

**“PROPOSED AGENDA”**  
**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**MONTANA AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION**  
6:30 p.m. – February 5, 2008  
Conference Call

1. Call to Order
2. Approve Minutes of Last Meeting
3. National Meeting Update
4. Northern Plains District
  - a. National Tournament Teams (State Playoff)
  - b. District Tournaments (Presidents Cup) Teams / High School
  - c. Hockey Weekend Across America (24 Hour Games)
  - d. 1500 Annual Fee
5. Financial Issues
  - a. Treasurers Report
  - b. Grants/Equipment Update
  - c. Costs for Mite Jamboree
6. League Issues
  - a. League Structure / Discussion Only (See attached League Formats)
  - b. 8's Under Cross Ice Tournament / Update
  - c. Game Score Sheets / Standings
  - d. Girls Tournament / Presidents Cup
7. Player Development/Festivals
8. Referee Issues
  - a. State R.I.C.
9. Other Business
  - a. Website
  - b. Red Lodge Grant
  - c. Annual Meeting / Host NPD Meeting
  - d. Next Meeting
10. Adjourn

<u>League Format Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<p>1. A-B Divisions with Team Discretion (Current Format in Bantams)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allows the associations to choose which division their teams will play.</li> <li>2. Allows for higher level of play for stronger teams.</li> <li>3. Provides a format for Tier II play downs within the state.</li> <li>4. Allows teams to play all other teams in their division across the state (due to smaller numbers).</li> <li>5. Allows associations to bid tournaments in divisions where they have teams.</li> <li>6. Year end tournament for all teams.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allows teams to "sandbag" or do the opposite (be overly optimistic in their teams abilities) and select a division for which they are either too competitive or not competitive enough</li> <li>2. May result in a shortage of teams at either division, thus requiring those teams to find games outside of the Treasure State League for appropriate competition.</li> <li>3. May require significant travel to meet league obligations for teams in extreme locations within the state.</li> </ol>
<p>2. One Division (no A-B) with A/B Tournaments decided at year end (Current Format in Pee wee &amp; Squirt)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Removes the opportunity for teams to play down for purposes of winning a division.</li> <li>2. Removes any arbitrary team placement that may be at issue between associations or MAHA.</li> <li>3. Allows for simplicity of administration by league commissioners.</li> <li>4. Promotes the establishment of more recreational teams to participate in the league.</li> <li>5. Allows all teams in the state to play the best competition available.</li> <li>6. Allows for an easy separation of teams at year end for purposes of A-B championships.</li> <li>7. Year end tournament for all teams.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires higher level teams to play teams of lesser ability over the course of the year.</li> <li>2. May require extensive travel to fulfill game requirements across the state.</li> <li>3. Tournaments may be hosted by associations with no team participating.</li> <li>4. If the number of teams is excessive, may result in arbitrary game schedules by Treasure State League commissioners (could be a positive as well).</li> </ol>

<u>League Format Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<p>3. Pre-Season Jamboree Placement Tournaments (teams participate in one weekend tournament to establish A and B divisions)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Eliminates the ability of teams to "sandbag" or otherwise compete in an improper division.</li> <li>2. Establishes a set number of teams for each division for purposes of year end tournaments.</li> <li>3. Allows higher level teams to play within their respective divisions (objective standard) at a more competitive level throughout the year.</li> <li>4. Allows for associations to establish highly competitive and tryout teams for in state play within the Treasure State league.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One additional event that all teams must attend at the beginning of the year.</li> <li>2. Some teams may not have ice or sufficient time to prepare for this tournament for an accurate reading of their ability to compete. May conflict with some players involvement in other sports activities.</li> <li>3. An additional event that must be hosted or promoted by the Treasure State league for these purposes.</li> <li>4. Unless tiering is decided (either all or none) it may not provide a format for play down to districts for national tournaments.</li> <li>5. Additional cost to the teams for attending and participating in the tournament.</li> <li>6. Depending upon the timing of the events, it may require separate scheduling conferences for each age division.</li> </ol>

