

NOTE: All resolutions in these minutes were approved by the USTA NorCal Board as of December 10, 2025

NOTE: These minutes were approved on December 18, 2025.

Andrea Barnes, Chair of the Adult Leagues Committee (the "Committee"), called the meeting to order at 6:31 pm and roll call was conducted. The meeting was held by Google Meet video conference.

Committee Members Present: Andrea Barnes (chair), Leslie Airola-Murveit, Anoosh Davoudzadeh, Damon Levy, Marilyn Morrell-Kristal, Paul Startz

USTA NorCal Staff Present: Michelle Wilson (Sr. Manager, Adult Competition)

Guests Present: Sarah Robinson

- 1. Approval September 29, 2025 Minutes.** The Committee considered for approval the draft minutes of the meeting held on September 29, 2025.

The following motion was then **APPROVED** by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

RESOLVED: That the minutes of Adult Leagues Committee meeting held September 29, 2025 be approved as presented.

- 2. Items Approved by Unanimous Written Consent.** Staff reported to the Committee the following items that were passed by unanimous written consent since the September 29 ALC meeting:

- A. The **2025 League Facility of the Year Award** was approved on October 17 by the Adult League Committee to be awarded to **Saint Mary's College of California**.
- B. The **2025 Local League Area Coordinator of the Year Award** was approved on October 17 by the Adult League Committee to be awarded to **Kathy Serksnis** and **Kevin Vliet**.
- C. On November 9, 2025, the Adult League Committee approved the following 2025 playoff date changes due to the forecasted rain to give the teams extra time to get their matches played:
 - a. Combo Playoff Dates
 - Week 1: November 13-~~16~~23
 - Week 2: ~~November 20-23~~December 4-7
 - Week 3: ~~December 4-7~~December 11-14
 - b. Combo Daytime Playoff Dates
 - Week 1: November 10-~~14~~21
 - Week 2: ~~November 17-21~~December 1-5
 - ~~Week 3: December 1-5~~
 - c. Mixed 55 Playoff Dates
 - Week 1: November 6-9
 - Week 2: November 13-~~16~~23
 - ~~Week 3: November 20-23~~
 - d. Adult 70 Playoff Dates
 - Week 1: November 10-~~14~~21
 - ~~Week 2: November 17-21~~

Rationale: There was heavy rain forecasted for November 13-18. Staff reviewed the calendar and determined there was enough time to be able to extend playoff dates. Extending the dates gives teams extra time to play the matches if their initial date is rained out.

- 3. Captains of the Year Award Update.** The committee was informed that Adult League Awards sub-committee is currently reviewing the nominations for the 2025 Captain of the Year Award and will have their recommendations shortly.

4. 2027 National Regulations Proposals

1) 2.06A(3) Section Limiting number of players on a roster that are at a specific level in regards to the Move-up/Split up rule

The Committee reviewed the proposal to clarify regulation 2.06A(3).

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS)

2.06A(3): If a Section has a regulation that limits the number of players on a roster that are at a specific level, the Section must suspend that regulation for one year in the SAME DIVISION, SAME AGE GROUP for any team that advanced to, or qualified for, any National Championship the previous year and chooses to move up one NTRP team level.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to clarify rule 2.06A(3) specifying that the section must suspend the At-Level regulation for one year in the SAME DIVISION, SAME AGE GROUP for any team that advanced to, or qualified for, any National Championship the previous year and chooses to move up one NTRP team level.

Rationale: This is just a clarification to the rules

2) Point Considered in Play Once the Ball is Tossed For the Serve

The proposal to consider the start of a point being in play once the server tosses the ball was reviewed. It is being proposed that once the ball is tossed it for the serve, the ball must be hit. If the ball is not hit, it would be a fault.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to require a player to hit the ball when they toss it for their serve.

Rationale: This rule change proposal is not within the Friend at Court.

3) 2.01C(7) Rule Addition to Clarify Known and Unknown Defaults

The Committee discussed the proposed rule addition to clarify what known and unknown defaults are and how to proceed when the defaults occur.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

2.01C(7) DEFAULTS. A DEFAULT OCCURS WHEN THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH PLAYERS TO FILL EACH POSITION IN A LINE-UP.

2.01C(7)a. KNOWN DEFAULTS. A KNOWN DEFAULT OCCURS WHEN, PRIOR TO THE MATCH, A CAPTAIN IS AWARE THAT THERE WILL NOT BE A PLAYER AVAILABLE TO FILL EACH POSITION. THE LINE-UP CARD WILL DESIGNATE A DEFAULT FOR THAT POSITION(S) IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ORDER OF MATCH DEFAULTS TABLE REG. 2.03K

2.01C(7)b. UNKNOWN DEFAULTS. AN UNKNOWN DEFAULT OCCURS WHEN A PLAYER IN THE LINE-UP FAILS TO APPEAR BY DEFAULT TIME. A DEFAULT WILL THEN OCCUR AT THE POSITION IN WHICH THE PLAYER IS MISSING, REGARDLESS OF WHERE THAT POSITION IS IN THE LINE-UP. THE ORDER OF MATCH DEFAULTS TABLE WILL NOT APPLY.

