

Marino Torrens: Hello, hello, hello. Good morning. If we can please start taking our seats, we are about to start. Good morning, hello. If we can please take our seats so we can get going. Ok, good morning everyone. Thank you for joining us at the 2013 AGM. First things, the Agenda that's in your book it looks like the company copied the one from last year so the one we are doing is the one at your tables, not the one in the book. Has everybody seen it? Need to adopt the agenda? Somebody? See none. We adopt the Agenda. Tommy, Credential Reports.

Tommy Thompson: Put it up, please, Cody. Ok, total available votes this year were 6,854. We had 6,092 were validated or 88.88%. It's getting better, it can get better. A simple majority is 3,047 votes. 2/3 is 4,061. Put up the Region A totals, please, Cody, because they have an election this week. There's your Region A votes and your simple majority Region A picked up 93.57% of their votes.

Region B picked up 89.15% of their votes.

And show Region C also because they have an election and I didn't write it down. They picked up 91.38% of their votes.

And Region D, 48.48% of their votes.

Rob Stover. Is Rob here? Rob Stover's District, 100% of his votes were validated. That's the first time that's ever happened. To let you know we had 117 electronic proxies and as far as I know everybody that wanted their votes picked up, got them picked up on time. Move to adopt the Credentials report.

Member: I move to adopt the Credentials report.

Tommy Thompson: Any discussion? All in favor? Any opposed?

Marino Torrens: The next thing on the Agenda we're going to go over the procedures for the standing rules. I'm going to ask Becky McLaren to go over them, please. I get to delegate.

Becky McLaren: What's going to happen is when we have a motion on the floor, we'll have one person speak for or against, whichever is first, then we have to have somebody speak for the opposite and we go back and forth until one side is exhausted. So, it will go a for and against or an against and a for, but it will go back and forth and if we have anybody that calls a question, then if they have a point of question or a point of order then they would actually go before anybody who's already standing at the mike. What we also ask that you do is if you have anything to say with anything on the floor that has been proposed, is that you come to the microphones that you see in between each section, that you state your name and the club that you're from so that we have that for recording purposes in our minutes. Does anybody have any questions? If not, then, do you want me to go right into rule changes, yes?

Cody, if you can start with the proposed changes on the screen. What I am going to do is because you have them in their book, if there's any with the workshop that we had yesterday on the proposed changes, if there were anything that we can make amendments to or make changes to before we presented it on the floor, that were suggested yesterday and we did that and when we get to that I will stop and read that one. Otherwise, I will tell you it's presented as on the screen, give you a few minutes to read that and then ask for a motion from the floor.

Okay. Bylaw 17.1, Page 15. Cody, if you'll move down. The old Bylaw, the suggested change. Down a little further, Cody.

Okay. I have a motion to approve the proposed change as presented?

Member: I make a motion.

Becky McLaren: Move by Terry. A second?

Marino Torrens: Second.

Becky McLaren: Second by Marino. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Passes.

We'll go ahead and go on down. Rule 106 - 101.6, Page 30, this one is kinda lengthy, you have it in your book.

Motion to accept as presented?

Member: Motion to accept.

Becky McLaren: Moved. A second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstention? Passes.

Rule 102.1, Page 31. Have a motion from the floor, please, to accept as presented?

Member: Motion.

Becky McLaren: Then moved. Seconded?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Passes.

102.3. This is one where we did make a change based on the feedback yesterday.

Cody, if you'll go down to the proposed change. In the suggested change we added the FYSA office will notify all affiliates within a 15 mile radius and request that any objections be submitted to the office no later than seven – seven - Cody, do you want to insert days in there after the number 7. Up, up, right there. Seven days prior to the next scheduled meeting of the EC/BOD. FYSA's Vice President of Administration and Communications shall only present the completed applications at the next Board of Directors or EC meeting. And then 1 through 6 would remain the same and still add 7 and 8.

Can I have a motion to approve as presented on the screen, please?

Member: Motion to approve.

Becky McLaren: A second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Passes as amended on the screen.

103.4. Can I have a motion to approve as presented?

Member: Motion to approve.

