

Directors Present: Leslie Airola-Murveit (elected Secretary at the meeting), Andrea Barnes (elected Vice President/President Elect), Collin Braun, Christine Costamagna (President), Anoosh Davoudzadeh, Mike Dickey (elected Treasurer at the meeting), Silvia Duenas-Biesler, Cheri King, Jana Klein, Damon Levy, Mylene Martin, Pam Sloan (Delegate), Caroline Sheu, Valerie Thong

Directors Absent: Mariko Fritz-Krockow, Samir Mahir and Marco Sanchez

Advisory Directors Present: Andrea Norman and David Panconi

Legal Counsel Present: Jonathan Madison

USTA NorCal Staff Present: Summer Verhoeven (Executive Director), Omar Ahmad (Director of Operations)

1. Call to Order and Introduction of New Staff

President Costamagna called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm and a roll call was conducted. She then asked Ms. Barnes to read the NorCal Mission Statement and Vision Statement.

2. Approval of Agenda

The Board considered approval of the agenda, a copy of which was distributed with the meeting packet. President Costamagna noted that she would like to add a report of the Hall of Fame Selection Committee to the Closed Session. There being no opposition, the agenda was announced and approved as amended.

3. Introduction of New Directors

President Costamagna announced the election of seven new directors: Leslie Airola-Murveit, Collin Braun, Silvia Duenas-Biesler, Jana Klein, Damon Levy, Marco Sanchez, Valerie Thong.

Mr. Davoudzadeh joined the meeting during the introduction of Directors.

Ms. King joined the meeting at the conclusion of the introduction of Directors

4. Election of Officers and General Counsel

The next order of business was the election of persons to fill the positions of Vice President/President Elect, Treasurer, and Secretary. Although the Bylaws also reference the election of a Parliamentarian, the recently approved Bylaws that will go into effect January 1, 2026 no longer require this position. The existing Bylaws also require the election of General Counsel

- Election of Treasurer: A nomination was made for Mike Dickey, who accepted the nomination. There being no other candidates, Mr. Dickey was elected Treasurer by unanimous voice vote.
- Election of Secretary: A nomination was made for Leslie Airola-Murveit, who accepted the nomination. There being no other candidates, Ms. Airola-Murveit was elected Secretary by unanimous voice vote.
- Election of Vice President/President Elect: A nomination was made for Andrea Barnes, who accepted the nomination. There being no other candidates, Ms. Barnes was elected Vice President/President Elect by unanimous voice vote.
- Election of General Counsel: A nomination was made for Jonathan Madison. President Costamagna announced that she spoke with Mr. Madison in advance of the meeting and he would like to continue serving as General Counsel. There being no other candidates, Mr. Madison was elected legal counsel by unanimous voice vote.

5. Governance Overview

Ms. Costamagna directed the Board's attention to the governance packet included with the Board materials. She focused on the role of the Director, and also noted that more training would occur at the January meeting.

6. Approval of Minutes

The Board considered approval of the minutes of the meeting held October 15, 2025. Following discussion, the following motion was duly made by Ms. King, seconded by Ms. Airola-Murveit, and **approved** by a vote of 14 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the USTA NorCal Board of Directors held October 15, 2025, are hereby approved as corrected.

7. Executive Committee Report. The following sanctions were approved by the Executive Committee by unanimous written consent effective November 20, 2025. Most sanctions were considered urgent as registration for these tournaments have start dates so close to the next board meeting, that waiting for approval would likely limit the ability of the organization to properly plan for the events.

Junior Tournament Sanctions								
Date	Level	Divisions	Events	Organizer	Director	Location	Courts	Limit
December 6	Level 7	BG12-4	Singles	Bay Club South San Francisco	Jason Thomas	Daly City	10	16
December 13-14	Level 6	BG12-16	Singles	Cudny Tennis Academy	Enny Cudny	Union City	6	8
December 21	Level 7	BG12-16	Singles	Cudny Tennis Academy	Enny Cudny	Union City	6	8

Adult Tournament Sanctions								
Date	Level	Divisions	Events	Organizer	Director	Location	Courts	Limit
Dec 12-14	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD	NextGen Sports	Lokesh Sisodiya	Lathrop	8	16
Jan 10-12	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD	NextGen Sports	Lokesh Sisodiya	Lathrop	8	16
Jan 24-25	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5	MS, WS, MD, WD	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
Feb 8	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8

Because the Advisory Directors will be participating in the reports being made during the Closed Session, Ms. Norman and Mr. Panconi remained in the room during the Closed Session.

8. Closed Session

President Costamagna announced that the Board would be going into closed session. Following the conclusion of the closed session, she announced all discussion held during the session was to remain confidential; however, it was agreed that the following would be reported in the public minutes:

- **Approval of 2024 Audit & Financial Statements.** The Board reviewed the 2024 Audit of the 2024 Financial Statements done by Moss Adams (which was recently acquired by Baker Tilly), and the Executive Committee's approval of it at a Committee meeting held on November 12, 2025. Highlights of the audit:
 - No significant unusual transactions were encountered.
 - No significant difficulties were encountered.
 - No significant disagreements arose during the course of the audit.
 - There were no circumstances that affected the form and content of the auditor's report.
 - There were no uncorrected misstatements whose effects are material to the financial statements as a whole.
 - Completion was delayed, due in large part to NorCal's transition to a new accounting platform and the needed integration and reconciliation. The USTA was advised that NorCal would submit its audited financials late, which was met with no objection.
- **Approval of 2026 Junior, Adult, Family & Wheelchair Tournament Sanctions.** The sanctions for 2026 Adult, Family & Wheelchair Tournaments and 2026 Junior and Adult Tournaments as set forth on Exhibit A, and the Levels of any Adult Tournament were authorized to be adjusted by the appropriate competition committee, as needed. Following a motion duly made by Ms. Sloan and seconded by Ms. Barnes, the motion was **approved**. The vote was 14 in favor, none opposed and no abstentions. *Legal Counsel Jonathan Madison left the meeting following Closed Session.*

Ms. Norman, Mr. Walker and Ms. Ehrenfeld returned to the meeting following the Closed Session.

9. Consent Calendar

President Costamagna directed the Board's attention to the Consent Calendar that was distributed with the meeting packet and noted that there are:

- 6 recommendations being made by the Junior Council

- 2 recommendations being made by the Adult League Committee
- 3 recommendations being made by the Adult Tournament Committee

President Costamagna explained that any Director may unilaterally request that an item be removed from the Consent Calendar for individual consideration apart from the Consent Calendar. She also noted that simple questions, clarifications, or short amounts of dialogue relative to an item on the Consent Calendar may be discussed after the motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

President Costamagna asked if any Director intended to pull any recommendation. There being no interest in doing so, a motion to adopt the Consent Calendar was duly made by Mr. Levy and seconded by Ms. Martin. Following discussion, the following motion was **approved** by a vote of 14 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: That items listed on the Consent Calendar attached as Exhibit B are hereby approved.

10. Action Item: US Gay Open

President Costamagna presented the Action Item proposed by the DEI Committee to fund the The United States Gay Open (USGO). USGO is the largest and longest-standing LGBTQ+ tournament in the world. The Gay Lesbian Tennis Federation (GLTF) has been running the tournament for the last 44 years, and in 2026, has reached out to USTA NorCal for support. After consulting with GLTF, staff believes that, with the resources USTA NorCal has, the Section can return USGO to profitability.

