Officers: 

 President Jeff Schultz ’19

 Vice President Shannon Schmidt ’20

 Communications Lisa Lynch ’19 (not present)

 Secretary/Treasurer Karl Borski ’20

 Scheduling Director Jim Schlegel ’20

 Tournament Director Scott Harris ’19 (not present)

Membership and Association Representatives:

Air Force - Tim Connors Aspen - Jackie Ayers, Beth Madsen Boulder Bison/LRR - Not Present Colorado Springs - Not Present Colorado Select - Phil Harbison Durango - Jodi Roof

Hyland Hills - Not Present

New Mexico - Tom Neale Salt Lake - Shannon Schmidt Steamboat Springs - Steve Paoli Summit - Jackie Koetteritz

Telluride - Brigitte dePagter Kusuno West Elk - Wendy Buckhanan

Vail - Karl Borski CAHA - Alan McLean (VP Rec)

9:15am Roll Call / Introductions

Agenda

Website:

 Domain name expired. Original registrant (Ryan Haggerty) was primary on account and had set up on a 10 year purchase. Unable to contact registrant (left board 8 years ago). 10 Year expiration came up 4/20/19. Working on ICANN to transfer ownership. In the meantime going to purchase new Domain name and re-direct website.

Policy re:minimum time between games:

 Does it vary by age group?

 Does 19U need more time between games versus 15U and 12U?

Scheduling:

 12U Divisions-

 Last year there we more 12U teams declared prior to Scheduling Meeting (Fall) then any previous years. Decision was made to create 2 Conferences to help minimize extensive travel

Scheduling (cont’):

for this age group since often it is considered the entry level to travel hockey for most associations. Conferences were structured to geographically minimize travel.

Discussion on what to do next year. Last year Vail and West Elk did not field 12U teams resulting in lack of variety in opponents and game count. Associations were encouraged to schedule cross conference scrimmages but very little took place due to lack of availability of ice and weekends.

Agreed that doing away with conferences was the best direction but still need to address minimizing the excessive travel especially for younger ages.

Considerations included scheduling jamboree weekends (12U) where 3 teams can meet up for a four game weekend. This could result in 4 for game weekends in the season (1 home and 3 away). Challenges for areas with only a single sheet of ice. This might have to be created in the

Travel Matrix to insure game count parity. Also considering on implementing a “travel radius” to help reduce travel. This would most likely result in 1-2 associations not playing one another

during the regular season. Further discussion required but all attendees agreed that this would be the best course of action.

 Preferred to when possible 19U/15U traveling together since many smaller associations often need to double roster players.

There is a need for more 10U Jamborees with programs who have Devo/Rec groups that don’t currently play on a boys squirt team and/or creating the opportunity for these girls to play on an all girls team. Some associations incorporate 9-10 year olds into their 12U teams (often in the Mountain associations).

MSGHL (Rec) and Tier II Scheduling has been very problematic for nearly all the mountain based associations since the Aspen AA team comprise of so many MSGHL players unlike the Front Range Tier II teams which are stand alone teams. Increase cooperation between the Tier II schedulers and MSGHL is necessary in order for many players in the mountains to participate with out or limited conflict. Perhaps scheduling games earlier was discussed as well as looking at more holiday weekends since Tier II players tend to be more committing. Alan McLean advised working through Andrea Rosenthal (CAHA VP Women’s) to coordinate scheduling between the MSGHL and Tier II.

Periodic scheduling audits by associations to ensure correct information is being distributed. Colorado Hockey Hub/CAHA Sport Ngin website should be the official schedule that all members refer to. Any changes with already inputted information should be communicated immediately with all teams/associations involved. Suggestions that someone from each association monitors this. Often it’s a rinks decision to adjust a game by an hour or so ( outside our control) but clear communication still needs to be passed along.

Rule Changes:

 Last years changes lost?

 Due to a hard drive crash those changes were not recorded in Governing docs. Since then those changes have been updated and mostly pertained to double rostering rules (Limits) which were removed from the language.

Rule Changes (cont’):

48 Hour rule for cancellation not due to weather was under consideration to be increased due to a few isolated instances but the membership thought it was well managed and the need to change is unnecessary. It’s expected that the cancelling team would pick up any expenses (ie, Ice fees and/or Referees) that can not be recouped. This does not apply to hotels since most have a 48 hour cancellation policy.

