have allowed the ALC to make a needed interpretation. In the recent issue about match rescheduling ("any time, any place"), when the SLC claimed the issue to be 'time sensitive' there was no urgency for a decision (it was between league seasons), and when the ALC made its decision, it was quite different from the SLC's.

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Staff Comments:

The ALC met on May 11, 2005 and voted to approve the original language in the motion passed on March 2, 2005. That wording reads as follows: "The SLC is granted the authority to interpret the LLAR's for the purpose of clarification, without changing the wording." – passed 6-0 and 1 abstained
They have looked at this very carefully and do not think they are in the best position to keep track of the day-to-day issues brought to the attention of the leagues department. They trust the staff to make good sensible rationale decisions. The staff is hired for that purpose. The volunteers (ALC) are not available to respond to issues from league players on a daily basis. Currently most of the interpretations made by staff are minor. Here is an example brought up by one committee member: A captain calls to ask, "if it says the match starts at 6pm, and we have trouble getting there due to traffic, is that okay". Well, the SLC can easily "interpret" the rule, and say, "no, it is not okay. " When an issue comes up that is complex or requires a change in the wording, the original action item clearly states "to interpret the LLAR's for the purpose of clarification, without changing the wording." Any changes in the wording of the LLAR's would not happen unless the ALC has met and approved such changes and the board approves those changes.

May 2005 E

From: WKepler@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 12:28 PM

To: hunt@norcal.usta.com

Subject: Action Item A

Presenters: Paul Kepler, Brian Cory, Randy Becker, Bill Schoen, Phil Stromer, Jack Drimmer

Action Item: To rescind Junior Council decisions #4, #5 and #6 (below) made at their April 4, 2005 Meeting until the Junior Council has established an evaluation system for all Junior Tournaments that rates tournaments on a five-point scale, provides specific, objective consequences based on a tournament's rating, and allows for a probation period of one year (or the tournament site's next tournament whichever period of time is less) except for an egregious violation of Junior Council Sanction rules, so long as a written list of such egregious violations are available in advance to all tournaments.

Once such an evaluation system has been recommended by Junior Council and approved by the Board of Directors, decisions #4, #5 and 6 may be revisited by Junior Council.

4. Mileage and Concurrent Tournaments (Sanction Rule #18.b.ii.)

RESOLVED, that Rule 18.b.ii. of the USTA NorCal Tournament Sanction Rules be amended to remove the 75-mile restriction on the sanctioning of Challenger Tournaments. New Rule 18.b.ii. shall apply to tournaments sanctioned in 2005 to be held beginning January 1, 2006 and shall read in its entirety as follows:

ii. Challenger Tournaments. There are no mileage restrictions for sanctioning concurrent Challenger Tournaments.

Rationale: In order to allow the Junior Council the flexibility to further expand the number of its lower-level tournaments to grow the game, the elimination of the mileage restriction for Challenger Tournaments is being proposed.

5. Mileage and Concurrent Tournaments (Sanction Rule #18.b.iii.)

RESOLVED, that Rule 18.b.iii. of the USTA NorCal Tournament Sanction Rules be amended to remove the 150-mile restriction on the sanctioning of Open Tournaments. New Rule 18.b.iii. shall apply to tournaments sanctioned in 2005 to be held beginning January 1, 2006 and shall read in its entirety as follows:

ii. Open Tournaments. There are no mileage restrictions for sanctioning concurrent Open Tournaments.

Rationale: In order to allow the Junior Council the flexibility to further expand the number of its lower-level tournaments to grow the game, the elimination of the mileage restriction for Open Tournaments is being proposed.

6. Tournament Sanction Priority (Sanction Rule #19)

RESOLVED, that Rule 19.b.iii. of the USTA NorCal Tournament Sanction Rules relating to the electronic tournament reporting requirement for tournament sanction priority be amended to delete reference to electronic reporting and expand the eligibility to compliance with all sanction and tournament rules New Rule 19.b.iii. shall apply to tournaments sanctioned in 2005 to be held beginning January 1, 2006 and shall read in its entirety as follows:

iii. Compliance with USTA NorCal sanction and tournament rules. Only tournaments that have been found to be in compliance with all USTA NorCal Tournament Sanction Rules and the applicable Adult

Tournament Rules or Junior Tournament Rules shall be eligible.

