

UAHA meeting minutes March- Final upon approval

Craig carlson joining on speakerphone
Brian herbstriit from India
Steve Stapleton and TC Lewis on Speakerphone

Meeting starts at 7:04

Approval of February minutes

SW motion to accept the minutes
Brina clements - second

approved 5
2 abstention
0 opposed]

passed

WCR sub affiliate Request

JD- give an update on where we are and who we are
presentation attached:

page 2 most important - did receive Tier I status special meeting may 19 for U14, U16 and U18

2014-15 season ups and downs - 55% utah kids make up WCR teams

MB- I dont know your organization well enough how many teams,
we approved the status for 1 team at each level.
Can Utah support the amount of teams we have?

JD- we have 1 tier team at each level approved U14, U16 and U18 - we also have a House rec roster developmental at the U16 level. In total we have the number of Utah kids at the 16 level that would make up one team, so we haven't taken any extra players from other organizations.

MB- I have heard good things about your organization Joe , I am not against it , I just think it is important to follow proper policies and procedures.

JD- I agree Matt and we have submitted everything necessary with detail, we have been completely transparent and complied with all requests from the tier committee and UAHA. We followed the Tier policy and the policies and procedures.

JD- is it safe to say we can to say that we can move forward with this at this point.

MB- Jennifer have you received everything from WCR ?

JL - I have received all information and it is complete

MB- historically the greatest fights are from initiating a new organization I don't see any rules on this.

JL- WCR fulfilled everything we asked them to do in order to obtain sub affiliate.

MB - What would the effect be on Park city? Is Park City okay with WCR having their own Sub affiliate.

Aaron Dufford- Park City agrees that WCR should have their own Sub affiliate - we have no problem with that?

MB- What if some of your players leave to play for WCR?

AD- If a player can play at that level we are happy for them to go and play. That is what we want - to develop players to move on to a better and higher level, we think of that as success.

JD- We intend to continue partnering with Park City, they have a great development model and we have enjoyed working with them.

MB- Are there guidelines currently I don't see anything?

JL- we told WCR they have to operate under Park City for one year and can apply for sub - we have the old bylaws

KS- We didnt want to go into a sub affiliate during the season. We thought we should wait until everything is complete.

SS- hopefully to go into a new sub affiliate when the rules are set

JD- I can appreciate that, However we have put a lot time and money into this and waiting for a date for new rules that we have no idea when that will come through puts us a disadvantage and is unfair.

SS- we can wait or the sub affiliate can grant the status tonight . It is within the right of the Board to approve the sub affiliate status tonight.

JM - make a motion: to approve to approve the WCR for a sub affiliate pending the letter from Park city approving the separation, subject to all bylaws and policy and procedures as all other sub affiliates

LD- The letter from PC goes to Tier Rep? once she gets it we are approved?

KS- yes

JM - motion above

BC- second

Further discussion

Favor 6
opposed 1
abstentions 0

Outliers Presentation

Scott Farrel

We got into the season late , our goal was to provide the kids with a good experience. Last year when I took over the operation , I called Steve and Mike and in no way would we stand in anyones way - we think that growth of hockey is important - development of kids and overall experience of the families to develop players in this area to compete nationally. I have been a Hockey director of 600 kids in seattle. I have been friends with Paul Taylor since I am really young. He is a good guy who had a successful organization in Texas.

we have a Clear and concise vision on where we want to go - good for everyone - went through a process of a name change to create separation from the Regulators and the New Outliers. I sat down and spoke with Joe D. and talked about the 16's teams playing games against each other.

MB- the first letter went out with the word " dissolved" what is the story with that?

SF- that was a typo that was asked to be taken out and it wasn't. We have changed the name of the organization to The Outliers.

MB- what is the story with the litigation with texas and Paul Taylor- what is the background there?

SF- Paul Taylor coming in there was a conflict between USA hockey and Pauls organization - he has never been suspended , never had his coaching card taken, I am his boss , trust me there is no one that is wanting to be done with all of this more than Paul. I acutally think it is all over now.

MB- TC is the litigation over?

TC- No its not over but I don't think it involves the ice jets at this point

JL- you provided some paperwork, my first question is your paperwork an application for tier I? or an application to run a new organization?

SF - it was meant to be a tier I application if I need to apply
I wanted to include the information for a tier I organization.

JL- a name change was when Mike holmes owned the regulators and changed it to Renegades. Changing every aspect of an organization , people who run it, operating procedures , board etc. is different than simply changing a name. We need all of the information about this new organization.

The application from last year contained different information, if we are going to have a new organization we need to know about them we don't know anything about them.

MB- we don;t have that many kids registered in the state- How can the state support another organization?

SF- I agree with that as a concept but if you can bring players in you won't have to take players from existing orgs. We have the ability to recruit players and bring them in.

MB- What are you planning on doing? What teams?

SF- We plan on only fielding a U16 tier I team this season

LD- You have academy as part of your name - do you plan on having a school or academy and possibly fielding a HS team?