2.03I Individual Defaults. An individual default occurs when a player fails to appear on time or is disqualified by a tournament official for misconduct. THE PROCEDURES SHALL BE THE SAME AS IN REGULATION 2.01C(7) a, and b; DEFAULTS, KNOWN DEFAULTS, UNKNOWN DEFAULTS

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to add language to clarify what known and unknown defaults are and how to proceed when the defaults occur.

Rationale: The Committee does not believe we need this additional language. The proposed additional language is too complicated.

4) Generate Dynamic Ratings for Adult 65 & Over and Mixed 55 & Over Leagues

The ALC discussed the regulation proposal to generate dynamic ratings for the Adult 65 & over and Mixed 55 & over league beginning the 2027 Championship year. They noted that this regulation was previously discussed as it was submitted by NorCal.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to generate dynamic ratings for Adult 65 & Over and Mixed 55 & Over Leagues beginning the 2027 Championship year.

Rationale: NorCal submitted this proposal. By having the process of generating dynamic ratings for the Adult 65 and Mixed 55 Leagues, this will encourage positive growth because players will know that their work to improve means something, and improves their confidence at being at their level because they will know that they are playing with players at the same level and that if self-rated and appealed players generate three ratings at the clearly above level, they will be required to move up to the next rating. If USTA allows the "appeal down" process, then appealed Adult 65 and Mixed 55 players should also be subject to the 3 strikes disqualification and/or grievance. While the Adult 65 League does not progress to a League Nationals, it does progress to a League National Invitational, and it is still the coveted National competition.

5) 1.04E(2) Membership

The Committee reviewed the regulation proposal to require a captain to be a USTA member. They noted that this regulation was previously discussed as it was submitted by NorCal.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

1.04E(2) Membership. All individuals who CAPTAIN AND/OR compete in the USTA League must be current USTA members in good standing through the local league season. Any individual who progresses to a championship level in the USTA League must be a current USTA member through each championship progression. Individuals shall only have one USTA membership account/USTA number. Individuals who obtain more than one USTA membership account/USTA number may be subject to a grievance and such suspension penalties as outlined under the League Suspension Point System.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to require a captain to be a USTA member.

Rationale: NorCal submitted this proposal. Team captains need to be responsible for the team(s) they are captaining. All SLCs were notified on the week of May 5 at the SLC workshop, that in order to file a grievance, an individual must be 1) a paid USTA member at the time the grievance is filed and 2) must be registered for a current league in progress. Team captains should be held accountable to the rules as they are the individuals that put the teams together. They are also the individuals that can file a grievance against an individual or team.

6) 3.03B(3) Grievances pertaining to Eligibility

The Committee reviewed the regulation proposal regarding grievances pertaining to eligibility.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

3.03B(3) Any grievance regarding failure to meet eligibility requirements may be filed by a team captain, league coordinator or member of a Championship Committee at any time.

3.03B(3)a For eligibility matters of simple fact (e.g., age, USTA membership, TennisLink registration, MISREPRESENTED NAME OR DOMICILE, VIOLATION OF GRIEVANCE DECISION) a USTA SECTION OR DISTRICT league coordinator may declare a player ineligible, [and] disqualify that player AND REVERSE MATCHES IN ACCORDANCE WITH 3.03B(4) and 3.03C(4) without filing a grievance. IF A PLAYER WISHES TO DISPUTE ANY ACTIONS UNDER THIS SECTION, THE PLAYER'S CAPTAIN MAY FILE AN ADMINISTRATIVE GRIEVANCE AGAINST THE APPLICABLE COORDINATOR. IN ADDITION, PLAYERS MAY BE SUBJECT TO A GRIEVANCE AND SUSPENSION POINTS AS OUTLINED UNDER THE LEAGUE SUSPENSION POINT SYSTEM.

[(See Regs.1.04C(1) Official League Registration, 1.04E(2) Membership, 1.04E(3) Age, and 1.04F Official League Rating Program, and 2.01A(1)).]

[3.03B(3)b All other grievances must go to the appropriate League Grievance Committee or other Committee as designated in these USTA League Regulations.]

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to allow section or district coordinators to reverse matches without filing a grievance.

Rationale: The Committee specifically does not support the language "AND REVERSE MATCHES IN ACCORDANCE WITH 3.03B(4) and 3.03C(4)". We feel it's best to allow the Grievance Committee to investigate these issues and allow players to defend themselves rather than allow staff to unilaterally disqualify players or overturn matches.

7) Clarification on when NTRP Grievances can be filed

The ALC discussed the regulation proposal to clarify when an NTRP Grievance can be filed.