Rationale: The existing eligibility criteria include a requirement that a tournament use electronic reporting. The presenters believes this should be expanded and that only tournaments that are in compliance with all of our sanction and tournament rules should be eligible for Tournament Sanction Priority status.

Rationale: Items #4, #5 and #6, passed by the Junior Council at their April 4, 2005 meeting, are putting the "cart before the horse". This Board has discussed on several occasions the need for a tournament evaluation system that is objective and has real consequences. By permanently eliminating mileage rules (#4 and #5), Junior Council is taking away one of the major incentives for improving the quality of tournaments. #6 is too broad, has no clear consequences, and may lead future Boards to think there is a real tournament evaluation system in place, when there is not.

Tournament quality among juniors is a major concern of ours and may be a major reason for decline in tournament participation as well as overall tennis participation in Northern California. In our opinion, an evaluation system with real incentives (e.g. preservation of "date blocks" and mileage rules) will increase quality.

Even without a serious evaluation system in place, there are substantive reasons to maintain mileage rules at some level. It makes no sense to allow tournaments in the same geographic area to compete with each other on the same dates, or to allow a new tournament director to sanction multiple tournaments with no track record, or to allow a new tournament site in an existing date block with no due process of all applicants (all of these things can and do happen now). In addition, the elimination of mileage rules will cause some high quality, long standing outlying tournaments to throw in the towel.

An evaluation system that provides specific, objective consequences is long overdue in Northern California and it is time the Board gave that clear message to Junior Council.

Fiscal Impact: Minimal

Staff Comments:

The Junior Council purposely adopted these new rules as separate decisions so that in the event the Board took exception to any one of them, they would be considered by a separate vote. By lumping these items together as one Action Item and restricting Junior Council from reconsidering each of them until a specific new evaluation process is in place, the presenters are purposely forcing the vote on rescinding all three decisions by one resolution. Staff believes Junior Council's rationale for the decisions #4 and #5 is different from #6 and the Board could reasonably vote to rescind one or more of these while at the same time vote for one or more to become effective.

The Action Item not only moves to rescind JC Decisions #4, #5 and #6, it also requires Junior Council to establish a specific new evaluation process that includes 5-point scale, provides specific consequences, and establishes a mandatory probation period. The presenters are unaware of the 4-month long process that is approaching an end that has included the study of our existing online evaluation, the review and redrafting of a new evaluation, and the creation of criteria each tournament must meet. Further, the Council discussed at its meeting in April the caution it should use by creating automatic penalties. It felt the direction the Council should take addresses problems at a tournament on a case-by-case basis. Further, the existing USTA NorCal Tournament Sanction Rules have a specific list of possible penalties incurred by tournaments that fail to meet the rules.

Decision #6 is a new rule that both the Junior Council and the Adult Tournament Committee passed. The ATC committee decision in the exact form adopted by Junior Council was also on the April 2005 Committee Decisions yellow sheet distributed to the board. The presenters have only referenced the new Tournament Priority rule as it relates to Junior Tournaments and staff believes this Action Item is unclear as to whether it applies to both Junior and Adult Tournaments, especially in light of the fact that the mandatory evaluation to be established is only required of Junior Council.

It should finally be noted that the original Action Item submitted on the deadline date was done so without a rationale, a mandatory part of the Action Item form. This has put the Staff at a disadvantage in preparing its comments as it has not been given the opportunity to fully understanding the presenter's rationale.

Removing Mileage Restrictions on Open and Challenger Tournaments (JC Decisions #4 and #5): The original rationale submitted with the Junior Council Committee Decisions #4 and #5 is as follows:

Rationale: In order to allow the Junior Council the flexibility to further expand the number of its lower-level tournaments to grow the game, the elimination of the mileage restriction for [Open/Challenger] Tournaments is being proposed.