If approved, a NorCal staff member will be the Tournament Director in 2026, and GLTF will attempt to secure sponsorships and partnerships, so that in the long-term the event can be run without NorCal financial support. GLTF has already reserved courts at Goldman Tennis Center and San Francisco State University for the 2026 tournament, which will take place Memorial Day Weekend (May 24-26), with a pre-player party on May 23. In the future, GLTF will also be responsible for securing courts in the future.

It was noted that at a meeting held December 3, 2025, the Budget & Finance Committee determined not to support adding these funds to the 2026 Budget; however, this does not preclude it from consideration by the Board. Mr. Dickey reported the rationale of the Budget & Finance Committee's decision were twofold:

- The decision speaks more to incomplete information available at the time of the meeting, as opposed to the perceived value of supporting this tournament, the most critical of which was that the off-setting revenue was not included in the packet presented to the Budget & Finance Committee.
- This is a large amount to allocate to run one tournament.

Ms. Duenas-Biesler noted that the goal is for this to be an initial investment to ensure the tournament continues, and that it will eventually become self supporting.

President Costamagna noted a P&L that projected 250 participants with \$25K in income. The expenses are approximately \$25K, with \$5K being contributed by GLTF for the player party. The \$15K is to cover up front expenses, but that the net revenue/expenses would not have a significant impact on the budget based on 250 participants.

Following discussion, the following motion was duly made by Mr. Levy, seconded by Ms. King, and **approved** by a vote of 14 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: That, effective immediately, \$15,000 be added to the Community Programs 2026 Budget for NorCal to take over the full administration of the 2026 United States Gay Open.

RESOLVED: The Board supports in concept approving \$15,000 be added to the Community Programs 2026 Budget for NorCal to take over the full administration of the 2026 United States Gay Open provided that the net expenses are close to the net income for the event.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That should this condition be met, the Executive Committee is authorized to approve the addition of up to \$15,000 to the Community Programs 2026 Budget for this purpose.

11. Options for Junior Level 6 Tournaments Unable to Secure Referee

Ms. Norman presented the Action Item proposed by Junior Council to provide options to junior Level 6 tournaments that are struggling to find a Referee. These options have been developed based on programs working in other Sections, past history with "Dial-a-Ref" and in collaboration with the Official's Committee.

Following discussion, the following motion was duly made by Ms. Klein, seconded by Ms. King, and **approved** by a vote of 14 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: That effective January 1, 2026, the options listed on Exhibit C will be made available to Junior Level 6 Tournaments that are unable to secure an on-site Referee.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That no later than January 1, NorCal staff will create a list of individuals who are interested in and qualified to serve in the role of an On-Call Referee so that implementation of this option can begin in January 2026.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That NorCal staff will create a follow-up survey for the Tournament Director, and the On-Call Referee or Certified Official permitted to fulfill the role of Referee so that ongoing feedback can be gathered on how the program is working, and such feedback shall be reported to the Officials Committee and Junior Council.

12. Action Item: CTDW Stipends

President Costamagna directed the Board's attention to the three Action Items presented by the Community Programs, DEI and Parks & Recreation Committees. As all of these Action Items propose funds for stipends to the CTDW in the aggregate amount of \$21,000. She noted that all three proposals were submitted to the Budget & Finance Committee for review and it is in support of the proposals. She requested that the Action Items be discussed and voted on at the same time, and that the Board alternatively consider a total of \$15K for stipends, with a consolidated application process. The conditions include that a recipient must participate in a future NorCal community tennis workshop.

Ms. Sloan, who is a member of the USTA's CTDW Task Force, stated that the early bird registration deadline for a discounted registration fee has been extended through December 2025. The timeline for applying for and receiving these stipends will facilitate taking advantage of the early bird registration fee.

Following discussion, the following motion was duly made by Ms. Duenas-Biesler, seconded by Ms. Klein, and **approved** by a vote of 14 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

RESOLVED: That, effective immediately, up to \$15,000 to be added to the 2026 Community Programs budget for USTA NorCal to provide stipends \$1,000 to cover the registration fee and to offset the cost of hotel and airfare for volunteers and providers to attend at the 2026 USTA Community Development Workshop (CTDW) to be held at Grapevine, Texas.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That an application will be created by NorCal staff, which will include a request for information on how the conference will impact the attendee, and tennis participation, from which the applicants will be selected by staff and Chairs of the DEI, Community Tennis and Parks & Recreation Committees.

RESOLVED FURTHER: All recipients of the stipends will be required to submit a post-conference report as a condition of receiving the funds.

RESOLVED FURTHER: As a condition of receiving the funds, all recipients of the stipends will be asked to participate in sectional community tennis development workshops that may be scheduled.

13. Delegated Authority Decision Report

President Costamagna directed the Board's attention to the report of decisions made by Committees that were within the clearly defined scope of authority that the Board has delegated to the Committees in the applicable Committee Charters, a copy of which was distributed with the meeting packet. She noted that the report contains the following decisions:

- Consideration of 9 grievances filed with the Adult Leagues Grievance Committee
- Consideration of 1 grievance filed with the Adult Leagues Grievance Appeals Committee
- Consideration of 62 NTRP Self-Rate appeals filed with the NTRP Self-Rate Appeals Committee
- Consideration of grievances filed with the Sportsmanship Committee
- Approval of adjustments to the Combo, Combo Daytime, Mixed 55 and Adult 70 Adult League Playoff Dates by the Adult Leagues Committee
- Approval of the 2025 Captains of the Year by the Adult Leagues Committee
- Approval of the 2025 Adult Tournament Outstanding Competitor of the Year Awards by the Adult Tournament Committee

President Costamagna explained that if the Board disagrees with any action, it may consider taking further action as it deems appropriate. Following the presentation of the Report, the Directors had neither questions, comments, nor objections to the actions taken by the Committees.

14. New & Returning Organization Members

Mr. Ahmad presented the report of 3 new and 5 returning Organization Members since the last time the Board met on October 15, 2025, so that the Board may fulfill its obligation to review such report pursuant to USTA NorCal Bylaw III.D.

15. Treasurer's Report

Mr. Dickey reported that the financial statements for October 2025 were distributed with the meeting packet. The budget is favorable YTD by 526K (prior report favorable \$236K)

- Expenses unfavorable YTD by \$326K, (prior report favorable 62K)
- Revenue favorable YTD by 810K (prior report 613K)
- The forecast FY 2025 is positive, with bottom line favorable by \$683K (prior report favorable 85K),
- Expenses FY unfavorable by \$197K
- Revenue FY favorable at 881K
- Reserves increased by about 482K from the USTA Foundation (closed) and higher than expected revenue from Leagues

16. President's Report

President Costamagna highlighted the following items from her report:

- Call to Action of Directors. President Costamagna stressed that Board members are the volunteer face of USTA NorCal. Engagement is more than just attending Board meetings and Directors are asked to attend the various events being held throughout the Section.
- USTA Funding & Support. The USTA has set aside up to \$50,000 for each Section (which will need to apply) to help with coaching, several million dollars for data analytics and technology, unilateral support for addressing and handling grievances; \$3 million for coaching support, local advocacy, facilities, youth team tennis and fundraising/grants. Micro grants and facility grants will continue through 2026 and the Growth Catalyst Fund would remain active.
- Cornerstone Technology. USTA National is sharing its training platform for volunteers and staff with all USTA sections

President Costamagna encouraged the Directors to review her full report in greater detail.