Becky McLaren: Moved. Seconded?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

104.3. Cody, if you'll move all the way down, this is the one where I did make – where a change was made based on a suggestion from the round table yesterday. One through four would remain the same as in the current rule. The current 5 would become 8, which you'll see – what you see there and then we add 5, 6 and 7, which in the original proposal were 6, 7 and 8. So, it's just moving that number 5 down to the bottom to be number 8 to make the exceptions be at the bottom.

Can I have a motion to approve it – a motion to - from the floor to approve it as seen on the screen, please?

Member: Motion.

Becky McLaren: A second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Seconded. All those in favor signify by – any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Motion passes.

105.2. Can I have a motion to approve as presented in the book and on the screen?

Member: Motion to approve.

Becky McLaren: A second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

105.3.2. Can I have a motion to approve that as presented?

Member: Motion to approve.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

105.3.6. Can I have a motion to –

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Seconded.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

105.4.1. May I have a motion?

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

105.4.2. May I have a motion for – to – for accepting as presented on the screen?

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

105.7.1. Can I have a –

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

105.7.2. Can I have a motion, please?

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries.

105.7.4.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

105.8.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Motion passes.

201.4.

Member: Motion to accept.

Becky McLaren: Second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Motion passes.

201.5.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

201.6.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed. Motion – abstentions? Motion passes.

201.9.1.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

201.9.2.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries.

202.1.1.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

204.5.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Motion passes.

205.5.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and accepted. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

205.6.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Motion carries.

205.7.

Member: Motion to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Motion carries.

207.5.

Member: Motion to approve.

Becky McLaren: Motion to approve. Second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

207.9.

Member: Move to accept.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Motion carries.

208 B. This was presented by Scott O'Brien from Sebastian. Is he here?

Member: No.

Becky McLaren: Okay. Can I have a motion?

Member: Motion to discuss this at a later time.

Becky McLaren: And a second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion?

Speaker: Hi, my name is Alex Giovano. I am with Seminole Youth Athletic Association.

Becky McLaren: Yes.

Alex Giovano: I'd like to propose an addition to the suggested change. In the first sentence where it says if a player is playing more than two birth years –

Becky McLaren: Uh-huh.

Alex Giovano: I'd like to see we add or one age group, the same that we're adding below for the U8.

Becky McLaren: So, you want it to say if the player is playing –

Alex Giovano: No, not –

Becky McLaren: No, not there, Cody.

Alex Giovano: No, outside of the parentheses.

Becky McLaren: Up where it says –

Alex Giovano: More than two years -

Becky McLaren: So, if the player is playing up more than two birth years -

Alex Giovano: Or one age group.

Becky McLaren: Or one age group.

Alex Giovano: Or more than one age group, excuse me.

Becky McLaren: Or more than one age group.

Member: Motion to amend.

Becky McLaren: Do we have a second to the amendment?

Speaker: Second.

Becky McLaren: Can you go to the microphone, please, and say who you are because we need it for the minutes.

Speaker: Me?

Becky McLaren: Yes, we need to know who seconded his amendment for the minutes. So, I'll just need you to state your name and your club.

Charlie Graham: Alright. Charlie Graham with the Satellite Beach Soccer Club and I would second the amendment.

Becky McLaren: Okay. It's been moved and seconded for an amendment. Is there any discussion?

Speaker: John Stacey, Vice President –

Becky McLaren: Come here, I don't think it's on.

John Stacey: John Stacey, Vice President of Coaching Player and Development. The addition of that language would seem to then make it further restrictive. I think the intent of the rule is to actually expand the playing up.

So, by saying more than one age group a U9 – or a U12 player playing up U14 would require the State Director of Coaching. And right now we allow, I believe, two. So, a U12 could play U14 with - at the affiliate level. And Mike Strickler, if you are here, please step - please share and clarify.

Charlie Graham: That's why I added the word more – more than - more than one age group.