The USTA NorCal Junior Council has created many significant changes over the past two years in order to grow tennis. Rescinding these new sanction rules will actually decrease participation. By limiting our tournaments using mileage restrictions, we are in essence reducing playing opportunities for our players. The consumer is being told, "if you want this product you need to drive 150 miles in order to buy it!"

Staff is also concerned about the impact these mileage restrictions have on one of the level one priorities of the USTA - increasing diversity? Staff believes restrictions have a negative impact on diversity by limiting tournaments to players with the resources to drive long distances.

It is not the intent of the Junior Council to suddenly have a proliferation of like-tournaments in every date block. It is merely asking the Board to place its faith in the Council to make reasoned decisions about tournament sanctioning that it believes will best serve our junior players.

Finally, this Action Item and the Action Item related to a combined ranking, submitted together, contradict each other. Simply stated, a combined singles and doubles ranking is being proposed to increase participation. In reality, the effect of this action would be to limit the size of a draw to possibly as low as a round of 32 for singles. This would mean we would need more tournaments, but would be unable to if the mileage restrictions remain on Open and Challenger tournaments.

Tournament Sanction Priority Requirement that all Rules be Followed (JC decision #6): The original rationale submitted with the Junior Council Committee decision #6 was as follows:

Rationale: The existing eligibility criteria include a requirement that a tournament use electronic reporting. The presenters believes this should be expanded. Only tournaments that are in compliance with all of our sanction and tournament rules should be eligible for Tournament Sanction Priority status.

The Council adopted this rule with the belief that tournament priority is a privilege that is extended to long-standing tournaments that are delivering a superior product to our customers, the players. A tournament should not be given the automatic privilege of tournament priority if it is in violation of our tournament and sanction rules. This privilege should automatically be extended only to those tournaments that are in compliance with the policies that have been adopted by the Board. Anything less would send a message that our section is aspiring to mediocrity.

May 2005 F

From: WKepler@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 12:31 PM

To: hunt@norcal.usta.com

Subject: Action Item B

Presenters: Paul Kepler, Mark Manning, Brian Cory, Bill Schoen, Margie Peterman, Phil Stromer, Rosie Bareis, Jack Drimmer

Action Item: To establish a combined junior player ranking (weighted 75% singles and 25% doubles) as the only ranking to be used by NorCal for endorsement, seeding, and entry into limited draw tournaments for all Sectional Juniors.

The specific implementation of such combined junior player ranking (e.g. point tables, types of tournaments, etc.) needs to be recommended by the Junior Council for Board approval no later than its July 20, 2005 meeting and such combined junior player ranking will be made effective January 1, 2006.

Rationale: Despite its obvious advantages in terms of player development and socialization, doubles play by juniors has not increased substantially in NorCal. The primary reason for this is lack of support from above; therefore, by implementing a combined junior player ranking, demand for doubles will be driven from below leading to a cultural change within NorCal that will help Promote and Develop the Growth of Tennis.

The ITF implemented the same combined junior player ranking 1 ½ years ago and they are happy with the results; doubles play has increased substantially - particularly by the middle ranked players; and the ITF intends to keep their combined junior player ranking in place.

A combined junior player ranking will easily blend into the national USTA ranking system (just as points per round did) and the ultimate result will be more doubles play by our juniors; more junior players with an all court game; more socialization and fun on the tennis court; and greater retention of Northern California junior tennis players as they become adults.

Fiscal Impact: Minimal

Staff Comments:

Creating a combined ranking system has been discussed at numerous NorCal Junior Council, USTA National Youth Competition & Training Committee, and USTA High Performance Staff meetings. The discussion began because the ITF adopted a combined ranking system and most experts would like to see our junior players develop an all-round game by playing more doubles.