17. Executive Director's Report

In addition to the NorCal program statistics and written report included in the meeting packet, Ms. Verhoeven's in-meeting presentation included the following:

- USTA Player Eligibility Policy. The USTA has adopted the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee's (USOPC) National Governing Body (NGB) Athlete Safety Policy regarding transgender participation, to provide direction regarding sex-specific USTA-sanctioned leagues, tournaments and competitions, and to ensure consistent application of eligibility guidelines across the USTA organization. The full policy is available on the USTA website.
- 2025 Section Connection Update. Approximately 225 people attended the 2025 Section Connection, along with five vendors and 18 amazing speakers who made the day both engaging and inspiring. In the evening, NorCal welcomed 150 volunteers and their guests for our Volunteer Recognition Dinner, where 32 awards were presented.

Ms. Verhoeven asked the Directors to review her written report for other important information, including important events happening during the next several months.

18. Delegate's Report

- Ms. Sloan highlighted the following items from her report:
- USTA Player Eligibility Policy. Ms. Sloan noted that her written report includes additional detail regarding the new Player Eligibility Policy and asked that if any Director receives questions that they be directed to Ms. Verhoeven to answer.
 - USTA Coaching. The USTA reports that the roll out of USTA Coaching is going as planned. 878 modules have been completed year to date and 6,000 members have registered. In 2026, money will be in a bucket to focus on high school, college and women coaches.
 - Section Employee Benefits. The Delegates are looking into the comparative benefits that are offered to the employees of the various Sections so that all Sections can be aware of the various policies in place.

19. Adjournment

Following the announcement that the next meeting will be in person on Wednesday, January 21, 2025, with no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 9:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Norman, Acting Secretary

EXHIBIT A - Approval of Tournament Sanctions

Adult Tournaments Approved								
Date	Level	Divisions	Events	Organizer	Director	Location	Courts	Limit
March 8	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
Mar 14-16	Level 6	NTRP 40+/55+ 23.0 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD	NextGen Sports	Lokesh Sisodiya	Lathrop	8	16
Mar 14-15	TBD	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
March 21	Level 7	NTRP 18+ 3.0, 4.0, 5.0	WS, WD,	Broadstone Sports Club	Chrys Atkinson	Folsom	12	8
March 22	Level 7	NTRP 18+ 2.5, 3.5, 4.5	WS, WD,	Broadstone Sports Club	Chrys Atkinson	Folsom	12	8
April 4-5	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Mission Hills Racquet and Swim Club	Max Taylor	Fremont	12	16
April 12	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
April 11-12	TBD	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
April 18-19	TBD	NTRP 40+/55+ 3.0 to 5.0 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
May 10	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
May 23-25	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD	NextGen Sports	Lokesh Sisodiya	Lathrop	8	16
May 30-31	TBD	NTRP 40+/55+ 3.0 to 5.0 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
June 7	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
June 13-14	TBD	NTRP 40+/55+ 3.0 to 5.0 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
June 27-28	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5	MS, WS, MD, WD	Sierra View Country Club	Steven Dunmore	Roseville	6	16
June 27-28	TBD	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
July 12	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
July 18-20	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD	NextGen Sports	Lokesh Sisodiya	Lathrop	8	16
July 25-26	TBD	NTRP 40+/55+ 3.0 to 5.0 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
Aug 9	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
Aug 21-23	Level 5	Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Modesto Fitness & Racquet Club	Brian Heiser	Modesto	16	64
Sept 13	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
Sept 12-14	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD	NextGen Sports	Lokesh Sisodiya	Lathrop	8	16
Sept 19-20	TBD	NTRP 40+/55+ 3.0 to 5.0 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
Sept 26-27	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5	MS, WS, MD, WD	Sierra View Country Club	Steven Dunmore	Roseville	6	16
Oct 3-4	TBD	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16

Adult Tournaments Approved								
Date	Level	Divisions	Events	Organizer	Director	Location	Courts	Limit
Oct 11	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
Oct 17-18	TBD	NTRP 40+/55+ 3.0 to 5.0 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
Nov 8	Level 7	NTRP 18+/40+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	GripSpin Tennis	Javon Montgomery	San Jose	8	8
Nov 7-8	TBD	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5 & Open	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16
Nov 7-9	Level 6	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.0	MS, WS, MD, WD	NextGen Sports	Lokesh Sisodiya	Lathrop	8	16
Nov 21-22	TBD	NTRP 18+ 2.5 to 5.5	MS, WS, MD, WD, MX	Lafayette Tennis Club	Hunter Gallaway	Lafayette	9	16

Junior Tournaments Approved								
Date	Level	Divisions	Events	Organizer	Director	Location	Courts	Limit
March 22	Level 7	BG12-16	Singles	Acers Tennis	Katie Martin	Santa Rosa	6	8
April 5	Level 7	BG12-16	Singles	Acers Tennis	Katie Martin	Santa Rosa	6	8
April 11-12	Level 6	BG12-18	Singles	Saint Mary's College	Dan Cardiff	Moraga	12	16
April 18-19	Level 6	BG12-18	Singles	Moraga Country Club	Thomas McGee	Moraga	10	16
April 25-26	Level 6	BG12-18	Singles	Saint Mary's College	Dan Cardiff	Moraga	12	16
May 17	Level 7	BG12-16	Singles	Acers Tennis	Katie Martin	Santa Rosa	6	8
May 30-31	Level 6	BG12-18	Singles	Saint Mary's College	Dan Cardiff	Moraga	12	16
June 21	Level 7	BG12-16	Singles	Acers Tennis	Katie Martin	Santa Rosa	6	8
August 30	Level 7	BG12-16	Singles	Acers Tennis	Katie Martin	Santa Rosa	6	8
September 19-20	Level 6	BG12-18	Singles	Moraga Country Club	Thomas McGee	Moraga	10	16
September 20	Level 7	BG12-16	Singles	Acers Tennis	Katie Martin	Santa Rosa	6	8
October 3-4	Level 6	BG12-18	Singles	Moraga Country Club	Thomas McGee	Moraga	10	16
October 17-18	Level 6	BG12-18	Singles	Saint Mary's College	Dan Cardiff	Moraga	12	16
October 18	Level 7	BG12-16	Singles	Acers Tennis	Katie Martin	Santa Rosa	6	8

This document contains all committee recommendations made (or not included) since the previous board meeting on October 15, 2025.

Junior Tennis Council

- 1. USTA National Doubles Championship Quota.** Approved at a meeting held October 27, 2025, by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That, effective immediately, the quota policy for the USTA National Doubles Championship will be amended as set forth below (underlined language is proposed to be added; stricken-through language is proposed to be deleted):

USTA National Doubles Championship: The USTA National Doubles Championship accepts one quota team from each Sectional Association into each division (Boys' and Girls' 14, 16, and 18 divisions), provided a timely entry has been submitted.

- NorCal will place the doubles teams finishing 1st through 4th place at the June Sectional Championships in these divisions on its quota lists in place finish order.
- A team comprising at least one of the players in the top four finishing teams ~~may submit a request to appear on the quota list with another player. These teams~~ will be listed below any place finish teams in an order to be determined by the combined doubles rank of the players comprising the team.
- A team comprising any two players with NorCal residency ~~may submit a request to appear on the quota list. These teams~~ will be listed below all other teams in an order to be determined by the combined doubles rank of the players comprising the team.
- A team comprising any one player with NorCal residency will be listed below all other teams in an order to be determined by the combined doubles rank of the players comprising the team.

