

CAPE COD SENIOR SOFTBALL LEAGUE

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 14, 2017 BOARD MEETING

HARWICH COMMUNITY CENTER

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Rocco Annesi, John Hession, Steve Marini (via phone link), Jim McNamara, Mike McCarthy, Mike McCluskey, Dave Noonan, Bill Prodgers, Charles Salerno (Ex-Commissioner) and Commissioner Terry Moran.

BOARD MEMBER ABSENT: Van Khachadoorian

Meeting Called To Order by Commissioner Moran at 10:00 A.M.

Approval of Minutes: Dave Noonan noted that in last month's minutes a correction was needed for #6. Motion approval had 1 dissent and 0 abstentions NOT 1 abstention.

Motion made by Hession to accept the minutes of 12-10-2016 with the appropriate correction. Motion unanimously approved.

Treasurer's Report - Hession

Motion by Prodgers to accept the Treasurer's report, seconded by Noonan
Treasurer's report accepted.

Board Business and Reports:

1. Division Presidents' Report: No report from Masters, Div. 3, Div. 2. Div. 1, Jim McNamara reports that the members are concerned about the proposed division age breakdowns.

5. 2017 Applications & Division Breakdown – Moran (*a number of players were in attendance and had concerns about this whole issue, thus the reason for skipping to #5 on the Agenda*).

Currently we have 110 applications, but 10 or so are Pool Player and or Masters. Terry then read the letter that Bob Maruca sent to him. (That letter is included in its entirety at the end of these minutes). It was noted that Bob's letter that he mentioned amending the process that has been used in the past and it was stated that this was not the case. The Board is continuing to apply the process that has been used in the past. The ages in all divisions will be finalized once applications and players can apply to the Age Reassignment Committee (ARC) to play in a different division.

After extensive discussion regarding Bob's letter and the web site post by the Commissioner, the Board will continue to work with the applications as to how many teams in each division and what the divisional age brackets will look like. The discussion was very positive and elicited some good ideas. All questions and concerns were addressed until everyone in attendance indicated that they were satisfied with the process moving forward.

In reality nothing can be set until we have all the information (i.e. applications), and all are due by March 15th, to make any decisions regarding the configuration of the Divisions

which, according to our policy, will be age based with consideration of skill level. Players will still have the opportunity to play in a different division by submitting a letter to the ARC.

The Division 4 reinstatement is just a consideration and nothing is etched in stone.

Regarding new players, they will be placed in an appropriate division;

2. Fields – Salerno

Meeting with McNamara on Monday to do another pass at Baker to see what needs to be done to make it better than last year; they will also be taking care of the sprinkler system.

3. Other Field Issues – The Harwich Highway Dept. has agreed to fix up Bassett field to meet the Little League parameters.

4. Other Committee Reports:

Recruiting Committee Meeting Tuesday, Jan. 17th; we are open for any ideas.

Tournament Committee: Memorial Day Tournament. Two Divisions: 55-70 & Jim McNamara will be the Commissioner and 65-90+ with Peter Cutler as the Commissioner. There will be 48 per field. First come first serve. 5 games 12 players per team.

6. CPC Proposal – Moran

We have a meeting with the Harwich Rec Commission on January 24th to attempt to get their approval for the project. Chip Hayden contacted Mark McManus who is developing up plans for bathrooms and storage as part of the facility. The storage area would replace the existing sheds.

7. 2017 League Assignment – Moran

Charlie Salerno will take over the Rules Committee. Jim McNamara will take over the Pool Player Committee.

8. Open Session for all Players – nothing

9. Suggestion Box Review – Nothing at this time

10. Round Table – Board Members

Producers – so good to have so many players attend this meeting as it was very productive.

Annesi – leaves for Fl.

Noonan – Jim DeVoe suggested waiting until April to pursue sponsors or until we have the number of teams determined.

Chip Hayden – Could we investigate the use of banners during a game for advertisement? What are the “rules” of the town?

McNamara – We have put a lot of money into the fields –how about some extra game (this could be look at as a return on investment)

McCarthy – could we relook at the veer rule for 2nd base and maybe some type of safety rule for 3rd base?