<u>League Format Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<p>4. Post-Season Jamboree Placement Tournaments (in preparation for next years scheduling)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allows for an objective placement of teams into proper divisions.</li> <li>2. Removes the ability of teams to independently sandbag or select divisions that may be inappropriate for their level of play.</li> <li>3. Teams have had a significant opportunities to play over the season and accurately establish their level of play.</li> <li>4. Establishes a set number of teams for each division for purposes of year end tournaments.</li> <li>5. Allows higher level teams to play within their respective divisions (objective standard) at a more competitive level throughout the year.</li> <li>6. Allows for associations to establish highly competitive and tryout teams for in state play within the Treasure State league.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. May not be the same team next year. Associations may not have the ability to predict accurately whether this team will be the same team (due to age changes or players moving, etc.).</li> <li>2. An additional event that must be hosted or promoted by the Treasure State league for these purposes at years end.</li> <li>3. Insufficient ice facilities at years end.</li> <li>4. Unless tiering is decided (either all or none) it may not provide a format for play down to districts for national tournaments.</li> </ol>

<u>League Format Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<p>5. One division for each age group with a split or division in the middle of the year for A/B divisions</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teams would be unable to arbitrarily select a division that may be inappropriate for their level of play.</li> <li>2. The A/B designations would be based upon competitive level and higher level teams would be able to finish the season at a higher level of competition.</li> <li>3. Year end tournaments would be more competitive based upon the competition of the teams participating during the year.</li> <li>4. Depending upon the selection process that is initiated for dividing the teams, it may provide an opportunity for play downs to districts and nationals.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires an addition administrative responsibility for someone or some group of people to make a determination at the middle of the year for placement of teams into their appropriate divisions.</li> <li>2. Depending upon the procedure required for dividing teams, it may not provide for an appropriate play down for districts or nationals.</li> <li>3. Requires additional administrative scheduling requirements in the middle of the year.</li> <li>4. May interfere with the bidding process for tournaments at the A/B divisions until in the middle of the year, or may require associations to host an event without a team participating.</li> </ol>
<p>6. Arbitrary placement by Treasure State league based on non subjective criteria (example: First year Pee wee/Second year Pee wee; last years records; tier teams vs. non tier teams, etc.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Simplicity of league administration.</li> <li>2. Objective criteria for determining placement of teams.</li> <li>3. Allows associations to simplify their selection process for various teams within age divisions.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arbitrary criteria may have no relationship to the competitive level of teams selected to play in any division.</li> <li>2. Does not promote a higher level or competitive level of play.</li> <li>3. Seriously restricts the ability of some teams to play or have an opportunity to play down to a district or national tournament.</li> <li>4. Subjects the determining body to significant opportunities for criticism and debate as to the implementation of the criteria.</li> <li>5. No guarantee that the arbitrary criteria would result in fairly equivalent sizes of divisions for year end tournament play and for host associations to bid on tournaments.</li> </ol>

<u>League Format Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<p>7. Require all associations to submit at least one team in the highest level or division that is available (Minnesota/Del Ficco method) *Please see attached e-mail</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires associations to commit teams to play at the highest level of competition possible.</li> <li>2. Eliminates the opportunity for sandbagging or submitting teams to play at inappropriate levels of competition.</li> <li>3. Allows for associations to have "tryout / competitive" teams and lessor or non competitive teams participating in the league.</li> <li>4. Allows for an A/B division of teams (depending upon the number of teams).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Depending upon the number of associations available to participate, it may restrict or limit the ability to have B or C divisions and sufficient number of teams to satisfy those divisions.</li> <li>2. May simply result in all teams being in one division in any respect.</li> <li>3. Inability to predict when and where year end tournaments may be held or hosted based upon the number of teams that apply.</li> <li>4. Would require teams to submit sufficiently early in the season (when associations may not have a good indication).</li> </ol>