Following is the proposed changes to the following regulations (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

1.04F(1)g Each Sectional Association shall designate a committee to handle Self-Rate Appeals for those who appeal their assigned self-rating level. This committee may be the same, in whole or part, as the Sectional League Grievance Committee that handles NTRP Grievances. Players who appeal their rating and anyone acting on their behalf will abide by the Self-Rate Appeals Committee's decision without further right to appeal same, except that the Committee may reconsider its decision in the event there has been a clear factual error made by the Committee. Players granted an appeal of their self-rating may be subject to NTRP Grievance IF THEY FAILED TO SELF-RATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH USTA GUIDELINES OR OMITTED INFORMATION REGARDING THEIR HISTORY IN EITHER THE SELF-RATE QUESTIONNAIRE OR SELF-RATE APPEAL FORM. [based only on newly discovered or missing information not previously considered. (See General & Experiences Player Guidelines – Supplement to the NTRP Guidelines.)]

3.02E NTRP Grievance. Any grievance contending that a PLAYER FAILED TO SELF-RATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE USTA GUIDELINES OR OMITTED INFORMATION REGARDING THE PLAYER'S HISTORY [player's NTRP level is lower than their actual skill level] shall constitute an NTRP Grievance. (See Reg. 3.03E(1) Players Subject to NTRP Grievances.)

3.03A(7) Regardless of any other regulation, a league coordinator or a member of a Championship Committee may file a grievance at any time, except for Administrative Grievances[and NTRP Grievances]. (See Regs. 3.03A(2)[and 3.03E(3)]).

3.03E NTRP Grievances.

3.03E(1) Players Subject to NTRP Grievances.

3.03E(1)a Any self-rated player who HAS FAILED TO SELF-RATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE USTA GUIDELINES OR OMITTED INFORMATION REGARDING THE PLAYER'S HISTORY [is playing at an NTRP level lower than their actual skill Level] is subject to an NTRP Grievance.

3.03E(1)b If an NTRP Grievance Committee determines that the [self-rated] player has an inaccurate or inappropriate self-rating, the player shall be disqualified and have their NTRP level adjusted by the NTRP Grievance Committee. Scoring of matches played by the disqualified player, per Reg. 3.03E(6), may be administered in accordance with Reg. 3.03B(4) Scoring of Eligibility Disqualification in Local League and Reg. 3.03C(4) Scoring of Eligibility Disqualification for Championships.

3.03E(1)c The NTRP Grievance Committee may [additionally] impose other penalties against a player who has inappropriately self-rated under the League Suspension Point System. [Also, a] A captain or others who have completed, assisted, condoned or approved AN inappropriate self-rating will be subject to such penalties[as the NTRP Grievance Committee may decide, under the League Suspension Point System].

[3.03E(1)b A player with a valid NTRP Computer (C) rating or granted an Automatic Appeal (A) rating of a Computer (C) rating is not subject to an NTRP Grievance. Players 60 or over who are promoted and granted an appeal per Reg. 2.05E are also not subject to an NTRP Grievance. Any other player is subject to an NTRP Grievance including players with granted Medical Appeals.]

3.03E(2) Any league captain, coordinator or member of a Championship Committee may file an NTRP Grievance AT ANY TIME.

3.03E(3) [NTRP Grievances may be filed against a player at any time up to 48 hours after the conclusion of the Sectional Championship of the player's team, whether or not the player participated.] NTRP Grievances will not be DECIDED [accepted] at National Championships. FOR ALL CHAMPIONSHIPS AT OR BELOW THE SECTIONAL LEVEL, THE SECTIONAL ASSOCIATION MAY ADJUDICATE NTRP GRIEVANCES DURING CHAMPIONSHIPS.

3.04B(4) A copy of the Grievance Appeal Committee's written decision setting forth the basis of its decision shall be promptly sent to all [interested] parties. [and s]Such decisions shall be final and binding. The following exception shall apply: any individual [or team] suspended by [any Local, District/Area, or Sectional] A Grievance Appeal Committee for a period of 12 months or more may appeal the final decision of the Grievance Appeal Committee to the National League Grievance Appeal Committee within the deadline established by the Grievance Appeal Committee.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to only allow NTRP grievances if a player failed to self-rate in accordance with the USTA Guidelines or omitted information regarding their history in either the self-rate questionnaire or self-rate appeal form.

Rationale: The dynamics are an important part of the investigation into these issues and should still be able to be used in an NTRP Grievance investigation.

8) 1.04F(1)g. Clarification on when a player can submit a self-rate appeal

The Adult League Committee reviewed the regulation proposal clarifying when a self-rate appeal can be submitted.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

1.04F(1)g Each Sectional Association shall designate a committee to handle Self-Rate Appeals for those who appeal their assigned self-rating level WHICH SHALL BE BASED ONLY ON MISSING OR INACCURATE INFORMATION THAT OCCURRED DURING THE SELF-RATING PROCESS. This committee may be the same, in whole or part, as the Sectional League Grievance Committee that handles NTRP Grievances. Players who appeal their rating and anyone acting on their behalf will abide by the Self-Rate Appeals Committee's decision without further right to appeal. [except that the Committee may reconsider its decision in the event there has been a clear factual error made by the Committee.] Players granted an appeal of their self-rating may be subject to NTRP Grievance based only on newly discovered or missing information not previously considered. (See General & Experiences Player Guidelines– Supplement to the NTRP Guidelines.)