Skipping the MSGHL Tournament:

 The last 2 years Tellurides 12U team who qualified for the MSGHL Playoffs could not attend due to lack of player participation (citing several different reasons). Several ideas were suggested such as probation on future participation or even paying a fine/penalty. It was agreed upon that the best action was to implement a rule that “that a withdrawal from the end of season tournament must be made on or prior to January 31st. It is assumed that by not notifying the League that all teams qualifying will attend. If an association withdraws after that date then that association will cover the cost of the next associations team based on the standings at the completion of the regular season.”

Motion: Jim Schlegel

2nd: Tim Connors

In-Favor: All

Opposed: None

Enforcement:

 During the months prior to the “opt-out” date the league will make every attempt to keep the membership informed of the withdrawal deadline including stating it during the January conference call, however it is up to every association to know and comply with the League Rules.

Front Range Growth:

 How does it look through the schedule?

The CRHL is looking to vote as early as this week to voluntarily removing checking from both Bantam and Midgets. By doing this it could have an impact on girls only hockey where often players leave boys hockey just prior to the start of the Bantam year due to the allowed checking. This could have a more national impact as USA Hockey considers the same rule.

Tier II teams and players:

 Presence of Tier II teams in the MSGHL?

There was a growing concern having Tier II teams playing in the MSGHL as they tend to dominate league play. It was mentioned that often this is done to increase game count for eligibility as well as “getting more games in”. Tier II does have their own State Tournament as well as Multi-District and then potentially US Nationals and that playing in the MSGHL playoffs just takes away from the experiences of other girls not looking to play at that level.

Rule addition:

It was decided to not allow any registered Tier II Nationally bound teams into the league however we could create a “scrimmage only division” to allow these team to attend our Fall Scheduling Meeting to schedule these games which will have no bearing on the League’s

Rule addition (cont’):

regular season standing nor the ability to participate in the end of season tournament. No association is required to participate in scheduling these games they are “opt-in only”.

Motion: Jim Schlegel

2nd: Tom Neale

In-Favor: All

Opposed: None

Limit to the number of Tier II players on an MSGHL Team?

 It was decided to not change the current rule allowing Tier II players to play on an MSGHL team nor implementing a limit. To help guard against this and to maintain the Mission of the MSGHL in being a recreational league that allows the opportunity for all girls to participate regardless of experience, the MSGHL will implement a rule stating that no MSGHL team/association will conduct a formal try-out in order to field a higher caliber team. Any association so lucky to have more than the 20 player roster rule per USA Hockey should consider fielding 2 teams.

Motion: Jackie Koetteritz

2nd: Stephen Paoli

In-Favor: All

Opposed: None

By-Law Changes:

 \*See above changes

Elections:

This was tabled until the CGHL discussion gets resolved.

President

Communications

Tournament Director

Immediate Past President - Jeff Schultz

Colorado Girls Hockey League (discussion):

 A letter was sent from Shaun Hathaway of Aspen Junior Hockey outlining the desire to with draw from the MSGHL and create a new “Colorado Only” league. Points outlined in the letter did not clearly explain the shortfalls of the MSGHL other than there are 2 out of State Associations included. The membership discussed how some of the travel concerns (stated in letter) can be addressed (see section on scheduling). Concerns of how the creation of the WCHL was created, the short falls of their inaugural season and the exclusion of several Colorado associations. This was evident when several smaller Colorado associations were unaware of this proposal. Of the associations present, Durango and Air Force had not been notified, and their standing with the CGHL was unknown at meeting time.

A roundtable discussion ensued, with all associations present offering (1) their understanding of the CGHL initiative, and (2) their position regarding joining the league.

Colorado Select Director Jesse Davis (not present at meeting) informed the CGHL that they would be joining the league, but Colorado Select President Phil Harbison stated that was unknown to him, and that Colorado Select is a board-driven organization, and that the board would make that decision. Being new to the Director position, Mr. Davis may not be aware of some of the board protocols, and Colorado Select would be re-visiting their CGHL answer.

Shannon Schmidt from Salt Lake City expressed displeasure with the CGHL, since it excludes their association.

Tom Neale from New Mexico expressed displeasure with the CGHL, noting that New Mexico has been a strong and supportive member of the MSGHL for nearly 15 years, and was troubled by the exclusion from a new league, which would have a potentially destructive impact on girls hockey in New Mexico by shutting down access to the only other girls recreational hockey in the area. Mr. Neale stated that in his 3-year involvement with the MSGHL that he found it to be a very collegial league that was always able to solve its own problems.

Jodi Roof from Durango stated that Durango had not even been included in the announcement, and accordingly were unable to offer an opinion or status of commitment.

Beth Madsen and Jackie Ayers offered information from a Q&A Beth had with Shaun prior to the meeting. Among the reasons offered for starting the CGHL were to reduce travel, increase growth at the U8 and U10 levels, and align Colorado girls hockey with CAHA objectives and state recreational playoffs.