So, you are talking about an 11 year old player, an 11 and ½ year old player to play up. When we look at birth year, we're looking at an 11 year old technically 12, 13, 14. It's three – three years versus an 11 and ½ year old playing up one age group is an 11 and ½ year old playing on a U14 team playing against players that are essentially 12 and 13.

Becky McLaren: Mike?

Mike Strickler: Okay. The rule as it states right now, a U12 could play a U14, okay. And the age groupings were set up based upon accepted practices in regards to where players should be able to play.

The issue that I – the biggest issue if you put age grouping in there, is that there are leagues that have U12 and then they go to U16. Okay, so you could technically have a U11 player – or an 11 year old playing with U16's if you leave it as age groups. So, as that – as that gets submitted to me, if the rule stays as it's stated then I must make that available. Okay. We change the rules so that it would be in lines with best practices in regards to where players should play, how much they should play up and how little they should play up. That's how the rule is right now. If we change it, we're going against best practices and we're also opening things up when you throw age groups into where they go because – because you technically have leagues that have U10, U12 and then they go to U16 because they don't have a lot of players.

Charlie Graham: I understand the comment. The question then becomes if we had an 11 year old player, would they be allowed to play on a U14 team and that's been denied.

Mike Strickler: Yeah, yeah, we would have to – it'd have – if there's an 11 year old player it depends on when they're 11 because we're going by our August birth dates, although we do make allowances for players that are born in – born before September 1 because they're in the same class grade. So, we do make allowances for that. But, if you're talking – I mean, if you're talking a very late 11 year old playing up three age groups, that's – that's why it was not approved.

Charlie Graham: And I guess that's where we're trying to get clarification because it's not really three age groups, its three birth years. And I understand what Mike is saying about obviously a U – an 11 year old player playing on a U16 team is a problem. But, an 11 year old player playing against players that are 12 and 13, I think is the heart of what we're talking about.

Mike Strickler: Yeah, yeah, but you have to word it correctly.

Becky McLaren: Okay.

Mike Strickler: Because right now it's not worded in that way.

Becky McLaren: The gentleman here and then here. Please state your name.

Steve Sassman: My name is Steve Sassman, I'm the District Commissioner for B5. I spoke with Scott yesterday and I have an e-mail that kinda gives you the flavor for what he's trying to address. I don't think he's trying to address the older players. It's the small clubs with the even age groups, the U6's and the U8's. So, a lot of what I'm hearing sounds to be on the periphery, it's above U8, it's not – it's not what he is targeting in his rule change. And with your permission, I have an e-mail from him that I'd like to read.

Becky McLaren: Since he's the proposer of the change.

Steve Sassman: This is just a summary of his thoughts behind it. It's for smaller, midsize and even some larger clubs that do not have sufficient numbers to be able to offer recreational teams in all age groups. It seems to be more the norm the recreational teams are formed in even age groups starting at U6. The physical, mental and skill development of kids vary greatly and age alone is not a good determination as to which is the best bracket for a player to be in. For a select few kids it may be that playing up to the next age group is the best option while the FYSA rules help support and enforce the playing up request is made by parents, coach, director of coaching and the club, the rules prohibits U6 and U8 recreational players from playing up to the next age group at clubs where only even number age brackets are offered.

Some examples: A U6 player who is physically much bigger in size and aggression than his team mates and therefore poses a safety risk to fellow players.

A U8 player who played in a neighboring league that plays with goalies, has practiced with more skilled competitive players is more skillful than other U8 players and is bored playing with U8. P.S., he says in that case, the player quit playing soccer all together.

A very skillful U7 player who would have been a good candidate for a U9 academy team where he would have been under supervision of better trained coaches. Having gone through this process and after talking to some very reputable members from other clubs with similar experiences, it seems that FYSA is not in a position to look at each request in its entirety with all of the extenuating circumstances. It seems that the only factors FYSA can take into account at the age – is the age of the player and the age of the team that the player is requesting to play on. I believe the playing up rule should allow for a process by which a player can play up to the next available age group when only even numbered groups are being offered.

Becky McLaren: Okay, are you speaking for or against, sir?

Speaker: For.

Becky McLaren: On the right. Are you speaking for or against?

