

**USTA NorCal Board of Directors Meeting Minutes**  
**June 19, 2013**  
**USTA NorCal Office, Alameda, California**

**USTA NorCal Board of Directors Present:** Rosie Bareis, Margie Campbell, Chris Caputo, Gordon Collins (Treasurer), Michael Cooke (President), Suzy Cosette, Christine Costamagna (Secretary), Jim Coyne, Mike Dickey (Vice President), Mark Fairchilds, Paul Kepler, Sarah Robinson, Jason Scalese, Tony Silveira (Delegate)

**Absent:** Andrea Norman

**USTA NorCal Advisory Directors:** Frank Haswell, Pam Sloan

**NorCal Staff Present:** Steve Leube, Executive Director

**Guests:** Anna Elefant. Adult Leagues Coordinator; Dale Russell, Chair, Adult Leagues Committee; Alvin Hom

**Legal Counsel:** Michael Harrison

---

**Call to Order:** Noting the presence of a quorum, Michael Cooke, President, called the meeting to order at 6:30pm. The President introduced the staff and guests. He reiterated the ground rules for the meeting. Mr. Dickey read the USTA NorCal mission statement. The President then asked for public comments which there were none.

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the May 15, 2013 Board meeting were presented for approval. On motion duly made, seconded, and carried, the minutes of the May 15, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved, as submitted.

**Executive Director Report:** Mr. Leube provided an overview of his report, a copy of which was provided in the meeting material. He noted that NorCal was #1 in membership growth during May. He commented on junior and adult membership levels.

Mr. Leube commented on the recent Diversity Training meeting and Junior Pathway meeting that occurred in New York. With respect with the junior pathway, he noted that there is a desire to have sections align on a number topics, including tournaments and earned advancement. He noted that because there is a long process in place to make changes and get approvals and that the Section Presidents are being asked that if 75% of voting strength can be obtained, there will be an agreement that 100% of the Sections will be in alignment. He commented on the formation of an ad hoc committee to look at all programming options. The Board expressed their concern about the percentage and the potential lack of flexibility and independence within Sections. It was noted that, if this were to move forward with the alignment process, no decisions would be retroactive.

Mr. Leube concluded by commenting on the upcoming Generation Gap tournament scheduled for June 22 and the Hall of Fame banquet in July. He responded to questions concerning the membership levels for 10 & Under ("Taut") and noted that there has been a philosophical shift to focus on retention.

**President Report:** The President provided his report to the Board. In addition to Mr. Leube's comments, he commented on overall marketing and the focus on membership retention.

**Delegate Report:** The Chairman called upon Mr. Silveira to provide the Delegate's report. Referring to the PowerPoint presentation provided at the meeting, Mr. Silveira began by commenting on the progress of the Membership Innovation Study Group (the "Group"). He noted that the Group was looking at membership and the evolution of information technology. He reported that the Group discussed the value proposition for USTA and this was an opportunity to concentrate on USTA's strengths. He suggested that "growth" in the mission statement might be changed to "participation." He reported that overall membership levels in 2012 declined 1.8% despite a growth of 45,000 in Taut memberships. He reported that a model of engagement is needed and the next steps include communication and listening; development of concepts into business cases and testing; learning and adaption/retesting; approving, aligning and informing. He concluded by noting that the timeline to finalize the Group's recommendations is by the Semi-Annual meeting in 2014.

The Board discussed in detail the value of programs for members and what could be offered to the membership, particularly new members to get them engaged. They further discussed marketing needs and the value of a membership.

**ROG Pathway Update:** The President called upon Ms. Campbell who provided an update concerning the ROG pathway. Ms. Campbell began by noting that she was pleased with the ROG progress and that challenges are being addressed and worked through by the ROG Committee. She commented on the major areas of concern, including requirements at each level, education of rules, diversity and consistency of tournament opportunities. She also commented on participation points, flexibility of the pathway program, and a lower cost of participation at entry level.

The Board discussed the systematic problems with the current system. Ms. Campbell offered some suggestions to the problems. The Board also discussed diversity issues. During the Board discussion, it was noted that there should be a focus on strengths, communications and marketing; education of the pathway; and consultation with the Diversity Committee.

**ROG Sportsmanship:** It was noted that sportsmanship was included in the pathway progress.

**JTT Proposal Update:** As a follow-up to the April Board meeting, the President noted that an ad hoc committee, chaired by Mr. Fairchild, was formed to gather additional information to represent the proposal to fund court renovations to the Board for consideration. Mr. Fairchild reviewed the background information researched by the committee, including number of facilities, grant money distribution, number of courts per facility, conditions for grant consideration and the engagement of contractors.