SF- No , not at all - the academy is the teaching of our overall philosophy and training in hockey frankly it is just for Marketing— we aren't going to have a school - we plan on having only a U16 team this year.

MB- jennifer makes a good point - please provide the information of who's who in the organization and then we can make a decision based on the new information.

CL- You need to follow the Tier application and 3.1

JL- Per the UAHA P&P this org should have turned in ppwrk to the state by sept. 1

JM- We approved them to operate last year - why are we having this discussion? The Regulators was approved for U16 and U18 tier I teams when the other teams WCR and Junior Grizz were approved.

JL- We approved an application from Mike Holmes last year with the understanding that there was some sale pending. We never received any information on that. The tier committee feels this is a new organization.

JL- Scott what did you buy?

SF- I bought Regulators Hockey inc. LLC - The for Profit

DR- the tier I was in the non-profit , I would like to clarify so we don't end up another year from now with another one. If the Tier I was in the non- profit we should see something that proves the non- profit now belongs to Scott Farrel.

SM- we provided what was needed, we corrected before the board voted.

JL - it was contingent on a 30 day opportunity to provide information on the pending sale - I never received that. I received a contract with conflicting information on it. There are a lot of questions being asked.

JL- this is a tier I application for a U16 Tier I team, the sub affiliates have to be in good standing to be approved. Normally the process of renewal is a rubber stamp unless something has happened and the organization is not in good standing. It was stated at a previous board meeting that Mike Holmes and the Regualtors organizaiton is not currently in good standing

JE- do we know that part of that sale included the tier I , how can this board be certain what was actually sold to you without seeing the information

SW- steve sent an email with the contract?

JL- there is nothing in this that is formal that there was a clear sale , what date it happened who is what and what was sold . is there any legal documentation or state entity that recognizes the sale.

KS- how do we know what holmes sold to Mr FARrel - Jennifer is asking for some documentation of the sale of the Regulators what was sold

SS- Jennifer you have every right to ask for whatever you want

SS- they should provide the information . you have the right to see all information and understand who this organization is and bring the recommendation to the State Board/Affiliate after receiving all the information.

KS- Lets table this until april and I will get together with scott and jennifer to determine what else is needed

JL - Scott you provide the information , the Tier committee gets to see it and then recommends to the Board a decision based on that application.

State camp april 3-5
NAtionals - volunteer positions online at DIBS

Derek tournament fee funding

attached agenda -

DL - We have multiple teams traveling to district tournament, if all spots funded 6400.00 would be the total amount needed. We can use previously budgeted money to help fund this?

2500 was in the tier budget

KS- the money in the tier budget 2500, 2500 from the showcase girls - so state would be tunding \$1400.00

JL - Motion to approve the 6400.00 , with the above numbers

JE- second

7 approve
1 abstain

Affiliate fees for next year -

do we keep the fees

DR- motion to keep the fees the same
SW- second
8 approve
motion passes

Rink in south Valley

KS- Fred and Kathleen met with a senator to get all of the facts together to put together a fact finding mission - would be a huge asset for Riverton - 15 year old high school boy started this in motion, he is an amazing young man.

Mike Adamek Suspension

KS- Coach received a match penalty has appealed the suspension timeline

jan 24 - match penalty
expedited hearing - waived 7day notice
jason collected the disciplinary panelists
FEb 2 hearing was held in Ogden

Feb 5 - discp. committee finalized their decision
FEB - 9 notice of appeal and statement of appeal

Turns it back to mr Empey goes back to committee for statement

Feb. 23 got the information back from the committee

Aaron Dufford- I asked for an expedited hearing

KS- it is an annual guide so it doesn't matter when the infraction happened - you have received a lot of misinformation

Heidi Faust - we want the board to understand our feelings on this - the petition was for you to see that he has great support

KS- Do you understand that we are in process of an appeal - it has been explained to Mike and Aaron

Mike Hebert- 300 voices of Utah hockey community feel this is unfair

Jason Mull - its a process and it just takes time

Heidi - we want someone to hear our voices - the perception is that it is very unfair

KS- There is no guideline

AD - the thing that has been frustrating for me is that I feel that I failed
We need to use you guys as a voice to help us

KS- you are choosing not accept an answer

HF- you aren't giving a clear answer

JM - how long will it be until they have some clarity?

KS- We will look at documents tonight and if they are enough we can make a decision tonight

AD- I still don't understand why the Hearing wasn't expedited?

SS-Yes the board could have decided to expedite the hearing. They are following their process, could they have moved more quickly - probably - did they have to move more quickly no. There is a process that takes awhile - the board can change the decision or modify the decision.

MB- Steve just said we could have decided to expedite this hearing

TC- why would you have an expedited hearing?

MB- we were asked to do it - I think our president had the opportunity to present us with the opportunity to do an expedited hearing - the president got the information and didn't give us the opportunity.

KS- the referee in chief asked for review

TC- The process is being followed there is nothing irregular

MB- Why did the President decide on her own and not involve the rest of the board?

SS- you can discuss the process and decide if it was mishandled.

MB- motion to adjourn

SW- second

Closed meeting 8:47