1.04F(1)h Valid NTRP Computer Ratings: See Valid NTRP Computer Ratings Table

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to specify that a self-rate appeal shall be based on missing or inaccurate information that occurred during the self-rating process.

Rationale: NorCal has had several instances of players needing to appeal their self-rating based on ambiguous questions in the survey, for instance: Q-2b: I can sustain short rallies and have participated in some organized match play.

9) 2.03E Team Match and Scoring – Tie-break Rule for 4-Line Leagues

The regulation proposal adding a Tie-Break Rule for 4-Line Leagues was reviewed. During the discussion it was discussed that NorCal used points per position to determine the overall match winner for our 4-line league (Adult 40).

Following is the proposed change addition (all of the language in this proposal is new):

2.03E(1) For Championships below the National Championships and local leagues that use a 4-court format (1 Singles, 3 Doubles) for Adult 40 & Over leagues, a match shall be considered valid if 2 courts, one of

those courts being line 1 doubles, have been played. In the case when only 2 courts are played and there is a 1-1 tie, the following tie break process shall be used:

- a) Sets: Loser of the fewest number of sets
- b) Games: Loser of the fewest number of games
- c) Game Winning Percentage: Total games won divided by total games played
- d) Winner of No.1 Doubles

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to add a Tie-Break Rule for 4-Line Leagues.

Rationale: NorCal already uses points per position to determine the overall match winner of the four-line league in NorCal. The proposed change will discourage play because it will make it easier to play just two of the four lines in these matches.

10) Dynamic Disqualification for Adult 65 & Over Leagues

The ALC discussed the regulation proposal to calculate dynamic ratings for Adult 65 League, making the players that play in this league subject to the dynamic disqualification process.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to calculate dynamic ratings for the Adult 65 League.

Rationale: NorCal submitted the same proposal for Adult 65s. By having the process of generating dynamic ratings for the Adult 65 League, this will encourage positive growth because players will know that their work to improve means something, and improves their confidence at being at their level because they will know that they are playing with players at the same level and that if self-rated and appealed players generate three ratings at the clearly above level, they will be required to move up to the next rating. If USTA allows the "appeal down" process, then appealed Adult 65 players should also be subject to the 3 strikes disqualification and/or grievance. While the Adult 65 League does not progress to a League Nationals, it does progress to a League National Invitational, and it is still the coveted National competition.

11) Dynamic Disqualification for Mixed Leagues

The ALC discussed the regulation proposal to calculate dynamic ratings for Mixed Leagues and include mixed exclusive players in the dynamic disqualification process.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to calculate dynamic ratings for Mixed Leagues and include mixed exclusive players in the dynamic disqualification process.

Rationale: Calculating dynamic ratings for Mixed Leagues and including mixed exclusive players in the dynamic disqualification process will help to better ensure that all mixed exclusive players are playing at the correct level.

12) 2.01C(6) Team Line-Ups. – Clarification on what to do when players are not present at the time of the match

The Committee reviewed the rule change proposal to clarify what to do when players are not present at the time of the match.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

2.01C(6) Team Line-Ups. The team captain for each team shall exchange their team line-up simultaneously [prior to the beginning of the team match] AT THE START TIME OF THE TEAM MATCH.

a) ALL PLAYERS NOT PRESENT WHEN THE LINE-UPS ARE EXCHANGED MUST BE LISTED IN THE LOWEST SINGLES OR DOUBLES POSITION. A CAPTAIN WITH MISSING PLAYERS MUST INDICATE IF THE MISSING PLAYER(S) WILL BE LISTED IN SINGLES OR DOUBLES.

b) AT THE TIME OF THE LINE-UP EXCHANGE, ANY CAPTAIN MISSING A PLAYER MUST INDICATE WHICH LINE SAID PLAYER IS LISTED. THE NON-DEFAULTING CAPTAIN MAY ADJUST HIS/HER LINE-UP.

c) IN A SPLIT MATCH, LINE-UPS MUST BE EXCHANGED BEFORE THE FIRST LINE IS PLAYED. TO AVOID A DEFAULT, IF A PLAYER IN THE LINE-UP IS NO LONGER ABLE TO PLAY, BOTH TEAMS HAVE THE OPTION TO ADJUST THEIR LINE-UP.

IN A POSTPONED MATCH, LINE-UPS STAND FOR POSITIONS THAT HAVE STARTED THEIR MATCH. OTHER POSITIONS MAY BE CHANGED INCLUDING DEFAULTED COURTS.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal on what to do when players are not present at the time of the match.