Ms. Sloan noted that USTA National assistance is **up to 20%**, that it needs to be for public use, that a letter of commitment is required for site maintenance, and that a program plan, which includes blended lines, must be submitted. The Board asked about research concerning the proposed \$15 court fee. Mr. Collins asked about the reasonableness of launching this program in 2014. He suggested a 6 court minimum, that restrooms should be mandatory, and that the team tennis program should be more

than just 2 years. The Board reiterated the sentiments about the 2 year team tennis program requirement as well as the court fee issue. Ms. Bareis suggested that the primary use of the courts should be for juniors which raised issues on how to control usage. Ms. Bareis also suggested that a timeline should be developed for a roll-out of court renovations. The Board discussed the need for liaisons at the schools and who will be responsible for programming at the sites. Mr. Caputo also suggested generating press releases surrounding the renovations.

After discussion, Mr. Fairchilds then made a motion which was seconded "to allocate up to \$500,000 to renovate selected high schedule and junior high school courts throughout the Section" which was approved – 11 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**Base Fee Intent:** In the absence of Ms. Norman, the President presented a clarification to the tournament base fee. Referring to a handout distributed at the meeting, he noted that because the current sanction rule does not specifically state that in a limited draw scenario; a tournament may only charge a base fee when the ratio of singles draw limit to doubles draw limit in a division is 2:1, the staff and Sanction and Schedule Committee would like the Board's support in clarifying this is the intent of the Base Fee Rule. A brief discussion ensued concerning the success of the base fee model. Thereafter, Mr. Kepler made the following motion which was seconded by Mr. Collins:

**RESOLVED:** That effective immediately, USTA NorCal Sanction Rule 2.D.v. be amended to clarify the Base Fee policy as follows (underlined language is proposed to be added; stricken through language is proposed to be deleted):

**2. Sanction Application.**

D. *Information provided on Online Sanction Form.*

v. *Entry fees.* Entry fees must be listed on the Online Sanction Form.

Tournaments may charge either a Base Fee or a Per Event Fee as follows:

a. *Base Fee.* A Base Fee is a flat entry fee that a player pays for playing in the tournament. One fee is charged for two or more events entered. Only tournaments that have the following characteristics are eligible to charge a Base Fee:

- The Tournament offers more than one event (for example, singles and doubles), and

- The Tournament offers the same events in all divisions (for example singles and doubles are offered in all age divisions, NTRP levels, junior tournament levels), and

- If draws are limited, the doubles draw limit is not less than one-half of the singles draw limit (for example, if the singles player draw limit is 16 players, the doubles team draw limit must be no less than 8 teams). ~~are eligible to charge a Base Fee.~~

b. *Per Event Fee.* A Per Event Fee is an entry fee that a player pays for playing in each event in a tournament.

The motion was approved- 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

**Treasurer Report:** The Chairman called upon Mr. Collins to provide a report covering NorCal's financial status. Mr. Collins noted that NorCal was financially sound and discussed the timing of revenue and expenditures hitting various line items.

**Committee Decisions:** The President noted that the Committee decisions were provided in the meeting material. He brought to the attention of the Board 2 voting items that needed approval in order to waive the challenge period. He then referred the Board to page 6 of the Committee decisions concerning the SJVTA Future Stars 2000 tournament scheduled to begin on July 13 and asked the Board to approve the tournament so that it can get posted and timely open entries. On motion duly made, seconded and carried, the Board approved the tournament – 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

The President then called upon Mr. Russell to present the 2014 USTA League calendar. Referring to the calendar in the meeting material, Mr. Russell explained the process used to establish the calendar, including input from facility owners. He noted that USTA National now requires USTA Championships to be held in the same calendar year as league play. The Board discussed the placement of certain leagues within the calendar and Mr. Russell and Ms. Elefant responded to related questions and explained the reasons for league placement. Mr. Kepler asked about the extension of a 12 week local league in order to play additional matches as well as the spacing between local leagues and post season play. Ms. Bareis raised questions concerning the number of players required to be at level.

After discussion, Ms. Robinson made a motion which was seconded by Mr. Coyne to approve the 2014 league calendar as presented. Mr. Kepler then made an amendment to extend the 18 & over season by 2 weeks to allow for additional matches which was denied by the Board. The Board then voted on the original motion to approve the 2014 league calendar which was approved-9 in favor, 4 opposed, 0 abstention.

**Unfinished Business:** Ms. Bareis nominated Ms. Sloan to fill the vacancy which was created as a result of Mr. Gill's resignation. After a brief discussion, on motion made by Ms. Bareis and seconded by Ms. Cosette, the Board approved the appointment of Ms. Sloan – 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**New Business:** None.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Christine Costamagna  
Secretary