## Bruce Bekkedahl

---

**From:** Roger Del Fiacco [rdelfiacco@nemont.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2007 6:06 PM  
**To:** 'Kevin Funyak'; 'Montana Amateur Hockey Association'; 'Billings - Jason DiMatteo'; 'Bozeman - Kevin Stone'; 'Butte - Guy Quam'; 'Coach In Chief - Dave Dukart'; 'Director - Randy Crawford'; 'Director - Randy Crawford'; 'Director - Rich Haines'; 'Director - Rich Haines'; 'Director - Tim Hiebert'; 'GF - Donna Garton'; 'Glacier - Tony Clayton'; 'Havre - Koery Nelson'; 'Helena - Mike Voeller'; 'Hiline - Michael Eliason'; 'MAHA Registrar - Todd Porter'; 'MAHA Registrar - Todd Porter'; 'MAHA Webmaster - Glynis Gibson'; 'MC - Todd Devlin'; 'Missoula - Dave Miewald'; 'Pres Bute - Mark McGinnis'; 'Pres Hiline - Tim Volk'; 'Pres Whitefish - Kevin Jones'; Bruce Bekkedahl; 'President - Bruce Bekkedahl'; 'PW Commish - Wendy Hiebert'; 'Referee - Cory Talbott'; 'Risk Manager - Tim Sanders'; 'Treasurer - Dexter Busby'; 'Treasurer - Dexter Busby'; 'Vice President - Dianna Blom'; 'Whitefish - Marty McGill'  
**Cc:** 'Commish - Jan Hefner'; 'Chimene Dahl'; 'Dan Stremcha'; 'David Charpentier'; 'Greg Chirrick'; 'Jim Tevlin'; 'John Brewer'; 'Keith Keierleber'; 'Mike Hass'; 'Rob Gagnon'; 'Sean O'Donnell'  
**Subject:** RE: 07-08 TREASURE STATE LEAGUE TEAMS

All:

For what they're worth, I'll give you my thoughts...

As a longtime representative and advocate of AHAUS (forerunner of USA Hockey) and USA Hockey I would strongly encourage all Associations, players, coaches and parents to play all teams at the highest possible level. That will ensure that players will be pushed to their limits at every practice and they will playing against the best possible competition for their age group. We are here to develop hockey players, not win games. As a veteran coach of over 1,500 games behind the bench, I pushed my players hard, got them out of their comfort zones at practice, and yes I wanted to win every game. But I would never sacrifice player development for the sake of winning games. And that is exactly what you would be doing by playing at levels lower than warranted. You would be sacrificing long term tangible goals (developing players to be able to move up to the next level) for some fleeting short term intangible gains (trophies that get discarded because we're tired of dusting them).

That being said....

Kevin brings up a point that has plagued every district in every USA Hockey State. My personal experience has been in Minnesota (25 years +) and Colorado (4 years +) and the last 2 years in Montana. The only tangible solution I have ever seen that addresses the problem came from a District in Minnesota and I'll tell you it wasn't very popular when it began. Here's the short version:

I'll pick the PeeWee level as an example... If an association wished to participate in District (there's 8 or 10 Districts in MN) play the first team they entered had to be A level and if they had a second team they could enter it as an A or a B team (they could not enter their second team as a C team). If they had 3 or more teams they could enter the third+ teams as either an A, B or C team. Most Associations in this particular District had 3 to 8 teams at every level (Squirt, PeeWee and Bantam). This policy ensured that there would be sufficient teams at A, B and C and that no team would "sandbag" and play at a lower level just to rack up the wins. Now there were exceptions every year where an Association would not want to field an A team so they were given options: 1) field an A team and take your lumps or 2) put them in a B level and be ineligible for post season play (no playoffs, no state tournament, no nationals). They would also not be allowed to play in B Level Holiday tournaments within the District. There were some associations that took option 2. I understand that Montana does not have the team numbers that the Minnesota districts do. But this is workable and will ensure a sufficient number of A level games and players performing against the best competition.

If your season is long enough, there is one other workable option that was used in Colorado with great success. I'll use PeeWee teams again... All PeeWee teams would start out in one Pool and play the first half of the season games against every other team in the Pool. Then before the December USA Hockey Registration Deadline, the teams would be broken into A, B, and C level based on how they did in the first half season pool games. Then you would finish the season at your respective levels. Players, Coaches and Parents were unbelievably happy with this process but in Colorado we had our teams picked in August and started the first half games in September. That allowed us to get the pool games in before December USAH registration. It's probably not an option for Montana as we don't even hit the ice until October or November.

Certainly there are many more ideas out there, but these are the only ones that I've seen that have kept their eyes on the