Speaker: Well, actually, I just have a comment.

Becky McLaren: Okay.

Speaker: And I think this was brought up yesterday, you know, the idea of an 11 year old playing up to U16, I mean, ultimately it's still in the club's purview to deny that. I mean, I would hope the clubs would act sensibly when deciding these on a case by case basis. The rule change just gives that latitude to the club, is my impression of it.

And I would also like to ask a question or maybe a point of clarification. When it says in the last – and it's in the old and the new rule it says permission must be obtained for each event by league tournaments and league plays. So, I wasn't clear about –

Becky McLaren: That means if they're playing in a league, it needs required for league play. If they go to play in a tournament, meaning if they go to guest play in the tournament or if they go to play in a tournament they need the same permission.

Speaker: Okay, so if – so, if Mike Strickler has given permission for someone to play up –

Becky McLaren: If he's given to play up on that team and that team is going to a tournament and they're going with that team to that tournament they already have the permission. But, if they're going to guest play with another team they must obtain permission to play with that team.

Speaker: So, permission to play up for the league is the facto permission to play in that tournament -

Becky McLaren: If they are playing with the same team.

Speaker: With the same team. Okay, got it. Okay.

Becky McLaren: Because they've been given permission to play with that particular team.

Speaker: Just a point of information, I'm not speaking for or against. The intent behind this – I work with Scott as well – Chris Batey from Indialantic.

Becky McLaren: State your name and your club, please.

Chris Batey: Chris Batey from Indialantic Youth Soccer. The intent of this is as Steve kinda may have gotten lost with the lengthy e-mail he read, but the intent of this is a lot of our clubs in Brevard County on the rec side only do age groups every second year. So, we go from U6 to U8 to U10.

The way the rule is written now, a player in the first year of their age group cannot play up because you're only allowed to play up one year, not one age group. So, a true U6 player that has no U7 available to them cannot play up.

And what Scott's just trying to do here is saying if you do age groups every other year, U6, U8, U10 and you have a very talented true U6 or true U8, they would be able to play up to that age group from U6 to

U8 or from U8 to U10. And the current rule does not allow that, because it's only allowing to play up one year. So, a true U6 could only be considered a U7 and would still be in their – a U7 would be considered a U8 and still be in that age group and wouldn't be able to play up. That's the intent of this change.

Becky McLaren: Okay. Is there anybody that's speaking against the motion?

Chris Batey: Point of information?

Becky McLaren: Yes.

Chris Batey: Are we currently discussing the motion or the amendment to the motion?

Becky McLaren: The amendment, the amendment to the motion. We need to discuss the amendment. Is there any discussion further on the amendment?

Chris Batey: I speak against the amendment.

Becky McLaren: Yes.

Heiko Hallenbach, Nature Coarse Soccer. I understand Mr. O'Brien's point and I agree with it. We, too have a small club with alternating age groups.

The amendment that he proposes makes sense. It seems simpler to me, and again, this is – this is completely out of Robert's Rules of Order, just get rid of the second sentence all together, the one that differentiates U8 and below. Get rid of the parenthetical in sentence number one so that basically all age groups are under the same rule that you can't play up more than two years without permission. That solves Mr. O'Brien's situation and it seems to me, simplifies the rule in general.

Becky McLaren: Well, first we have to vote on the amendment to the motion.

Heiko Hallenbach: I understand.

Becky McLaren: Okay. For or against the amendment to the motion?

Speaker (Unnamed): For.

Becky McLaren: For?

Speaker (Unnamed): Yes.

Becky McLaren: Yes.

Heiko Hallenbach: The problem why I think this was added, we had the same problem in our club as well. I don't think it's about playing up, I think it's about an 8 year old player is too old to play on U8, but

an 8 year old player is technically going up two years to play on U10. I think that's why this was added and that's why I wanted to see that added originally. I can't speak to Scott's reasoning behind it.

But, if you take an 8 year old player, again, that's 8 before the cutoff date, they're too old to play on the U8 team because they're not under 8 anymore, but technically they're going up two years to play on a U10 team. It's the same thing with a 6 year old player. A 6 year old player is too young – too old to play on a U6 team but then they're going up two years to play on a U8 team.