The Individual Doubles Seeding List will be used to determine the doubles rankings of the players.

Rationale: Each year the USTA sanctions one doubles-only Level 1 - the USTA National Doubles Championship. Events are held in the BG18, 16 and 14 divisions. Since the inaugural tournament in 2013, the selection process has included one quota team from each Section. This process was created for a number of reasons:

1. To promote doubles play in the Sections by:
 - empowering them to create a doubles circuit with more meaning; and
 - providing a carrot for a top Sectional doubles team to advance to a USTA National Doubles Championship
2. To ensure highly ranked players of the next younger division are considered for selection
3. To permit strong players of any division and players with ITF rankings to be considered for selection.

NorCal is one of the few Sections that has taken this intent to heart and has awarded the quota spot to the June Sectionals Doubles Champions, and if that team is not playing, it can go to the successive place finishers, or to one of the finishers playing with another NorCal resident.

There are many times that a team either doesn't enter, or doesn't request to be the quota team as set forth in NorCal's policy. Additionally, there are times that, in a division, there is only a team comprised of one NorCal player and one player from another Section, and our policy prevents our Section from selecting that team. Every other Section allows for this, but prioritizes a team comprised of two players from their Section over split-Section teams. Because Andrea is the director of this Championship, she was able to give three examples of how NorCal teams are affected.

This proposed change to the Quota policy to addresses NorCal players' comparative disadvantage to other Sections, while still retaining the automatic awarding of the spot to one of our top finishers at Sectionals:

- It removes the requirement that a team request to be our quota team, and
- It permits as a last priority, for NorCal to select a team comprised of only one NorCal player.

- 2. Battle of the Sections Selection Policy.** Approved at a meeting held October 27, 2025, by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That the USTA NorCal Battle of the Sections Team Selection Policy be amended as set forth on Exhibit A (underlined language is proposed to be added; stricken-through language is proposed to be deleted).

Rationale: When the USTA created the Battle of the Sections to replace the separate 18s and 16s division Level 1 team events, NorCal established a selection policy that took into account the new WTN rating, and preserved some of the aspects of the old selection process.

Historically, NorCal has had selected players withdraw before the Battle of the Section begins, resulting in one or more alternates joining the team. Because the USTA mandates the ordering of the lineup based on WTN, this often results in an alternate disrupting the original lineup because their WTN is higher than one of the players selected based on their ranking. This also takes some of the subjectivity out of selecting a very strong younger-age division player whose ranking in a division doesn't reflect their true strength.

So that NorCal's policy is consistent with how the USTA manages the Battle of the Sections, this proposed amendment has been recommended to retain the selection of the Sectionals Champion, the highest ranked player, and one wild card, but select the remaining players based on WTN and order the alternates based on WTN, and go to the next eligible player if a previous criteria has been met.

- 3. Award Criteria for Junior Tournament Organizer of the Year.** Approved at a meeting held October 27, 2025, by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That effective immediately, the criteria for the Junior Tournament Organizer of the Year be amended as follows (underlined language is proposed to be added; stricken-through language is proposed to be deleted):

Junior Tournament Organizer of the Year:

- Organizer of 3-19 Tournaments: An organizer who has hosted at least three (3) and no more than 19 junior tournaments in the year with 95% or above average ratings from 20 or more customer reviews a minimum of an average of 4 customer reviews per tournament.
- Organizer of 20 or More Tournaments: An organizer who has hosted 20 or more junior tournaments in the year with 90% or above average ratings from a minimum of an average of 4 customer reviews per tournament.

The award can be given to multiple organizers.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the USTA NorCal staff shall be authorized to select the winners of these awards based on the approved criteria.

Rationale: This original criteria for the Junior Tournament Organizer of the Year have now been used to twice to select the Junior Tournament Organizer of the Year. When doing selections for 2025, the staff noted that it is easier for a tournament that has held fewer tournaments to receive the award than it is for an organizer that has run 20 or more. It was also noted that some organizers can earn this award with as few as an average of 2 reviews per tournament. Based on staff's recommendation, Junior Council is recommending that a two-tiered criteria be set, and based the number of required reviews on the number of tournaments held, so that all who are doing an excellent job have the opportunity for the award.

- 4. Concurrent Tournament Rule Exception for Intersectional Team Events.** Approved at a meeting held October 27, 2025, by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That, effective immediately, USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Regulation 6.D.ii. be amended as set forth below (underlined language is proposed to be added; stricken-through language is proposed to be deleted):

6. Player Entry.

D. Entry In Concurrent Tournaments.

- ii. Exceptions to Entering a ~~Concurrent~~ NorCal Junior Tournament Concurrent with and a USTA National Junior Tournament or USTA Intersectional Team Tournaments.** Entries for USTA National Junior Tournaments and USTA Intersectional Team Tournaments close approximately 3 weeks and 1 day before the tournament starts and selection for these tournaments happens approximately 3 days after the entry deadline.
 - A player that appears on the alternate list for a USTA National Junior Tournament or a USTA Intersectional Team Tournament may subsequently enter and be accepted into a NorCal Junior Tournament with overlapping dates. This applies to acceptance into the NorCal Junior Tournament at the time of selection as well as acceptance into the tournament from the alternate list after selection. Such a player may remain on the list of accepted players for the NorCal Junior Tournament and on the alternate list for a USTA National Junior Tournament or a USTA Intersectional Team Tournament until midnight on the Sunday prior to the start date of the NorCal Junior Tournament.

Before such time, the player may withdraw from the NorCal Junior Tournament to accept a place in the USTA National Junior Tournament or USTA Intersectional Team Tournament without penalty and the player is entitled to a refund as described in Regulation 25.C.ii.f.

After such time, a player may withdraw from the NorCal Junior Tournament to play in the USTA National Junior Tournament or a USTA Intersectional Team Tournament without penalty, but the player will not receive a refund.

- A player that appears on a list of selected players for a USTA Junior National Tournament or a USTA Intersectional Team Tournament and subsequently enters and is accepted into an overlapping NorCal Junior Tournament may be assessed suspension points.

Regulation 6.D.ii. Comment: The USTA Intersectional Team Tournaments are as follows:

- Level 2 Intersectional Team Tournament (called the Pacific Cup in NorCal, but may have a different name when held in another Section.)
- Level 4 Intersectional Team Tournament (called the Wild West Showdown in NorCal, but has a different name when held in another Section.)

Rationale: The NorCal Junior Tournament Regulations currently have an exception to the Concurrent Tournament Rule to permit a player to be concurrently entered in a NorCal Tournament and a USTA National Junior Tournament and withdraw without penalty until midnight on the Sunday prior to the start date of the NorCal Junior Tournament. As written this exception does not apply to the USTA Intersectional Team Tournaments, which are Sectionally-sanctioned tournaments, but for which our players compete on a team and represent NorCal. Currently there are two of such tournaments on the schedule, a Level 2 (the Pacific Cup) and a Level 4 (in NorCal called the Wild West Showdown). This proposal extends the exception to include these events.

