

IN ATTENDANCE: S. Baranick (SB); M. Feeney (MF); J. Hansell (JH); T. Jadwin (TJ); B. Kapeller (BK); R. Schemp (RS)

### 1. WWT III

MF indicated that we have \$5,950.21 in our WWT bank account. The only outstanding expense we have left to pay is \$935 to BLD. The result is that we should be able to write out a check to WW for approximately \$5K. RS not yet arrived. *(Subsequent to Board meeting, MF indicated that there was an additional \$40 expense to BLD-20 games vs. 16 games BLD believed were played-thus adjusting total expense to BLD to \$975.)*

### 2. League First Aid Kits

TJ believes that we should provide a first aid kit for all team managers, including out of area teams. JH motioned and TJ seconded that the league purchase first aid kits for all league managers in an amount authorized NTE \$70. **Motion passed 5-0.** RS not yet arrived. JH will provide the first aid kit in his possession toward this effort. The kit he had been holding had previously been earmarked for batting practices. RS not yet arrived.

### 3. Brandon's Diner (BD) Roster For 2/29/16 Games

RS in attendance. In discussion initiated by BD manager Dan Gutierrez (DG) with SB prior to the 2/29/16 scheduled games, DG indicated that he had a couple of “maybes” on his original roster and wasn't sure exactly which players he would have for the upcoming games. DG indicated that he may have players that he wanted to add as permanent roster players to replace other players from his originally submitted roster. SB indicated to DG that these players must be equal to, in terms of skill/performance, the players that were leaving the original roster. Based on this input to DG, based on the fact that the providing of roster players was a new procedure for both out-of-area managers and league management, and based on the fact that the Board would have to ultimately approve the rating of any new players, SB gave DG the OK to use this “new” roster for games on 2/29/16. As a result of this, there were players who believed that BD used ineligible players in the 2/29/16 games, and that some form of action should be taken against the team. After much discussion, BK motioned and TJ seconded that it be acknowledged and affirmed that BD violated league policy by not informing the league that it was replacing original roster players with 3 new players to be added to its roster.

**Motion failed 3 (TJ/BK/RS) – 3 (SB/MF/JH.)**

### 4. Ineligible Player – North County (NC)

SB read to the Board an e-mail sent from Bob Miller (BM), the Manager of NC. In this e-mail, BM indicated that while complying with the Monday league request to provide birth dates for his players, he uncovered the fact that one of his players, unbeknownst to him, was under age 55 with a birth date of 11/27/62 and, therefore, not eligible to play. In confronting the player on this issue, BM indicated that the player told him that he had contacted SSUSA and that SSUSA indicated that he would be eligible to play (as a 55 year old) this year. BM indicated that he immediately removed the player, Scott Mann (SM), from his roster and would tell SM that he would be eligible to play when he turns 55 according to our league rules. BM also indicated that he was upset and embarrassed by this and that he was resigning as NC manager. It is believed that SM played a substantial amount of the fall 2015 season. RS motioned and JH seconded that NC player, Scott Mann, be immediately declared ineligible to play in the Monday league due to age, that he further be suspended from playing in the Monday league for the full fall 2016-2017 season, and that he not receive a refund of his spring 2016 league fee. **Motion passed 6-0.**

BK motioned and JH seconded that all games in which SM played and which NC won be forfeited for the record only. **Motion failed 1 (BK) - 5.**

## **FROM THIS POINT FORWARD, MF HAD LEFT THE MEETING**

### **5. Out-of-Area Players Being Placed In Pool**

Without vote, but by consensus (SB dissenting), out-of-area teams will not be permitted to place players, either new or leaving their roster, into the player pool. A major purpose of the player pool is that players in the pool be available for pickup by ALL teams. This would not be the case with players from out-of-area teams.

### **6. Out-of-Area Teams – Provisional Rating For New Players**

Without vote, but by overall consensus, new roster players for out-of-area teams will be able to play based on a provisional rating (1-6) provided by the manager, and must be rated at, or lower than, the player(s) being replaced. Such new players may play for 1, or possibly 2 games, during which the Board will review and approve/change the provisional rating on the player. If the rating, as approved by the Board, results in a higher rating (lower number), the player in question will NOT be allowed on the out-of-area roster.

### **7. Out-of-Area Player Resignation**

A question arose as to whether players resigning from out-of-area teams will fall under the existing league Player Resignation Policy. Although the general consensus of those Board members in attendance was that the policy should apply (SB dissenting), since the policy, as originally written, was written with local teams in mind, and since the full Board was not in attendance, this issue will be tabled and addressed at the next Board meeting. Should a situation occur with the attempted return of an out-of-area player to the team roster prior to the Board formally addressing this issue, the player(s) will be told they are not eligible to play until the issue has been fully dealt with by the Board.

### **8. Out-of-Area Teams Force Rank Two “1's”, Two “2's”, etc.**

BK raised the idea of requiring out-of-area teams to rate their players in the “same fashion” as local players get rated as a result of their draft position. In other words, after rating all of their players from 1-6, the out-of-area teams would be required to identify two “1's”, two “2's”, two “3's”, etc. The justification for this would be to provide another factor in helping with balance/equity for all teams. Board members felt that the idea may have merit and is worth further discussion, but that such a change, if made at all, would not be made during a season. This will remain an open item.