RCYSL Board Meeting

March 21, 2012

St. Ignatius Parrish Center
3235 Arden Way, Sacramento, CA

Attendees: See list at end of this sheet

Note: The minutes provided below reflect discussion surrounding the slides provided in the RCYSL Board Meeting presentation. There may be instances where discussion provided below does not align to the subject provided in the specific slide referenced. It is the intention that the minutes accurately reflect discussion as it happened, in sequence, rather than aligning to a slide best suited based on topic. Direct references to slides within the presentation without discussion have been omitted from this list to eliminate redundancy. Due to the extensive round table that occurred and due to loss of pertinent information when summarizing, transcript style discussion has been provided where possible.

Meeting called to order at 7:05 p.m.

1) Disclosure given to all attendees by RCYSL President, Eileen Peebles, regarding Sac North CM's request to cease communication with the other Sac North Board members prior to the meeting.
2) Introductions
3) Agenda and guidelines
    a. Schedule for meeting (presentation page 2)
    b. Time limits established for attendees who with to speak
4) CYSA Affiliation (p.p. 12)
    a. Sac North - cited concern with RCYSL constitution violating USSF rules
        - RCYSL: Deferred to (p.p. 16)
5) RCYSL Constitution (p.p. 16)
    a. RCYSL: Clarified chain of command from RCYSL to CYSA and up
    b. SN: RSCYSL constitution and by-laws provide no verbiage that prevents partial affiliation
        - RCYSL: Re-reviewed RCYSL constitution and bylaws
6) RCYSL Oversight & Admin Concerns with Partial Affiliation (p.p. 23)
    a. SN: Requested reason for lockout of League One.
        - RCYSL: Given directive by District VI
    b. SN: Requested reason for no prior notification regarding lock out.
        - RCYSL: Registrar sent prior notification
    c. SN: Called into question the non-profit status of Natomas Soccer
        - NSC: Operates under the governance of RCYSL
    d. SN: Requested the rule in which CYSA regulation concerns uniforms
        - RCYSL: Concerns sighting confusion of parents/representation
        - SN: RCU has the same liability/uniform issue
7) RCYSL Admin & Oversight (p.p. 24-27)
    a. P.p. 24

- RCYSL: Identified a potential solution to issue surrounding governing PIM
- RCYSL: Obligated to provide CYSA with schedule of CYSA field use and Club field use
- RCYSL: Provided overview of claims process within CYSA

b. P.p. 25
- RCYSL: Registrar not allowing access to current distribution lists due to appearance of 2012 solicitation to U6 & U8

c. P.p. 26
- RCYSL: All players are under the collective auspice of CYSA
- RCYSL: Concerns with how to govern financial oversight with partial affiliation
    1. SN: CYSA collected funds can be used for Club
    2. RCYSL: Suggested obtaining CYSA approval to do so

d. P.p. 27
- RCYSL: Concerned with ability to maintain a low administrative expense burden with split affiliation scenario

8) Issues with SNSC (p.p. 28)
   a. SN: Requested definition of "we" within RCYSL
      - RCYSL: Members of Executive Board as well as Strategy Committee
9) Guidelines for Rec Play (p.p. 29-31)
   a. P.p. 30
      - Later PIM to redefine divisions
      - PIM 09.02 – Class division 1,3,4 and select became class unto itself
      - Metro Select division issues
      - Clarification of correct reference on p.p. 29
   b. P.p. 31
      - Clarification of CYSA season start and end, September to September of following year
      - RCYSL: Reason for CYSA's allowance of 8/1 start
        1. New players
        2. Tournaments
10) Kick Kat Player Time (p.p. 35)
   a. SN: (re statement on Kick Kats website with regard to parents voicing concerns over playing time)
      - Clarification: Parents have authority, coaches do not represent players to parents
      - SN: Kick Kats website is thee years old
   b. SN: All payers have played 50% of the time except in the case of extenuating circumstances and players were not subjected to tryouts
      1. SN: Followed CYSA's relaxed rules
      2. RCYSL: CYSA spring league is open and arranged differently than fall league
      3. AP: Disagreed with Sac North's previous statement regarding relaxed rules
      4. SN: Registration policy was clear, returning first
      5. RCYSL: Team selection was not per policy
      6. SN: There were a few glitches in the system; however, rules were followed to best of knowledge

7. RCYSL: Registration stats do not reflect statement made by Sac North
    - RCYSL: District Cup is the only official game where player time is monitored
c. AP Soccer: Concerned with Kick Kat arrangement creating disadvantages with competition
d. RCU: Concerned with Sac North's lack of disclosure to RCYSL CM's
e. Sac North: Intent for "developmental" team
    - Galaxy no longer in program
    - Many players wanted to play more soccer
    - Never an intent to impact RCU and create powerhouse teams

11) SNSC Development Team Timeline (p.p. 37)

a. RCYSL: Sac North minutes suggest a violation of RCYSL guidelines
    - SN: Discussion was not reality and no action was taken
    - RSC: Why take minutes?
    - SN: Discussion was off-hand
    - Other: Clarified dismissal of board members
    - SN: Minutes represented comments and no actual motions for action
    - NSC: Off record conversations within RCYSL have been initiated by Eileen in the past
    - SN: Previous month's minutes are not voted on; secretary took detailed notes
    - RSC: Were minutes reviewed?
    - SN: Minutes in RCYSL possession are different than that of official minutes, out of context
    - SN: Feels purpose of this meeting an "us" against "them" type of hostility between SN and other clubs within RCYSL
    - RCYSL: Trying to present facts
    - AP: Belief in due process
    - SN: SN was disorganized and didn't meet deadlines
    - SN: Requested where answers to questions are located in the rules
    - SN: Currently prepared to leave RCYSL after the meeting, at this time
    - SN: Exploring option of becoming a league under CYSA
    - SI: No previous knowledge of intent to partial affiliate
    - SI: SN came to meeting with notification that plan was already in motion
    - SI: Only had previous knowledge that SN was unhappy with RCYSL
    - SN: RCYSL has done nothing for U6
    - RCYSL: SN sent in a request, RCYSL is attempting to respond by bringing the two boards together
    - SN: Does not feel like a member of RCYSL, didn't receive info five says prior to meeting as promised
    - SN: RCYSL requested only one year of AGM notification
    - RCYSL: Two years were requested