Rationale: This takes autonomy away from captains. Also, this would be hard to enforce and might get gamed by a team. This may also lead to more sportsmanship grievances. We don't think it minimizes unknown defaults as they "just happen".

13) Championship Committee Filing Grievances for Match Defaults

The Committee reviewed the proposal to allow for the Championship Committee to file a grievance when an individual match default results in a situation that may impact the championship standings.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

The Championship Committee has the authority to file a grievance when EITHER AN INDIVIDUAL MATCH OR multiple individual match default(s) are given by one team resulting in a situation that may materially impact the championship's standings. (See Regulation 3.03A(7) and 3.03D (4))

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to allow the Championship Committee to file a grievance when an individual match default results in a situation that may impact the championship standings.

Rationale: This just allows for the possibility of a grievance, which gives the committee the freedom to act when they think it necessary.

14) Captains Conduct

The ALC reviewed the proposed rule addition to address captain's conduct.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

a. CAPTAINS SHOULD CONDUCT ADMINISTRATION OF THEIR TEAM IN A CLEAR, CONCISE, FAIR AND APPROPRIATE MANNER IN COMMUNICATIONS WITH OTHER PLAYERS, OTHER CAPTAINS, AND LOCAL LEAGUE COORDINATORS.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal regarding captains conduct.

Rationale: NorCal has a captain's agreement in place. There is a concern that the proposed rule change could potentially be grounds for discrimination based on writing ability, language, etc. It is encouraged to share the NorCal captain agreement that is in the NorCal LLAR as follows when this is being discussed.

NorCal Captain agreement:

(NorCal LLAR) Captain Agreement. Team captains are responsible for knowing the ULR/LLAR and for informing all team members and spectators of their obligation to be bound by the rules. Team captains and/or their representatives at matches are responsible for not only their actions but the actions of their players and spectators. Copies of the rules may be found on the NorCal League Resources page of the USTA.com website. Failure to comply with the ULR/LLAR will not be excused on the grounds of misinformation given by a USTA staff member or volunteer.

14) Invalid Matches

The Adult League Committee reviewed the rule change proposal aiming to clarify how to handle a match where a team does not have the minimum number of players to play the majority of the lines to make it a valid match. Two options were given in the rule change proposal.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

Option 1 – Invalid matches cannot count in standings

2.01C(3) Team Match. Each team match in a local league shall consist of such number of individual matches of singles, doubles, or any combination thereof as determined by the local league. FOR EACH TEAM MATCH, A MAJORITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL MATCHES MUST ACTUALLY BE PLAYED BY THE TWO TEAMS TO CONSTITUTE A VALID MATCH.

[A] Each team must have the minimum number of players available to play the majority of individual matches. If one team does not have the minimum number of players, the opposing team will be credited with a total team default[, and will win each individual match 6-0 6-0]. If neither team has the required minimum number of players, the match shall be scored as a double team default, and neither team will receive credit for a win. IN EITHER CASE, [the case of a TOTAL team default or double team default] any MATCHES THAT CAN BE PLAYED SHALL BE, BUT THEY [individual matches actually played] will count only for NTRP ratings and eligibility for advancement and cannot count for determining standings.

[B] A SECTIONAL ASSOCIATION MAY ELECT TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURES TO ENSURE A MAJORITY OF INDIVIDUAL MATCHES ARE PLAYED WHEN THE COMBINATION OF INDIVIDUAL DEFAULTS GIVEN BY ONE OR BOTH TEAMS IN THE TEAM MATCH RESULTS, OR WOULD RESULT, IN A SITUATION WHERE THE MAJORITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL MATCHES ARE NOT PLAYED. IF NO SUCH PROCEDURES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED, THE MATCH WILL RESULT IN A TEAM DEFAULT OR DOUBLE TEAM DEFAULT AS APPLICABLE. [If both teams have the minimum number of players available to play, but the combination of individual defaults by the two teams would result in the majority of matches not being played, the teams must follow the procedure(s) established by the Sectional Association, to ensure that a majority of individual matches are played.]

[C] Each Sectional Association shall establish procedures to determine the [1)] flight standings in the event of a team default or double team default [and 2) actions to take when the combination of individual defaults given by the two teams in the team match results, or would result, in a situation where the majority of the individual matches are not played. If no such procedures have been established, the match will result in a double team default.]

2.03E Team Match and Scoring. A team match will consist of the matches as shown in the following table. The team winning the majority of individual matches will be awarded one team point at National Championships. Sectional Associations may either follow the National Championships scoring format or determine a method of awarding points in order to determine the winning team of a championship competition. For each team match, a majority of the individual matches must actually be played by the two teams to constitute a valid [team] match. The Championship Committee has the authority to determine the actions to take when the combination of individual match defaults given by the two teams in the team match would result in a situation where the majority of the individual matches would not be played.]