Tim Connors of Air Force noted that they had not been informed, but countered the excessive travel argument by noting that Santa Fe was an easy trip for many, and that Air Force very much appreciated the MSGHL, and thought the level of hockey was quite good. Air Force was not in favor of the CGHL initiative.

Wendy Buckhanan of West Elk expressed consternation about the strong-arm tactics of the CGHL initiative that mirrored the approach when the WCHL was formed last year from the former CDYHL. West Elk had been a member of the CDYHL, but was excluded from the new WCHL, and had no league in which to play last season, a situation she did not wish to see repeated with the CGHL, and felt that West Elk was being forced into the CGHL to avoid an experience like West Elk had with the WCHL.

Briggite dePagter Kusuno from Telluride echoed West Elk’s concerns, and had serious reservations about the strong arm tactics they perceived as being applied to get MSGHL members to abandon the league and move to the CGHL.

Steve Paoli of Steamboat Springs discussed some reservations with the MSGHL that had to do with travel and level of play (especially at the U12 level where some teams have been dominant and resulted in impaired developmental opportunities to the lesser skilled team in lopsided games), but overall supported the inclusion of the out-of-state teams in a girls recreational girls hockey league in Colorado, and stated that the CGHL should invite New Mexico and Salt Lake City to join the proposed league.

Jackie Koetteritz and Jim Schlegel of Summit were not in favor of the new league. They noted that Summit President Chris Miller had agreed to join the CGHL, but after further discussions regarding the MSGHL and a better understanding of the current league that he was willing to withdraw that commitment. Summit questioned if some of the reasons advanced by Shaun Hathway via Beth Madsen were even league-level issues, that growth is an association-level endeavor. Mr. Schlegel stated there if there were problems with the current league that ample opportunities exist to contribute ideas to fix those problems, with two in-person meetings and ten monthly conference calls per year. Mr. Borski stated that he would be willing to look through the minutes, but that he thought it was three years since Aspen (the source of the CGHL initiative and its proponent at this meeting) was on an MSGHL conference call. Finally, Mr. Schlegel stated that the MSGHL Tournament was the best tournament he had ever seen.

Mr. McLean from CAHA countered the assertion that the CGHL aligning with CAHA for state playoff purposes by stating that is not a league issue, but a CAHA issue, and thus of no relevance. Mr. McLean noted that CAHA is the largest affiliate in the Rocky Mountain District, and as such it has contributions to make to help develop hockey beyond its own borders, and wondered whether eliminating access for programs in other states achieved that goal. Mr. McLean further noted that he spoke by phone to Randy Kanai, CAHA President, and suggested that all of the parties involved in the MSGHL/CGHL issue gather simultaneously to discuss the status of girls hockey and the CGHL initiative, whether in person or remotely via a third-party service such as GoToMeeting. He noted that CAHA had not received an application for a new league, and also expressed the opinion that girls hockey would not survive with two competing leagues.

Mr. Borski from Vail expressed dissatisfaction with the CGHL initiative, emphasizing that many of the complaints asserted against the MSGHL were isolated mostly to one association, and that such complaints are easily addressed within the format and structure of the league, but that those opportunities were not utilized by Aspen and Aspen had been largely non-participatory in the governance process.

Mr. Schultz summarized the discussion by relaying input culled from the membership over the last few days prior to the meeting, and the points advanced in the meeting. Reservations were expressed about the strong arm tactics being utilized by the CGHL, attempting to coerce associations to join by convincing them that since everyone else was joining it that they would be left behind if they did not commit. There was also a hurry to collect commitments prior to the MSGHL meeting, and not all commitments denoted in Shaun’s e-mail of May 8 were given, that one was inappropriately given and subject to review by the association, and yet another association was open to withdrawing its commitment based on further information. Mr. Schultz closed by contrasting the entre of the CGHL as being forceful, questioning the veracity of some of the assertions leveled against the MSGHL, and noting that the MSGHL is a fine league with a cooperative and inclusive approach, serving for 15 years its mission of successfully growing girls hockey in the Rocky Mountain region. He offered that any issues with league governance can be addressed at any conference call or meeting, and that the MSGHL seeks feedback both good and bad, and has always addressed issues if they are raised, and that the MSGHL’s Spring meeting is a prime opportunity to provide feedback and criticisms.

By voice vote, it was agreed by the league to postpone elections until at least the June conference call since we had run out of allotted time due to the length of the CGHL discussion.

Adjourned: 1:10pm