Salerno – rules committee will definitely look at the safety rules. Bob Naylor made a video about the league that will be used as a recruiting tool.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 A.M.

Next Meeting – February 11, 2017 at 10:00 A.M

Minutes submitted by: Judy Kennedy, Recording Secretary

Letter from Bob Maruca

To members of the CCSSL Board of Directors,

I am writing to express my concern about the League's newly proposed divisional age framework for next season and beyond and the proposal's apparent inconsistency with the By-Laws of the CCSSL. The Board's proposed rule for age-based player assignments is currently posted on the League's website and may be viewed here:

<http://www.capecodseniorsoftball.com>.

ARTICLE II of the By-Laws of the CCSSL states as follows: "The Cape Cod Senior Softball League is a **competitive** slow-pitch softball league for individuals aged fifty-five (55) years and older. It is organized into multiple divisions based on players' **ages and skill levels**, and its overall purpose is to promote healthy **competition** and camaraderie in a safe and friendly environment." See, <http://www.capecodseniorsoftball.com/page/show/151250-bylaws>.

On December 15th a notice was posted on the CCSSL website stating that the Board had approved a proposal to amend the age divisions for all players in the CCSSL. In a phone conversation with Commissioner Moran concerning these proposed changes, I was told that if the amendment was approved, then as many as 25 players aged 66 or older would be assigned to D2 without exception unless they are "needed" in D1. I asked the Commissioner if the former D2 players who fall within the D1 age range would be reassigned to D1 since the no exceptions policy would seem to apply equally to these players. Commissioner Moran responded that at least four players would be "grandfathered" into D2, acknowledging that these players were placed in D2 for reasons of skill and safety. This would appear to be an inconsistent application of the newly proposed age-based divisional assignments.

I would like to know why the skill level of former D1 players, now aged 66 or older, is not being taken into consideration in their individual divisional assignments so as to maintain an appropriate competitive playing level for individual players and for the divisions to which they are assigned? This apparent double standard is obviously in conflict with ARTICLE II of the League's By-Laws and may result in adverse consequences for players, the newly formed divisions and overall membership in the League. For example, under the proposed new rule, many top players, including four top 60's Travel Team batters, would be grouped in D2 with vulnerable players who are being reassigned to D2 from D1 for reasons of skill and safety.

Commissioner Moran stated to me that work is underway to address those inconsistencies. However, it seems clear that a straight forward application of ARTICLE II of the League's By-Laws, that is, multiple divisions based on players' ages and skill levels would present the best approach to addressing the inconsistencies that result from divisions that are solely based upon a player's biological age.

I firmly believe that a strong, competitive D1 serves as the League's "Gateway" for younger players at a time in their lives when they are transitioning from their work years to retirement. The blending of younger and older players in D1 who are grouped not by age, but by skill and enthusiasm for competition, can help younger players in this time of life's transition through camaraderie and team relationships with seasoned players who have already travelled this road. I also believe that this approach to team formation will promote the goals and long term success of the Divisions, the Travel Teams and the League.

In conclusion, I am a D1 level player and I am requesting an appropriate skill level assignment. I want to be afforded the same appropriate playing level as the "grandfathered" D2 players I described above. The 65 or so player evaluations completed by D1 coaches this past season lists 12 players with a rating of 90 or better on a scale of 100. Four members of the 60's travel team, including myself, are all part of that 90 or better group. We are faced with being forced out of a division that is most appropriate to our skill level. For both skill and safety reasons, none of us feel that we should be assigned to Division 2. Before a final decision is made, I would ask that all members of the CCSSL be afforded an opportunity for input.

This could all be resolved, in my opinion, by simply making Division 1 an open competitive division, conducting tryouts and player evaluations and then allowing players who want to play at a less competitive, more age appropriate level to do so. I have yet to speak with anyone in any age level who likes the proposed changes. We need to have a policy that meets the needs of all players and assigns players to divisions based upon both age and skill, applying a standard that is consistent with the provisions of ARTICLE II of the League's current By-Laws.

Bob Maruca