- 5. Selection of Players in Level 6 & 7 Tournaments: Players Split into Multiple Round Robins.** Approved at a meeting held October 27, 2025, by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That, effective immediately, USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Regulation 8.A.v.a. and 8.B.iii.c.(1) and (2) be amended as set forth below to permit round robins of different sizes to be used when an event is split into multiple round robins (underlined language is proposed to be added; stricken-through language is proposed to be deleted):

8. USTA NorCal Junior Ranking Tournament Descriptions.

A. Open Level 7 Tournaments.

v. Draw Formats Permitted. The draw must be one of the following formats:

a. Round Robin. One of the following round robin formats may be used:

- One round robin of 4 or 5 players may be used.
- One round robin of more than 5 players may be used whereby all players have the same number of matches, but not every player plays every other player in the round robin draw, and players play the minimum of 3 or maximum of 4 matches.
- An event may be separated into two or more round robin draws, *provided that all the round robins have ~~the same number of players~~ (a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 5 players); the round robins may have different numbers of players*. Players will be waterfalled into each draw using the most recently published National Standings List. ~~Regardless of whether there is a draw limit stated on the tournament website, if the number of entered players is not divisible by the draw size for each round robin (4 or 5, depending on what has been chosen by the Tournament Committee), not all players that enter will be selected.~~

8. USTA NorCal Junior Ranking Tournament Descriptions.

B. Open Level 6 Tournaments.

iii. Traditional Draw Format. Open Level 6 Tournaments with traditional draw formats are those that use standings to select and seed players and meet the parameters listed below.

c. Draw Formats Permitted.

(1) Round Robin. One of the following round robin formats may be used:

- One round robin of 3 or 4 players may be used.
- An event may be separated into two or more round robin draws, *provided that all the round robins have ~~the same number of players~~ (a minimum of 3 and a maximum of ~~3~~ 4 5 players); the round robins may have different numbers of players*. Players will be waterfalled into each draw using the most recently published National Standings List. ~~Regardless of whether there is a draw limit stated on the tournament website, if the number of entered players is not divisible by the draw size for each round robin (3 or 4, depending on what has been chosen by the Tournament Committee), not all players that enter will be selected.~~

Rationale: The Level 6 and Level 7 draw regulations require that when events are separated into multiple round robins, the round robins must have the same number of players. This requirement was put in place to ensure that all players would be getting the same match play opportunity in a tournament, and some players wouldn't be paying the same amount, with some playing less. While well-intended, this has led to players not being able to be selected, which at times is problematic because some players still struggle to get into a tournament on a weekend with L6s and L7s - some are have rankings too high to get into a Level 7, but are too low to get into a Level 6. This proposal removes the requirement that all round robin draw sizes be the same when an event is split into multiple draws.

- 6. Match Formats in Level 4 and 5 Doubles-Only Tournaments.** Approved at a meeting held October 27, 2025, by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: That, effective immediately, USTA NorCal Junior Tournament Regulation 8.C.ii.d. and 8.D.f. and (2) be amended as set forth below to change the match formats for Doubles-Only Level 4 and 5 Tournaments (underlined language is proposed to be added; stricken-through language is proposed to be deleted):

8. USTA NorCal Junior Ranking Tournament Descriptions.

C. Level 5 Tournaments.

ii. Level 5 Championship Doubles-Only and Mixed Doubles-Only Tournaments.

d. Match Formats. Ad scoring will be used.

(1) Round Robins. When a round robin is played, All matches will be the Best of 3 Tiebreak Sets with a 10-Point Match Tiebreak played in lieu of a 3rd set. If the score in a set reaches 6-games all, a 7-point Set Tiebreak will be played. See Regulation 21 for information on shortening match formats in the event of inclement weather, health concerns, or safety concerns.

(2) First Match Consolation. The main draw matches and playoff for 3rd place will be the Best of 3 Tiebreak Sets with a 10-Point Match Tiebreak played in lieu of a 3rd set. If the score in a set reaches 6-games all, a 7-point Set Tiebreak will be played. The consolation matches will be the Best of 3 Short Sets (4 game sets) with a 7-point Match Tiebreak played in lieu of a 3rd Set. If the score in the Short Set reaches 4-games, a 7-point Set Tiebreak will be played.

8. USTA NorCal Junior Ranking Tournament Descriptions.

D. Open Level 4 Tournaments.

ii. Open and Closed Level 4 Excellence Doubles-Only Tournaments.

f. Match Formats. Ad scoring will be used.

(1) Round Robins. When a round robin is played, All matches will be the Best of 3 Tiebreak Sets with a 10-Point Match Tiebreak played in lieu of a 3rd set. If the score in a set reaches 6-games all, a 7-point Set Tiebreak will be played. See Regulation 21 for information on shortening match formats in the event of inclement weather, health concerns, or safety concerns.

(2) First Match Consolation. The main draw matches and playoff for 3rd place will be the Best of 3 Tiebreak Sets with a 10-Point Match Tiebreak played in lieu of a 3rd set. If the score in a set reaches 6-games all, a 7-point Set Tiebreak will be played. The consolation matches will be the Best of 3 Short Sets (4 game sets) with a 7-point Match Tiebreak played in lieu of a 3rd Set. If the score in the Short Set reaches 4-games, a 7-point Set Tiebreak will be played.

Rationale: In June of this year, Junior Council proposed, and the Board approved, a change to the draw formats for the NorCal Doubles-Only Level 3, 4 and 5 tournaments. The new format at all levels is a First Match Consolation (FMC), but if 3-5 teams are entered, a Round Robin is played. When proposing these amendments, the proposal mistakenly authorized a shorter consolation format for Level 3 (short sets), but not for Level 4 and 5. The intent was for all the Level 4 and 5 Doubles-Only Tournaments to have the same format requirements as adopted for Level 3.

This proposal includes reference to a playoff for 3rd place, which is not currently required for the Level 4s and 5s. If this amendment passes, conforming changes will be made to require the 3rd place playoff.

Adult League Committee

1. Feedback on 2027 National Regulation Proposals. The proposals below are the Committee's straw votes taken at a meeting held November 11, 2025, with respect to feedback it has prepared for the USTA related to amendments the National Adult League Regulations.

A. 2.06A(3) Section Limiting number of players on a roster that are at a specific level in regard to the Move-up/Split up rule

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to clarify rule 2.06A(3) specifying that the section must suspend the At-Level regulation for one year in the SAME DIVISION, SAME AGE GROUP for any team that advanced to, or qualified for, any National Championship the previous year and chooses to move up one NTRP team level.

Rationale: This is just a clarification to the rules

B. Point Considered in Play Once the Ball is Tossed For the Serve

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to require a player to hit the ball when they toss it for their serve.

Rationale: This rule change proposal is not within the Friend at Court.

C. 2.01C(7) Rule Addition to Clarify Known and Unknown Defaults

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to add language to clarify what known and unknown defaults are and how to proceed when the defaults occur.

Rationale: The Committee does not believe we need this additional language. The proposed additional language is too complicated.

D. Generate Dynamic Ratings for Adult 65 & Over and Mixed 55 & Over Leagues

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to generate dynamic ratings for Adult 65 & Over and Mixed 55 & Over Leagues beginning the 2027 Championship year.

Rationale: NorCal submitted this proposal. By having the process of generating dynamic ratings for the Adult 65 and Mixed 55 Leagues, this will encourage positive growth because players will know that their work to improve means something, and improves their confidence at being at their level because they will know that they are playing with players at the same level and that if self-rated and appealed players generate three ratings at the clearly above level, they will be required to move up to the next rating. If USTA allows the "appeal down" process, then appealed Adult 65 and Mixed 55 players should also be subject to the 3 strikes disqualification and/or grievance. While the Adult 65 League does not progress to a League Nationals, it does progress to a League National Invitational, and it is still the coveted National competition.