While the concept is intriguing, there are numerous issues to more fully understand and resolve before adopting a new ranking system just 2 1/2 years after our players experienced another ranking-system change. By trying to increase doubles participation we will be creating serious issues in other areas, none of which are addressed in detail by the Action Item. Nor are the root causes to what the presenters believe is flat doubles participation.

In addition, as stated in the staff comments of the Action Item to rescind Junior Council decisions #4, #5, and #6, the presenters have contradictory items. This Action Item purports to encourage participation yet tournaments would have to limit draw sizes in order to accommodate the increased doubles draws. This means NorCal would need to offer more tournaments yet would be unable to do so if the mileage restrictions on tournaments continue to limit the Junior Council.

Staff believes there are potentially serious fiscal and participation issues that would be detrimental to the development and promotion of junior tennis in NorCal.

May 2005 G

2005 USTA NorCal Volunteer Travel Assistance Policy -
USTA Annual and Semiannual Meetings

Presenters: Sandi Kaney, Andrea Norman, Bill Hansen, Betty Cookson, Deb Petersen, Fred Tierney

Statement of Action Item:

1. Effective immediately, the USTA NorCal Volunteer Travel Assistance Policy for reimbursement of expenses related to travel to the USTA Annual Meeting and the USTA Semiannual Meeting be amended and restated in the form attached. This Policy will be effective through December 31, 2005.
2. Allocate an additional \$17,000 in the 2005 budget to cover the estimated expenses of the Policy in 2005.
3. After reimbursement of expenses from the 2005 Semiannual Meeting under the Policy, the Board shall reconsider in November 2005 whether to approve and/or amend this Policy for 2006 and beyond.

Rationale:

The presenters believe that USTA NorCal should adopt a Volunteer Travel Assistance Policy that reimburses significantly more of the expenses incurred by its volunteers to attend the USTA Annual and Semiannual Meeting for several reasons:

1. The persons eligible to receive assistance under the proposed policy are volunteers that spend a tremendous amount of time, talent, and personal resources to represent USTA NorCal here at home and on the national level. The presenters believe such volunteers should not be required to spend such a significant amount of their personal financial resources to attend the USTA Annual and Semiannual Meetings.
2. Reducing the financial barriers to participation on the national level may open up the opportunity for persons of more limited financial resources to apply for and receive national committee appointments.
3. Each time USTA NorCal volunteers attend a USTA Annual or Semiannual Meeting, valuable networking and relationship building occurs among our own volunteers and between our volunteers and staff. This networking and relationship building also is fostered between our volunteers and volunteers from other Sections. This exchange can be a crucial component in USTA NorCal accomplishing its goals to grow the game of tennis.
4. Attendance at the various meetings held during the USTA Annual and Semiannual Meeting is a opportunity to bring new ideas learned back to USTA NorCal to grow the game of tennis. The proposed Policy makes a more comprehensive Meeting Report a requirement for reimbursement in an effort to ensure the communication of new ideas learned at the Meetings. Our presence is also an opportunity for USTA NorCal to showcase the strides it is making toward growing the game in an effort to assist other Sections in their efforts.
5. There is an inherent benefit to representation by USTA NorCal on the national level and attendance by our talented volunteers at the USTA's Annual and Semiannual Meetings. Increased participation by NorCal at this level affirms our presence and value to the Association as a whole, builds respect for our

contribution to the Association, and can lead to additional appointments on the national committees, appointments to committee chair and vice chair positions, task forces, division council chair positions, and election to the Nominating Committee and the Board of Directors.

Fiscal Impact:

The fiscal impact of this proposal is uncertain. It is believed that three things will affect the dollar amount needed to fund this proposal:

1. Increase in reimbursable expenses from \$500 per meeting to the broader coverage with no monetary limit;
2. Addition of Sectional Representatives to the list of eligible persons; and
3. Potential for larger numbers of eligible persons to apply for reimbursement after the passage of a comprehensive policy by the Board.