2.03K Team Defaults. In all championships after local league competition, a team must have a minimum number of eligible players available for play in each team match in accordance with the following table [or the entire match must be defaulted. The maximum number of positions that may be defaulted without defaulting the entire match is also noted]. When defaults are necessary, the defaults shall be determined by the defaulting team captain in accordance with the following tables: [table omitted here]

2.03K(1) THE CHAMPIONSHIP COMMITTEE HAS THE AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE THE ACTIONS TO TAKE WHEN THE COMBINATION OF INDIVIDUAL MATCH DEFAULTS GIVEN BY ONE OR BOTH TEAMS IN THE TEAM MATCH WOULD RESULT IN A SITUATION WHERE THE MAJORITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL MATCHES WOULD NOT BE PLAYED, INCLUDING THE AUTHORITY TO FILE A GRIEVANCE AGAINST A DEFAULTING TEAM AS IT DEEMS NECESSARY. [The Championship Committee has the authority to file a grievance when multiple individual match default(s) are given by one team resulting in a situation that may materially impact the championship's standings. (See *Regulation 3.03A(7)* and *3.03D(4)*)]

2.03L Scoring of Full Team Defaults. If a team defaults an entire team match for any reason [during round robin play], that team is ineligible to continue play at that championship. All matches of the

defaulting team already played shall be null and void when determining standings but will be used for individual player ratings and individual player advancement purposes. If all teams with a mathematical chance to advance have played the defaulting team in good faith, those matches shall stand as played when determining standings. The Sectional Association may impose further penalties on the defaulting team. If such penalties include a suspension from League play, they must follow the [League Suspension Point System](#), including the filing of a grievance and assessment of suspension points (See *Regulation 3.03A(7) and 3.03D(4)*).

Glossary:

Valid Match: In a team match, a majority of the individual matches must be actually played by the two teams to constitute a valid team match, per 2.03E. [For a League using Points Per Position, please refer to your Section/Local Regulations.]

Option 2 – Removing invalid match concept

2.01C(3) Team Match. Each team match in a local league shall consist of such number of individual matches of singles, doubles, or any combination thereof as determined by the local league. Each team must have the minimum number of players available to play the majority of individual matches.

(A) If one team does not have the minimum number of players, the opposing team will be credited with DEFAULTS FOR THE UNPLAYED MATCHES[, and will win each individual match 6-0 6-0].

(B) If neither team has the required minimum number of players, th[e]OSE matchES NOT PLAYED shall be scored as a double [team] default, and neither team will receive credit for a win. [In the case of a team default or double team default any individual matches actually played will count only for NTRP ratings and eligibility for advancement and cannot count for determining standings.]

[If both teams have the minimum number of players available to play, but the combination of individual defaults by the two teams would result in the majority of matches not being played, the teams must follow the procedure(s) established by the Sectional Association, to ensure that a majority of individual matches are played.]

(C) Each Sectional Association shall establish procedures to determine the [1]) flight standings in the event of a [team default or] double team default [and 2]. A SECTIONAL ASSOCIATION MAY ESTABLISH PROCEDURES TO ASSIST TEAMS [actions to take] when the combination of individual defaults given by the two teams in the team match results, or would result, in a situation where the majority of the individual matches are not played. If no such procedures have been established, the match will result in a double team default.

(D) IF A TEAM DEFAULTS AN ENTIRE TEAM MATCH FOR ANY REASON, THAT TEAM IS INELIGIBLE TO CONTINUE PLAY IN THAT LOCAL LEAGUE. ALL MATCHES OF THE DEFAULTING TEAM ALREADY PLAYED SHALL BE NULL AND VOID WHEN DETERMINING STANDINGS BUT WILL BE USED FOR INDIVIDUAL PLAYER RATINGS AND INDIVIDUAL PLAYER ADVANCEMENT PURPOSES. A GRIEVANCE MAY BE FILED BY THE APPROPRIATE LOCAL LEAGUE AGAINST A TEAM IN SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES.

2.03E Team Match and Scoring. A team match will consist of the matches as shown in the following table. The team winning the majority of individual matches will be awarded one team point at National Championships. Sectional Associations may either follow the National Championships scoring format or determine a method of awarding points in order to determine the winning team of a championship competition. [For each team match, a majority of the individual matches must actually be played by the two teams to constitute a valid team match.] The Championship Committee has the authority to determine the actions to take when the combination of individual match defaults given by the two teams in the team match would result in a situation where the majority of the individual matches would not be played.

2.03K Team Defaults. [In all championships after local league competition, a team must have a minimum number of eligible players available for play in each team match in accordance with the following table or the entire match must be defaulted. The maximum number of positions that may be defaulted without

defaulting the entire match is also noted.] When defaults are necessary, the defaults shall be determined by the defaulting team captain in accordance with the following tables: [table omitted as not relevant to this discussion and subject of another reg proposal]

2.03K(1) The Championship Committee has the authority to file a grievance when multiple individual match default(s) are given by one team resulting in a situation that may materially impact the championship's standings. (See *Regulation 3.03A(7) and 3.03D(4)*)

2.03L Scoring of Full Team Defaults. If a team defaults an entire team match for any reason during round robin play, that team is ineligible to continue play at that championship. All matches of the defaulting team already played shall be null and void when determining standings but will be used for individual player ratings and individual player advancement purposes. If all teams with a mathematical chance to advance have played the defaulting team in good faith, those matches shall stand as played when determining standings. The Sectional Association may impose further penalties on the defaulting team. If such penalties include a suspension from League play, they must follow the [League Suspension Point System](#), including the filing of a grievance and assessment of suspension points (See *Regulation 3.03A(7) and 3.03D(4)*).