The addition that I'm proposing is just to address that for the older kids because you're not allowing them at all to play up. And if you aren't going to allow any playing up, then the rule should be totally taken away because, you know, again, it's very vague. An 11 year old player is allowed to play on a U14 team, well, it depends.

We don't have a clear cut off like with the age date where we say as of this date. We're saying it depends on how old they are and when. It needs to be specific, otherwise, you're making determinations based on what? Because if the point is the protection of the player then it has to go to more in-depth discussions, it has to go to the ability as a player and we're asking the current DOC at the field, the coaches, the parents to give their opinion about it, but then that opinion isn't necessarily what the decision is based on.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion against the proposed amendment to the motion?

Ann Graham: Ann Graham, Satellite Beach Soccer Club. Becky, it's really hard to read that. Can they make it larger by just holding the control key and pushing the plus sign, just to make it bigger? No, not the text, just control plus.

Speaker (unnamed) Magnify –

Ann Graham: Control plus. Where is the magic man? Did it do it? Okay.

Pretty sure I'm against the amendment if I understand it correctly because I think it changes the original purpose of this, you know, suggested change, which I'm for the original. And I think this amendment changes that all together.

And I've faced the same situation as I believe Scott has, where our little U6's that have played for, you know, this is their fourth season, they're running circles around all the others and their skills are way beyond all the others and they're not learning anything more and they need to move up to the next level and they're not allowed to. Same thing with those U8's in their last spring season and their parents are like, you know, my kid needs to play with kids of the same skill set and I tell them, hey, no throwing candy, throw money. Um, they want their kids to get something out of it and they're so frustrated and they're not allowed to play up. And I believe this amendment changes this whole suggested change.

Becky McLaren: Okay.

Ann Graham: Okay, thank you.

Becky McLaren: Okay, Mr. Thompson.

Tommy Thompson: Tommy Thompson, FYSA's Secretary. I heard what Steve said from Scott. I've heard a lot of conversations around here. We're talking about U6's, U8's, U10's recs, but there's nothing in this rule proposal to limit it to recreational players in those age groups. As Mike said if this passes, it also applies to competitive players.

I think this motion – this proposal needs to be tabled back to the maker to – if he wants to limit the scope to recreational players, then that needs to be part of the proposal. So, I make a motion to table this back.

Becky McLaren: Do I have a second to table it?

Member: Motion to table.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It's been moved and seconded to table. Is there any discussion on tabling the motion?

Member: We need to –

Becky McLaren: We need to vote on the amendment first.

Member: Move to vote on the amendment.

Becky McLaren: We are going to move to vote on the amendment to the motion.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It has been seconded. Is there any more discussion about the amendment to the motion? All those in favor of the amendment to the motion, meaning adding or more than one age group, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed, signify by saying nay.

Members: Nay.

Becky McLaren: Abstentions? The amendment to the motion fails. Now we have the original motion back on the floor and we have a motion to table that.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: That has been seconded. Is there any discussion on tabling the original proposed change? Back to Mr. O'Brien. State your name and club, please.

Chris Batey: Chris Batey with Indiatlantic Youth Soccer. I'd like to speak against tabling this. Rather than tabling this now, I think we have an excellent wording from a gentleman on the other side of the room earlier that would make this very clear. So, rather than tabling this for another year, I'd like to have him propose that – the wording he suggested as an amendment to this change. I think that made it very clear just to say that we can't play up more than two birth years period.

Becky McLaren: Do we have anybody that wants to speak on for tabling the motion? For tabling.

Steve Sassman: Steve Sassman, B5 District Commissioner again. I would prefer to get the language correct the first time and if the gentleman's amendment what he has addresses the issues of rec and strictly U8 below, I might be okay with it. But, I just don't see the need to rush through this today.

Becky McLaren: Anybody speaking against the tabling of the motion?

Speaker (Unnamed): He did.

Becky McLaren: He spoke for. Now I have to go to against. Seeing no other discussion, all those in favor of tabling the original motion, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed?