E. 1.04E(2) Membership

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to require a captain to be a USTA member.

Rationale: NorCal submitted this proposal. Team captains need to be responsible for the team(s) they are captaining. All SLCs were notified on the week of May 5 at the SLC workshop, that in order to file a grievance, an individual must be 1) a paid USTA member at the time the grievance is filed and 2) must be registered for a current league in progress. Team captains should be held accountable to the rules as they are the individuals that put the teams together. They are also the individuals that can file a grievance against an individual or team.

F. 3.03B(3) Grievances pertaining to Eligibility

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to allow section or district coordinators to reverse matches without filing a grievance.

Rationale: The Committee specifically does not support the language "AND REVERSE MATCHES IN ACCORDANCE WITH 3.03B(4) and 3.03C(4)". We feel it's best to allow the Grievance Committee to investigate these issues and allow players to defend themselves rather than allow staff to unilaterally disqualify players or overturn matches.

G. Clarification on when NTRP Grievances can be filed

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to only allow NTRP grievances if a player failed to self-rate in accordance with the USTA Guidelines or omitted information regarding their history in either the self-rate questionnaire or self-rate appeal form.

Rationale: The dynamics are an important part of the investigation into these issues and should still be able to be used in an NTRP Grievance investigation.

H. 1.04F(1)g. Clarification on when a player can submit a self-rate appeal

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to specify that a self-rate appeal shall be based on missing or inaccurate information that occurred during the self-rating process.

Rationale: NorCal has had several instances of players needing to appeal their self-rating based on ambiguous questions in the survey, for instance: Q-2b: I can sustain short rallies and have participated in some organized match play.

I. 2.03E Team Match and Scoring – Tie-break Rule for 4-Line Leagues

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal to add a Tie-Break Rule for 4-Line Leagues.

Rationale: NorCal already uses points per position to determine the overall match winner of the four-line league in NorCal. The proposed change will discourage play because it will make it easier to play just two of the four lines in these matches.

J. Dynamic Disqualification for Adult 65 & Over Leagues

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to calculate dynamic ratings for the Adult 65 League.

Rationale: NorCal submitted the same proposal for Adult 65s. By having the process of generating dynamic ratings for the Adult 65 League, this will encourage positive growth because players will know that their work to improve means something, and improves their confidence at being at their level because they will know that they are playing with players at the same level and that if self-rated and appealed players generate three ratings at the clearly above level, they will be required to move up to the next rating. If USTA allows the "appeal down" process, then appealed Adult 65 players should also be subject to the 3 strikes disqualification and/or grievance. While the Adult 65 League does not progress to a League Nationals, it does progress to a League National Invitational, and it is still the coveted National competition.

K. Dynamic Disqualification for Mixed Leagues

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to calculate dynamic ratings for Mixed Leagues and include mixed exclusive players in the dynamic disqualification process.

Rationale: Calculating dynamic ratings for Mixed Leagues and including mixed exclusive players in the dynamic disqualification process will help to better ensure that all mixed exclusive players are playing at the correct level.

L. 2.01C(6) Team Line-Ups. – Clarification on what to do when players are not present at the time of the match

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal on what to do when players are not present at the time of the match.

Rationale: This takes autonomy away from captains. Also, this would be hard to enforce and might get gamed by a team. This may also lead to more sportsmanship grievances. We don't think it minimizes unknown defaults as they "just happen".

M. Championship Committee Filing Grievances for Match Defaults=

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to allow the Championship Committee to file a grievance when an individual match default results in a situation that may impact the championship standings.

Rationale: This just allows for the possibility of a grievance, which gives the committee the freedom to act when they think it necessary.

N. Captains Conduct

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the rule change proposal regarding captains conduct.

Rationale: NorCal has a captain's agreement in place. There is a concern that the proposed rule change could potentially be grounds for discrimination based on writing ability, language, etc. It is encouraged to share the NorCal captain agreement that is in the NorCal LLAR as follows when this is being discussed.

NorCal Captain agreement:

(NorCal LLAR) Captain Agreement. Team captains are responsible for knowing the ULR/LLAR and for informing all team members and spectators of their obligation to be bound by the rules. Team captains and/or their representatives at matches are responsible for not only their actions but the actions of their players and spectators. Copies of the rules may be found on the NorCal League Resources page of the USTA.com website. Failure to comply with the ULR/LLAR will not be excused on the grounds of misinformation given by a USTA staff member or volunteer.

O. Invalid Matches

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support either option of the rule change proposal regarding invalid matches and total team defaults.

Rationale: We believe that we passed a better rule.

P. Adaptive Strike Thresholds and Rolling Dynamic Promotion

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 5 in favor, 1 opposed and 0 abstentions to abstain from voting on the Adaptive Strike Thresholds and Rolling Dynamic Promotion proposal.

Rationale: More information is needed such as examples and what percentage of the players this would affect.

Q. Retirements at Championships

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the following option to address retirements at Championships. The Committee also suggests that National considers what happens if matches are not put on at the same time.

Teams may retire ONLY if the other semi-final is complete (all lines played).

For all National Championships and Invitationals, the USTA League allows a semi-final to retire remaining matches once the semi is clinched only if the other semifinal has completed all lines. Referee, official, or site staff only may communicate with players on court.

Ensures teams play approximately the same number of total minutes on court for semi-final matches
Allows for quicker return for final and 3rd/4th place matches to begin.

Rationale: Currently, there is no rule regarding retiring at League Championships. In leagues a retirement occurs when an individual match has started and a player is unable to continue due to injury, loss of condition, emergency or refusal to play. Having a rule regarding players retiring at Championships will make Championships run more uniformly. Having a rule that allows players to retire when the other semi-final round match is complete would give players similar amount of rest but also allow them to be able to play the finals earlier to go home earlier on the final day.

R. Computer Rated Players Being Dynamically Disqualified

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the proposal for Computer Rated players to be subject to dynamic disqualification.

Rationale: Having Computer Rated players be subject to dynamic disqualification will help players play to the same standards. We agree with the submitted rational as follows:

For years we have heard about players or captains gaming the system in order to advance to a Championship. We have made minor change to try to combat this. The time has come to consider major changes that will not only benefit the program overall, but send a clear message to all players that the USTA is doing something about tankers, sandbaggers, cheaters or whatever we want to call them.

One thing that must always be remembered is we have a level-based program. If our system gives a certain number of strikes to a computer rated player, that player is out of level and that player needs to be promoted to the next level. It should not matter if they have an A, S, D, or C. This change will be welcomed by the majority if players, especially if it is clearly explained as to why we are doing it.

S. Removal of Auto Appeal for Computer Rated Players

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal processing dynamic disqualifications at National Championships.

Rationale: NorCal is already processing dynamic disqualifications as Sectionals and support continuing this through National. This will help to keep play more fair and level based through the end of League Nationals.

T. Processing Dynamic Disqualifications at National Championships

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal processing dynamic disqualifications at National Championships.

Rationale: NorCal is already processing dynamic disqualifications at Sectionals and support continuing this through National. This will help to keep play more fair and level based through the end of League Nationals.

U. Terminology Change from NTRP Dynamic Disqualification to NTRP Promotion

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal of changing the terminology from NTRP Dynamic Disqualification to NTRP Promotion.

Rationale: Changing NTRP Dynamic Disqualification to NTRP Promotion is a positive change because moving up in rating should be referred to as positive change; such as "you're improving", "you've been winning", etc.