Glossary:

[Invalid Match: A team match where a majority of individual matches aren't played due to defaults and/or retirements given by one or both teams. In this case, neither team will be awarded the match result for advancement purposes.]

[Valid Match: In a team match, a majority of the individual matches must be actually played by the two teams to constitute a valid team match, per 2.03E. For a League using Points Per Position, please refer to your Section/Local Regulations.]

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support either option of the rule change proposal regarding invalid matches and total team defaults.

Rationale: We believe that we passed a better rule.

16) Adaptive Strike Thresholds and Rolling Dynamic Promotion

The ALC reviewed the Adaptive Strike Thresholds and Rolling Dynamic Promotion proposal

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 5 in favor, 1 opposed and 0 abstentions to abstain from voting on the Adaptive Strike Thresholds and Rolling Dynamic Promotion proposal.

Rationale: More information is needed such as examples and what percentage of the players this would affect.

17) Retirements at Championships

The Committee discussed the proposal of having a uniform way to address retirements that occur at League Championships and the three options that were proposed.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the following option to address retirements at Championships. The Committee also suggests that National considers what happens if matches are not put on at the same time.

Teams may retire ONLY if the other semi-final is complete (all lines played).

For all National Championships and Invitationals, the USTA League allows a semi-final to retire remaining matches once the semi is clinched only if the other semi final has completed all lines. Referee, official, or site staff only may communicate with players on court.

Ensures teams play approximately the same number of total minutes on court for semi-final matches

Allows for quicker return for final and 3rd/4th place matches to begin.

Rationale: Currently, there is no rule regarding retiring at League Championships. In leagues a retirement occurs when an individual match has started and a player is unable to continue due to injury, loss of condition, emergency or refusal to play. Having a rule regarding players retiring at Championships will

make Championships run more uniformly. Having a rule that allows players to retire when the other semi-final round match is complete would give players similar amount of rest but also allow them to be able to play the finals earlier to go home earlier on the final day.

18) Computer Rated Players Being Dynamically Disqualified

The Committee discussed the proposal of including Computer rated players amongst players that could be dynamically disqualified.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

Who cannot be NTRP dynamically disqualified?

NTRP Level followed by the letter:

[C Computer Rated Players *]

M Mixed Exclusive Players **

T Tournament Exclusive Players **

Who can be NTRP dynamically disqualified?

Participants in the Adult and Mixed Divisions:

NTRP Level followed by the letter:

A Appealed – all granted appeals including

Medical and Promoted Players 60 or Over

S Self-rated Players

D Dynamic or NTRP Grievance Disqualified

Players

[C Exceptions to C year-end ratings as noted *]

C COMPUTER RATED PLAYERS

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the proposal for Computer Rated players to be subject to dynamic disqualification.

Rationale: Having Computer Rated players be subject to dynamic disqualification will help players play to the same standards. We agree with the submitted rational as follows:

For years we have heard about players or captains gaming the system in order to advance to a Championship. We have made minor change to try to combat this. The time has come to consider major changes that will not only benefit the program overall, but send a clear message to all players that the USTA is doing something about tankers, sandbaggers, cheaters or whatever we want to call them.

One thing that must always be remembered is we have a level based program. If our system gives a certain number of strikes to a computer rated player, that player is out of level and that player needs to be promoted to the next level. It should not matter if they have an A, S, D, or C. This change will be welcomed by the majority if players, especially if it is clearly explained as to why we are doing it.

19) Removal of Auto Appeal for Computer Rated Players

The proposal to remove Auto Appeals for Computer Rated Players was discussed by the Committee.

Following is the proposed change (language to be deleted in [brackets] and language to be added in ALL CAPS):

[2.05C Appeal of Year-End Ratings. Year-end NTRP valid computer rating levels may be appealed or denied through TennisLink except for 2.05D Medical Appeals.]

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal of removing auto appeals for computer rated players.

Rationale: We agree with the idea of level-based play and want to preserve the integrity of the NTRP system.

20) Processing Dynamic Disqualifications at National Championships

The ALC discussed a regulation proposal about processing Dynamic NTRP Disqualifications at National Championships. It was noted that currently no NTRP Dynamic Disqualifications are processed at National Championships.