12) SNSC Rec Plus for 2012 – 2013 (p.p. 40)

a. SN: Website was confidential

b. SN: Actual assessment not yet submitted to RCYSL
c. RCYSL: Must consider assessment in affiliation process

13) SNSC 2010 & 2011 AGMs (p.p. 41)
a. RCYSL: Requested AGM notices to members
b. SN: In disagreement with request

14) SNSC 2010 AGM (p.p. 43)
a. SN: All families given notice
b. RCYSL: Confirmed
c. SN: Average of 20-40 participants at AGM

15) SNSC 2010 AGM (p.p. 44)
a. RCYSL: Neither e-mail nor agenda reference changes to constitution at AGM
b. SN: Changes were limited to board members

16) SNSC 2011 AGM (p.p. 45)
a. RCYSL: Requested notice of U6 & U8 families
b. SN: Only discussion at AGM
c. RCYSL: Proper notice not given
d. SN: If out of order, will reverse changes

17) SNSC Affiliation (p.p. 46)
a. SN: Requested specifics
b. RCYSL: RCYSL did not increase fees to $12-$15 in November
c. RCYSL: RCYSL discussed a three man ref system however not passed
d. SN: $12-$15 increase was in November minutes, misinterpreted ref rule

18) Natomas (p.p. 48)
a. NSC: Was not aware of rule and did not notice families
b. NSC: RCYSL has never cared for U6
c. NSC: Do all clubs follow rules as laid out by RCYSL?
d. NSC: Is RSYSL acting on behalf of those who voted them in?
e. RCYSL: Meeting is to address all concerns
f. NSC: Would like presentation on friendlier terms
g. AP: Not fully trained and would like more feedback on AGMs
h. RCYSL: All CMs encouraged to attend CM/President Meeting

19) Referee and Coaching Programs (p.p. 53)
a. NSC: Would notice no difference in refs
b. RCYSL: Concerns with scheduling/training
c. AP: Concerns with fairness of coaches
d. SN: Agreed with difficulty in this area

20) Budget & Fundraising (p.p. 54)
a. RCYSL: Will need to cut back on spending or increase fundraising

Open Discussion:

21) RCYSL: Why remove affiliations with RCYSL?
a. SN: Discussions started prior to Sean's time
b. SN: Believes past leadership wanted to leave around the time of incorporation

22) RSC: Was assessment score used in placement?
a. SN: Intention was to be about team of family for success based on availability vs. winning

23) SN: Are affiliation requirements still the same? AGM request given to all clubs?
a. SN: Feels that they are singled out

24) SO: To clarify with NSC -

a. Recognizes that current U6 fields would need to be readdressed
b. Board voted to leave RCYSL if required to totally affiliate

25) SO: To clarify with SN –
a. Motion in 2011 to create Rec +
b. Not willing to use new name
c. Not willing to keep two sets of books
d. Willing to share assessment
e. SN reviewed PIM 09.02 prior to creating Rec +

26) RCYSL: If partial affiliation for 2012 is granted, what's SN's plan for 2013 considering SN feels that U6 & U8 was not provided services
a. SN: TBD

27) RCYSL: Would affiliation still be an issue if CYSA fees were equal to Club?
a. NSC: Declined to answer
b. SN: Yes, but would like to say that registration has become easier to process with Shannon coming on board

28) Other comments:
a. RCYSL representation failed to show last year at District VI meeting re fee changes
    - RCYSL clarified CYSA fee structure changes
b. RCYSL disclosed meeting with Club soccer to gather information
c. SN Coach/Parent: Concerned with fate of kids and urges RCYSL board to keep this in mind
d. RCYSL: However painful, RCYSL has and will continue to keep the interest of all kids in mind
e. RCYSL: Is U6/U8 partial affiliate a true split in every way? No
f. SN: $2500 was used to pay for Club
g. RSC: How will partial affiliation be managed separately?
h. SN: Based on player counts
i. Other: Why the dismissal to keep two separate books?
j. SN: Money will be used to develop, not seen as separate
k. RCYSL: Previous statement lends to no partial affiliation – fees structured equally
l. SN: Feels like SN is past the point of no return
m. AP: How will classes be insured by the proper insurance carrier and how will liability issues handled?
n. SN: Not sure at the moment
o. RCYSL: How would Rec + be dissolved?
p. SN: Not decided at this time
q. DD: Why no volunteer from SN to be coaching coordinator?
r. SN: Would prefer to run their own program
s. RCYSL: Every CM has been asked to finds a CC, etc.
t. SN: If allowed to create league in CYSA, RCYSL can interleague with SN
u. NSC: Would like to form own league
v. AP: RCYSL may consider Club
w. SN: Does not want direct competition for kids
x. RCYSL: $8/per player is equivalent of what does to CYSA
y. NSC: Would like to discuss evening with Board and get back to RCYSL tomorrow
z. RCYSL: Unclear of motivation and want of SN

aa. NSC: Would like to stay within CYSA, but would like to make comp more affordable

SN: Application to partial affiliate has been withdrawn
NSC: Application to partial affiliate has been withdrawn