V. Electronic Line Calling

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the rule change proposal to allow sections to establish procedures for using or not using Electronic Line Calling.

Rationale: Technology is advancing and this will allow for fewer conflicts and fairness.

W. TennisLink Enhancement in Championship Setup

Following discussion, a straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to support the TennisLink Enhancement request to make the adjustment to the TennisLink system to be able to use the select winner, top 3 option that is currently listed in TennisLink but not working.

Rationale: Having more options is always better

X. Temporary Cancer Medical Appeal

A straw vote was taken with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions to not support the Temporary Cancer Medical Appeal rule change proposal

Rationale: It's important to maintain the integrity of the medical appeal system and its rule against temporary conditions. Managing a temporary rating adjustment seems overly complicated and hard to enforce. There may also be other temporary medical conditions other than cancer.

2. NorCal Nominee USTA LEAGUE NATIONAL CAPTAIN OF THE YEAR. Approved by unanimous written consent on November 30, 2025.

RESOLVED: That Carol Kim be selected as NorCal's nominee for the USTA League National Captain of the Year.

Rationale: NorCal may nominate one captain a year for the new USTA LEAGUE NATIONAL CAPTAIN OF THE YEAR award, which Nomination is due December 31. The current Committee Charter doesn't delegate the authority for selecting this nominee, because it is a new award, hence the reason it has been placed on the Consent Calendar. The Committee made its selection based on the criteria established by the USTA for this award.

Adult Tournament Committee

1. 2026 NTRP Tournament Level Designations. Approved at a meeting held November 19, 2025 meeting by a vote of 5 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions, 2 recusals (Mark Fairchilds and Brian Martinez)

RESOLVED: That the following NTRP 18+, 40+ and 55+ tournaments be designated as Level 4 (Gold Cup) for 2026

NTRP 18+

- 3/27-29 - Sutter Lawn Tennis Club - Sacramento

- 5/1-3 - USTA NorCal Parks & Recs - Fremont
- 7/3-5 - Napa Valley Tennis Association - Napa
- 7/25-26 - Operation Pride - Berkeley
- 8/29-30 - Del Norte Tennis Club - Sacramento
- 9/4-7 - Lifetime Activities - San Francisco

NTRP 40+

- 9/26-27 - Lafayette Tennis Club - Lafayette
- 6/27-29 - Operation Pride - Berkeley

NTRRP 55+

- 8/1-3 - Operation Pride - Berkeley

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the following NTRP 18+ tournaments be designated as Level 5 (Tournament of the Year) for 2026

NTRP 18+

- 6/19-21 - Laguna Creek Sports Club - Elk Grove
- 7/10-12 - USTA NorCal Parks and Recs - Stockton
- 7/17-19 - Johnson Ranch Sports Club - Roseville
- 8/15-16 - Lafayette Tennis Club - Lafayette
- 10/17-19 - Park Terrace Swim and Tennis Club - Sacramento
- 11/14-16 - Operation Pride - Berkeley

NTRP 40+

- 3/28-30 - Operation Pride - Berkeley
- 7/25-26 - Lafayette Tennis Club - Lafayette

NTRRP 55+

- 9/18-20 - Operation Pride - Berkeley

Rationale: The selection was made based on the Board-approved criteria with the tournaments meeting the criteria being considered first. The Committee considered geographic distribution, however, due to a limited number of tournaments held in the previous year that would meet the criteria, the Committee decided to designate more tournaments in the same areas that meet the criteria to give players more opportunities to play in a Level 4 and Level 5 tournament to work on their ranking. This deviates from the previously approved criteria that permits one Gold Cup tournament and one Tournament of the Year in each region. At the time the tournaments were reviewed for Level 4 and Level 5 designations, there were no tournaments that applied in other areas that met the criteria to be designated a Level 4 or a Level 5 tournament.

- 2026 Age Group Tournament Level designations.** Approved at a meeting held November 19, 2025 meeting by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions, 1 recusal (Mark Fairchilds)

RESOLVED: That the following Age Group tournament be designated level 4 and 5 for 2026

Level 4 Tournaments:

- 4/23-25 - Bay Area Senior Games - USTA NorCal - Palo Alto
- 10/23-25 - Age Division 45 - 80+ Laguna Creek Sports Club - Elk Grove

Level 5 Tournaments:

- 3/13-15 - Age Division 45 - 80+ Laguna Creek Sports Club - Elk Grove
- 5/1-3 - Age 60-80+ - USTA NorCal - Fremont
- 7/10-12 - Age 60-80+ - USTA NorCal - Stockton

Rationale: The selection was made based on the criteria with the exception that Level 5s are not team tournaments as there are no team events sanctioned.

- Increase Limit for NTRP Level 5 Event (Tournament of the Year).** Approved at a meeting held November 19, 2025 meeting by a vote of 7 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions

RESOLVED: That effective immediately, the following amendments to the Regulation #33 regarding NTRP Tournament of the Year Designations. be approved (underlined language is proposed addition, crossed out language is proposed to be removed).

- NTRP Tournament of the Year Designations.** Each year, up to 6.10 NTRP tournaments, in different regions, may be designated as a Level 5 Open: Tournament of the Year Tournament by the Adult Tournament Committee.

Each year, an Organization Member is eligible to have one tournament designated as a Level 5 Open: Tournament of the Year Tournament. Tournaments that meet the following criteria may apply for this designation:

1. Offer all divisions that qualify for the NTRP National Championships:
 - For 18 & Over Adult NTRP: singles, doubles, and mixed doubles events must be offered in the 2.5-5.5 divisions.
 - For 40 & Over Adult NTRP: singles and doubles events must be offered in the 3.0- 5.0 divisions.
 - For 55 & Over Adult NTRP: singles and doubles events must be offered in the 3.0- 5.0 divisions.
2. Draw limits must be no smaller than 16 for singles, 8 for doubles, and 8 for mixed doubles. NTRP Tournaments of the Year (TOY) are those tournaments that, after NTRP Gold Cup Series Tournaments have been designated, receive the highest average rating by participants. Tournaments that meet the following minimum criteria shall be considered first for events to be designated as TOY:
 - Applicants that have hosted at least one Level 4, 5, or 6 Tournament in the previous calendar year at least one of which received an evaluation score higher than 80% (4.0) with a minimum of 15% of the total participants completing such evaluation; and
 - Applicants with a history of compliance with all applicable USTA NorCal Tournament and Sanction Regulations.

When an applicant has organized more than one Level 4, 5, or 6 Tournament in the previous calendar year, the results of player evaluations from all such tournaments may be considered when the Adult Tournament Committee makes the designations.

Rationale: The current Regulations give the Adult Tournament Committee the ability to designate only six Level 5 Tournament of the Year. This is the same number as Level 4s. However, the USTA Adult & Family Tournament Regulations say that there should be more level 5s than level 4s. In addition, other sections offer more than six level 4s and six level 5s giving their players the ability to earn more ranking points and therefore be higher on the National Standings List. Pending the Board's approval of this amendment, the Committee will revisit Level 5 designations again in 2026 as more organizations apply to see if any returning tournaments applied for after the primary sanction period meet the criteria to be considered a Level 5 tournament.

Team Size: NorCal fields one team of 8 boys and one team of 8 girls - they compete separately at different locations. Each team will have 4 players designated as 16 Division players, and 4 players designated as 18 Division players.