Following is the proposed change addition (all of the language in this proposal is new):

2.04B(2) Championship NTRP Dynamic Disqualification. [There will be no NTRP Dynamic Disqualifications processed at National Championships.] THERE WILL BE NTRP DYNAMIC DISQUALIFICATIONS PROCESSED AT NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS. THEY WILL BE PROCESSED IN ACCORDANCE WITH 2.04B(2)a Players who are NTRP dynamically disqualified at any championship including Nationals will be notified by the Sectional League Coordinator or designee and have the right to a review in accordance with procedures in Reg. 2.04C NTRP Dynamic Disqualification Review Procedures. The Section shall choose one of the following options for NTRP Dynamic Disqualifications at each Sectional Championship and below:

2.04B(2)a Run dynamic calculations and produce ratings throughout the championship. Through the conclusion of the championship event, notify and disqualify any player who meets the criteria for NTRP Dynamic Disqualification and reverse appropriate matches played. (See Regs. 2.04E(2)a and b for championship scoring procedures when NTRP Dynamic Disqualifications are done throughout the championship competition.)

2.04B(2)b Run dynamic calculations after the conclusion of the championship and disqualify those players who meet the criteria for NTRP Dynamic Disqualification. Matches played will stand. (See Reg. 2.04E(2)c for championship scoring procedures when NTRP Dynamic Disqualifications are done after the conclusion of championship competition)

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal processing dynamic disqualifications at National Championships.

Rationale: NorCal is already processing dynamic disqualifications at Sectionals and support continuing this through National. This will help to keep play more fair and level based through the end of League Nationals.

21) Terminology Change from NTRP Dynamic Disqualification to NTRP Promotion

The ALC discussed a regulation proposal to change the term NTRP Dynamic Disqualification to NTRP Promotion.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal of changing the terminology from NTRP Dynamic Disqualification to NTRP Promotion.

Rationale: Changing NTRP Dynamic Disqualification to NTRP Promotion is a positive change because moving up in rating should be referred to as positive change; such as "you're improving", "you've been winning", etc.

22) Electronic Line Calling

The Committee discussed the proposal regarding allowing the sections to establish procedures for using or not using Electronic Line Calling.

Following is the proposed change addition (all of the language in this proposal is new):

2.01E - ELECTRONIC LINE CALLING - EACH SECTIONAL ASSOCIATION SHALL ESTABLISH PROCEDURES FOR USING OR NOT USING ELECTRONIC LINE CALLING SYSTEMS. IF NO SUCH PROCEDURES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED, THEN SECTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS WILL NEED TO ADHERE TO FRIEND AT COURT

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to allow sections to establish procedures for using or not using Electronic Line Calling.

Rationale: Technology is advancing and this will allow for fewer conflicts and fairness.

23) Tennislink Enhancement in Championship Setup

The ALC reviewed the request to make the adjustment to the Tennislink system to be able to use the select winner, top 3 option that is currently listed in Tennislink but not working.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the Tennislink Enhancement request to make the adjustment to the Tennislink system to be able to use the select winner, top 3 option that is currently listed in Tennislink but not working.

Rationale: Having more options is always better

24) Temporary Cancer Medical Appeal

The Committee discussed the proposal to allow for Temporary Cancer Medical Appeals

Following is the proposed change addition (all of the language in this proposal is new):

2.05E Temporary Cancer Medical Appeal- Players currently undergoing treatment from a cancer diagnosis may apply for this appeal. Players who receive a temporary medical appeal cannot advance to any National Championship. Sections and districts may choose whether or not to allow players who are granted a TCMA to participate in their section championships and below. 2.05E(1) Players must have a treatment plan that includes at least 2 items from below: Surgery that significantly limits range of motion for 9 months or more with one or more of the following: Radiation that significantly affects your endurance for 9 months or more Chemotherapy that affects your physical endurance for 9 months or more 2.05E(2) Players who are granted a Temporary Cancer Medical Appeal are subject to dynamic disqualification. They will be approved for one of the following timelines based on their treatment plan: Review dynamics after the season they are requesting to participate in. If they are producing a majority of dynamics within the NTRP level they were approved for, they can continue through the year end rating publish date as an appealed player. If not, then they must immediately move up to the appropriate level. Review dynamics at the 6 months after they start playing USTA Leagues again. If they are producing a majority of dynamics within the NTRP level they were approved for, they can continue through the year end rating publish date as an appealed player. If not, then they must immediately move up to the appropriate level. Review dynamics at year end rating time. If a majority of matches were in the NTRP level they were approved for, the Medical Appeal Committee will take another look at their dynamics to determine when their next review will take place. 2.05E(3) Players whose appeals are granted through year end rating publish date may not receive a computer rating and must continue to be an appealed player, subject to dynamic disqualification. They will remain an appeal rated player until their timeline review has concluded or dynamic disqualification moves them up, whichever comes first.

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the Temporary Cancer Medical Appeal rule change proposal

Rationale: It's important to maintain the integrity of the medical appeal system and its rule against temporary conditions. Managing a temporary rating adjustment seems overly complicated and hard to enforce. There may also be other temporary medical conditions other than cancer.

There being no further matters to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 8:59 pm.