Existing Budget and Reimbursement History. Currently there is \$10,500 in the 2005 budget to cover the cost of the existing travel reimbursement policy that allows for up to \$500 per meeting per volunteer each year and players requesting assistance to tournaments. As of April 2005, approximately \$7,000 had been granted or spent. This relatively small budget number has been sufficient to fund the existing \$500 per person per meeting policy because of the low numbers of eligible persons who have requested reimbursement. After La Quinta, three persons (one Director not serving on a National Committee and two National Committee volunteers serving on USTA NorCal Committees) requested reimbursement for a total of \$1,294. At the 2004 Annual and Semiannual Meetings, a total of four persons requested reimbursement for a total of \$2,000 for each meeting.

Budget Committee Recommendations. This Policy has been presented to the Budget Committee for their consideration. Because of the uncertainty of the expense of this Policy, the Budget Committee has proposed two things that are incorporated into this Action Item.

The first is the Policy expiration date of December 31, 2005. This will allow for the Policy to be in effect for the 2005 Semiannual Meeting in New York, but will also allow for the Budget Committee to evaluate the real potential cost of the Policy to USTA NorCal based on reimbursement requests made after that Meeting, and will also allow the USTA NorCal Board of Directors to re-evaluate the reimbursable expenses in the Policy and make adjustments, if necessary in November 2005.

The second is the allocation of \$17,000 in additional funding to the travel assistance budget for 2005. The Budget Committee arrived at this number based on the average high and low cost of approximately 10 people attending the Annual Meeting and requesting full reimbursement (airfare, meals, and lodging without a roommate) for five days.

The Budget Committee has voted to recommend the approval of the USTA NorCal Volunteer Travel Assistance Policy for the 2005 trial period and has approved the \$17,000 addition to the 2005 budget.

Staff Comments:

None

Attachment to Action Item

2005 USTA NorCal Volunteer Travel Assistance Policy - USTA Annual and Semiannual Meetings

The following 2005 USTA NorCal Volunteer Travel Assistance Policy has been established to defray the high cost of attendance by volunteers representing USTA NorCal at the USTA Annual and Semiannual Meetings. This policy is in effect until December 31, 2005. After the reimbursement of expenses in 2005, the Board of Directors will re-evaluate the cost of this policy and vote to extend or modify the policy.

Eligibility - The following persons shall be eligible for reimbursement:

- USTA national committee members who are currently serving on a USTA NorCal Committee and Section Representatives
- USTA NorCal Directors and USTA NorCal Committee Chairs who are not on USTA national committees, except that such persons will be reimbursed for Lodging and Meal expenses ONLY as set forth below

Expenses incurred by spouses or traveling companions of eligible persons shall NOT be eligible for reimbursement.

Best Price Policy - At all times, persons eligible for reimbursement shall use their best efforts to incur

expenses at the lowest-possible rate. Persons are required to compare the cost of transportation modes (car vs. air/ground transportation) and use the most reasonable and least expensive mode of transportation.

Excluded Expenses - Any expense which is eligible for reimbursement by the USTA, another policy of USTA NorCal, or any other source, shall not be reimbursable under this USTA NorCal Volunteer Travel Assistance Policy.

Airfare - Provided air travel is part of the least expensive or most reasonable mode of transportation, coach airfare will be reimbursed. In order to ensure the best price, reservations must be made 21 days in advance. Please compare at least two sources to ensure that every effort is made to get the lowest fare possible. If applicable, please also compare airfares at more than one airport. For example, when traveling to La Quinta, compare airfares into Palm Springs and Ontario.

Driving - Provided driving a personal vehicle is part of the least expensive or most reasonable mode of transportation, USTA NorCal will reimburse the cost per mile allowed by the IRS for a deduction. Miles driven that are not related to attendance at the meeting should not be included on the request. In addition, tolls and parking fees will also be reimbursed. Gasoline will not be reimbursed. Valet parking will only be reimbursed when self-parking is not available.