Eligibility: Players must meet the USTA national age eligibility and citizenship requirements to be selected. Players must also be declared residents of USTA NorCal (per the USTA National Regulations).

Player Selection: Four boys and girls from each age division will be selected from among the timely applicants follows:

- The winner of the USTA NorCal June Sectional Championships up to 1 player
- ~~If not previously selected the~~ The player with the best standing on the most recently published USTA National Standings List of the division; however, if such player won the USTA NorCal June Sectional Championships, the player with the next best standing will be selected up to 1 player
- ~~If not previously selected the~~ The player with best World Tennis Number (WTN) as of the time of selection; however, if such player has been selected the player with the next best WTN will be selected up to 1 player
- Up to 1 Wildcard player may be selected up to 1 player
- ~~Vacancies will be filled with players from the most recently published National Standings List of the division, selected by order of standing.~~
- The remaining players will be selected using the most recently published WTN, selected by order of rating.
- Alternates will be ordered using the most recently published WTN.

Notwithstanding the selection process described above, players with a history of poor sportsmanship, including and players with a history of withdrawals and retirements, may be excluded from selection.

Team Line-Up: USTA policy governs how players are ordered; the current policy is to order the players based on WTN Unless the USTA mandates a specific lineup procedure, the lineups will be ordered as follows:

~~Players will be ordered first based on their position on the most recently published National Standings List of the division, except that;~~

- ~~Wildcard recipients will be placed in the lineup as determined by the Selection Committee; and~~
- ~~The Selection Committee may order a player higher or lower if justified by the ratings of all selected players.~~

~~Line ups will be announced to the participants as soon as possible after selection and line up order is determined.~~

~~NOTE: The USTA adopted a policy to order the players based on WTN~~

Wildcards:

- To be considered, a player must submit a timely entry to USTA NorCal no later than the entry deadline - note that this is not the tournament entry deadline by which Sections must submit their teams to the tournament, but the published deadline set by NorCal for being eligible for consideration for selection.
- Players may submit a request to be considered for a Wildcard, but this request is not required.
- The Selection Committee shall be comprised of two members of the USTA NorCal staff and Chair of Junior Council.
- Wildcards do not have to be awarded.
- There is no specific selection criteria for the Wildcards, however the purpose of awarding Wildcards (if any) shall be for NorCal to field the strongest teams possible. Notwithstanding the purpose to field a strong team, players with a history of poor sportsmanship, including a history of withdrawals, may be excluded from consideration.

USTA Board of Directors Meeting – December 10, 2025

ACTION ITEM: Options for Junior Level 6 Tournaments Unable to Secure Referee

Proposer: Andrea Norman, Chair - Junior Council

Resolutions:

RESOLVED: That effective January 1, 2026, the options listed on Exhibit A will be made available to Junior Level 6 Tournaments that are unable to secure an on-site Referee.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That no later than January 1, NorCal staff will create a list of individuals who are interested in and qualified to serve in the role of an On-Call Referee so that implementation of this option can begin in January 2025.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That NorCal staff will create a follow-up survey for the Tournament Director, and the On-Call Referee or Certified Official permitted to fulfill the role of Referee so that ongoing feedback can be gathered on how the program is working, and such feedback shall be reported to the Officials Committee and Junior Council.

Rationale: Earlier this year, NorCal staff learned of a program that has been working successfully in the Southwest Section - On-Call Referees. To address times when there is a shortage of Referees, Southwest permits an On-Call Referee at Level 5, 6 and 7, provided the Tournament Director has been trained in the Dual Role of Director and Referee, and provided efforts have been made to secure a Referee at least 6 weeks in advance of the tournament. Southwest does not have the same officials requirements as NorCal, making a word-for-word adoption of what it is doing not feasible in NorCal. Staff brought this idea to Junior Council for consideration to address the times there is a shortage of certified Referees for hire at Level 6 Tournaments.

Following the endorsement of this idea and a draft proposal by Junior Council at a meeting held in June, the draft proposal was presented to the Officials Committee at its meeting in September, which provided feedback that is incorporated into final recommended proposal. The Officials Committee voted by straw vote to endorse the concepts behind the proposal. During that meeting, Joan Vormbaum reminded the group that many years ago NorCal had a successful "Dial-a-Ref" program that was very similar to this and had the same rationale - to provide options when there was a shortage of officials. The Chair, Chris Preston, shared that he had spoken to colleagues in several other Sections who had reported they had similar programs, and they were working successfully.

The resolutions were approved at a meeting held on October 27, 2025, by a vote of 6 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

Financial Impact: None



USTA Options for Level 6 Tournaments That Are Unable to Secure an On-Site Referee

EXHIBIT A

The use of either of these options must be authorized by USTA NorCal staff. Level 6 Tournaments are not permitted to employ either option without such prior authorization.

Option 1: On-Call Referee at Junior Level 6 Tournaments

Junior Level 6 Tournaments may use an On-Call Referee provided the following conditions are met:

- The Tournament Director has completed the course to serve in the dual role of Referee and Tournament Director and will serve as the Site Referee.
- The Tournament has made a good faith effort to hire a certified Referee, which must be evidenced by solicitation of a Referee no later than 4 months before the start date of the tournament, *except that* if a tournament is sanctioned after such 4-month deadline, the sanction holder must solicit a referee within one week of being notified the sanction has been approved.
- The Minimum Officials set forth in Table 4 must be met, with the Tournament Director/On-Call Referee fulfilling one of the Certified Official requirements, and all other persons may be Approved Court Monitors.
- Tournament Director is required to be on site at all hours of tournament play.

Role of On-Call Referee & Fee:

- On-Call Referee will be paid no less than \$125 per day, unless a lower rate has been agreed to by the Sanction Holder and the Referee. In the unlikely event the Referee needs to go to the tournament site, the On-Call Referee will be paid the self-employed mileage rate as annually determined by the IRS (currently the 2025 rate is 70¢ per mile; such amount will be adjusted annually as needed).
- The On-Call Referee will be available by telephone during all hours of play to answer questions of law and to hear appeals of a unilateral default made by the Tournament Director acting in their dual role as the Site Referee. The On-Call Referee can also be consulted before any significant action is taken (such as a lateness penalty is assessed, a scoring dispute is settled) to ensure that proper procedures are followed.
- The On-Call Referee and the Tournament Director will have at least one pre-tournament meeting to review the procedures for the tournament.
- The On-Call Referee and the Tournament Director will have at least one check in call mid-day each day of the tournament and a check in call at the end of each day of play.

Option 2: Certified Official (who is not Certified as a Referee) Fulfills Role as Referee at Junior Level 6 Tournaments

Junior Level 6 Tournaments may use an USTA Certified Official (such as a rover or chair umpire) who is not certified as a Referee as its Referee provided the following conditions are met:

- The Tournament has made a good faith effort to hire a certified Referee, which must be evidenced by solicitation of a Referee no later than 4 months before the start date of the tournament, *except that* if a tournament is sanctioned after such 4-month deadline, the sanction holder must solicit a referee within one week of being notified the sanction has been approved.
- The Minimum Officials set forth in Table 4 must be met, with the USTA Certified Official serving in the role of Referee fulfilling one of the Certified Official requirements, and all other persons may be Approved Court Monitors.
- Tournament Director is required to be on site at all hours of tournament play.

Note: Persons who are not certified as a Referee will not have their work shown as Referee days worked in Officials First.