Members: Nay.

Becky McLaren: Abstentions, okay. I need you to take out your ballot books. Ballot A. Take Ballot A out of your book. Take Ballot A out of your book. I need you to write either yes or no for tabling the motion. Yes would be for tabling it. No would be against tabling it. Once you have completed your vote, please – I need everybody that's in the section directly in front of me to pass yours to the left. If you're in the far section over here, pass yours to the right. Over here, this section pass yours to the right and the far section, pass yours to the left so they can come down the middle and pick them up.

If you still have a ballot in your hand, hold it up high so that they can collect everything.

While they are counting these votes, I am going to continue so that we can try and get through as many of these as possible.

Anybody have any other ballots out? Seeing no ballots in the air, they're going to go ahead and count. While they're counting, we're going to go ahead and we're going to go to the next proposed change. So, Cody, if you can – as soon as you get there.

Okay, we'll continue while they're doing that.

211.1. May I have a motion from the –

Member: Motion.

Becky McLaren: A second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion on the proposed change? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes.

211.3. This was proposed by Mr. O'Brien as well. I'm hearing that they want me to – you want me to wait until the results of the other one. Okay, I can do that.

Okay, 301 – no, we can go. We're going to set aside that one and we're going to go to 301.5. Any discussion?

Chris Batey: Chris Batey with Indiatlantic Youth Soccer. I'd like to propose an amendment to retain the wording that's being stricken in the second portion of the change and their DC's.

I think the DC's are a critical link between FYSA, the Regional Vice Presidents and the local clubs. I have met and shared thoughts with and e-mails with my DC on numerous occasions throughout the years and find him a critical link back – back to Auburndale. I have never met or know who my Regional Vice President is. I know her name. I couldn't pick her out of a crowd.

So, I think the DC's are a critical part of our youth soccer structure and association and we need to maintain that link between Auburndale and the local clubs. So, I'd like to propose an amendment to retain, and their DC's, in this change.

Becky McLaren: Okay. Is there a second to the proposed change?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: I have a second. You've got to get up, Lou.

Lou Confessore: I gotta get up, okay. Lou Confessore, Soccer Academy of the Americas. I would like to second that.

Becky McLaren: Okay. The reason for this proposed change is because statements are no longer sent out to the clubs. They are done electronically through Got Soccer and they go into your Got Soccer account. Okay. Notification is sent to the Regional Vice President who sends it out to their DC's so that they can contact you when you know when you owe money. There is no way to pull a statement for DC's to be sent a statement and they cannot be sent a statement from your account because your account is electronically, the statements are pushed to you. So, that is the reason for this proposed change. There's no way in our system for us to be able to do that.

Speaker (Unnamed): (Inaudible)

Becky McLaren: It's getsoccer. It goes – it gets pushed to your account automatically.

Lou Confessore: I think we were told yesterday by getsoccer that you can e-mail anybody.

Becky McLaren: You can e-mail but we can't send a statement to them, Lou. All we can do is e-mail and tell them that the electronic statements have been sent to their clubs.

Lou Confessore: Okay.

Becky McLaren: They can't see the electronic statement, only you can see that.

Lou Confessore: That brings up another whole thing that we - hopefully we'll get into later on, but the DC's can't see anything.

Becky McLaren: Yes, they can.

Lou Confessore: Oh, yeah? You haven't been talking to the DC's. They can't see a lot of stuff that they used to be able to, okay, within the clubs to help us with stuff. So, a simple e-mail to a DC from the office saying that the statements have been sent out and this is the list of them is no big deal, I don't think.

Becky McLaren: Is there anybody to speak for? He's already spoken against, we have to go to - he's for the amendment to the motion. Is there anybody to speak against?

Chris Batey: Point of information.

Becky McLaren: Uh-huh.

Chris Batey: So, if I understood what you said earlier, you can have getsoccer electronically send notification to the Regional Vice Presidents?

Becky McLaren: What happens is when the statements are pushed and you – and your agent of record and your treasurer get an e-mail to tell them that statements have been sent. Okay, that's pushed automatic – that's pushed from the office when those statements are created.