Car Rental - Provided car rental is part of the least expensive or most reasonable of mode transportation, USTA NorCal shall reimburse the actual cost of the rental car, insurance, and gas for the day before the requestor's first committee meeting (including a sub-committee or other committee-related meeting) through the day after the evening of the requestor's last committee meeting (including a sub-committee or other committee-related meeting).

Ground Transportation - Provided cab fare or shuttle service is part of the least expensive or most reasonable mode of transportation, USTA NorCal shall reimburse cab fare or shuttle service, including gratuity and tolls, between the hotel and the airport and/or between home and the airport.

Lodging: National Committee Volunteers and Sectional Representatives - Room expenses at the USTA-sponsored hotel or at a hotel with a rate equal to or lower than the USTA-sponsored hotel shall be reimbursed for the day before the requestor's first committee meeting (including a sub-committee or other committee-related meeting) through the evening of the requestor's last committee meeting (including a sub-committee or other committee-related meeting), for a maximum 5-night stay. Room sharing is encouraged and all persons are required to attempt to find a roommate; failure to attempt to find a roommate may disqualify reimbursement of the full cost of the room. In the event a room is shared, reimbursements will be for the proportion of the room expense. Example: If you have meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday and you share the room with one person, you will be covered for 1/2 the total room expense incurred on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. Rooms that are shared with ineligible persons (such as spouses or traveling companions) are only eligible for their proportion of the total room expense.

Lodging: USTA NorCal Directors who are NOT National Committee Volunteers or Section Representatives - Room expenses at the USTA-sponsored hotel or at a hotel with a rate equal to or lower than the USTA-sponsored hotel shall be reimbursed for a maximum 5-night stay. Nights eligible for reimbursement are the night before the first scheduled meeting through the night of the last scheduled meeting at the USTA Annual or Semiannual Meeting. Room sharing is encouraged and all persons are required to attempt to find a roommate; failure to attempt to find a roommate may disqualify reimbursement of the full cost of the room. In the event a room is shared, reimbursements will be for the proportion of the room expense. Example: If the requestor shares the room with one person, the requestor will be covered for 1/2 the total room expense incurred up to a maximum of 5 days. Rooms that are shared with ineligible persons (such as spouses or traveling companions) are only eligible for their proportion of the total room expense.

Meals - Meals shall be reimbursed during the period the person is eligible for reimbursement for Lodging as follows:

The maximum meal expenses per day cannot exceed the following:

\$12.50 - breakfast

\$17.50 - lunch

\$30.00 - dinner

except that if the person eligible for reimbursement elects to purchase their own meal instead of benefiting from a meal provided by the USTA or USTA NorCal, no reimbursement is eligible for the meal.

Expenses Not Covered - Expenses incurred for alcoholic beverages, telephone calls, room service, movie rentals, laundry service, golf or health club fees, and excessive valet service shall not be eligible for reimbursement.

Meeting Report - In order to communicate important information from the meetings to USTA NorCal, a report shall be submitted with the Reimbursement Request Form that shall include all meetings attended, a brief summary of the meeting content, information that can be used by USTA NorCal to grow the game of tennis in our Section, and USTA NorCal policies and ideas that have helped to aid the growth of tennis other Sections or nationally. These reports will be given to the Board and all relevant USTA NorCal committees.

Reimbursement Request Form - All requests for reimbursement shall be submitted on the attached Reimbursement Request Form no later than 45 days after departure date from the Annual or Semiannual Meeting. Original receipts for all expenses must be attached to qualify for reimbursement. Forms should be sent to the attention of: Executive Director, USTA NorCal, 1350 South Loop Road, Alameda, CA 94502.

Exceptions - Expenses deemed to be excessive by the Executive Director will be reviewed by the Treasurer and Executive Director and may be disallowed. The Board of Directors may consider exceptions to any of these guidelines on a case-by-case basis.

Contact Bruce Hunt, USTA NorCal Executive Director, if you have any questions.

[USTA NorCal Volunteer Travel Assistance
Reimbursement Request Form](#) (PDF)

If you can't view the above file [click here](#) for your free version of Adobe Reader