Chris Batey: Okay.

Becky McLaren: Okay. That's automatically pushed. If you have – if payments haven't been made, the Regional Vice President is sent a list of the clubs that have not made payments.

Chris Batey: How is that list sent to the Regional Vice Presidents?

Becky McLaren: It's on an Excel spreadsheet and they send each region - each Regional Vice President gets it and then the Regional Vice President pushes it out to their DC's for them to contact their clubs.

Chris Batey: Okay ,so, you're – from what I understand and please correct me if I'm wrong, you are manually generating an e-mail to the Regional Vice Presidents?

Becky McLaren: It's not – the e-mail – the e-mail is sent from the - it's sent from our financial specialist in the office.

Chris Batey: Okay.

Becky McLaren: And that's - what she does is she manually goes down and sees who hasn't made payments, that haven't been processed, and those get pulled out.

Chris Batey: Okay. I'm a bit confused because you said you can't – the reason you –

Becky McLaren: They don't see the statement, they only see the amount.

Chris Batey: Okay.

Becky McLaren: The amount, it says this club and this is the amount that they owe. They don't see an electronic statement, which is what we used to be able to pull in the old system before we went to getsoccer.

Chris Batey: Okay. But the regional affiliate's agent of record and treasurer will be notified automatically when –

Becky McLaren: They get notified. When the statement is sent, the agent of record and the treasurer automatically get an e-mail to say your statement has been generated, you need to pay it.

Chris Batey: Okay. I withdraw my proposed amendment, then.

Becky McLaren: Okay. Do we have a second - since he's the originator of the motion and he withdraws his motion.

So, Cody, you can unhighlight and it goes back to the original motion. It's been called to question.

All those in favor of the motion as originally presented signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

Do we have a vote tally yet from the other that we just did?

Male Voice: No.

Becky McLaren: Okay.

301.5.1. Can I have a motion, please?

Member: Motion to accept.

Becky McLaren: It's been moved.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Motion passes.

303. Can I have a motion?

Member: Motion to accept.

Becky McLaren: Second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

402.4. Is Larry Reisman or Reisman, I'm sorry if I mispronounce your name, here that is the maker that proposed this change, or anyone here from Indian River that wants to speak to it?

(No response from audience)

Becky McLaren: Can I have a motion, please?

Member: Motion to discuss.

Becky McLaren: Second?

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: Second. Second for discussion.

The rule change is to add the referee should treat this stoppage just like any other normal stoppage of play as it relates to the game for the water break.

Member: Second.

Male Speaker: Where is this?

Becky McLaren: It's right – you have it in your book right in front of you as well.

Mr. Strickler?

Mike Strickler: Yeah, I -

Becky McLaren: Well, first I need a second before we can discuss.

Member: I seconded.

Becky McLaren: You did, okay. Discussion.

Mike Strickler: Well, since it used my name in there, really with the water break if we just say refer them to the water break protocol, I believe that covers everything and that has been submitted to the referees.

Unfortunately, you know, that was slow in getting out, okay, to the referees, but it is something that we have presented to the referees. I believe we did that in September to their executive group and then you – it's also posted on our website. So, I think if we can just refer them to the protocol, it covers everything that he's talking about here.

Becky McLaren: Any discussion for the proposed change?

Chris Batey: Point of information.

Becky McLaren: Yes.

Chris Batey: Through the Chair to Mr. Strickler. So, the – the protocol -

(Laughter)

Becky McLaren: Mike, you have to stay there.

Chris Batey: So, the protocol does specify to the referee they should be considered a stoppage in play and whatever he's going to do with respect to extending time or not –

Mike Strickler: Correct.

Chris Batey: - this is a stoppage?

Mike Strickler: Correct. Correct.

Becky McLaren: Is there any discussion for the proposed - for the proposed change?

Chris Batey: I don't think it's a for or against, but it's just a –

Becky McLaren: Point of clarification?

Chris Batey: Yeah, or information. There's nothing in the rule books that say referees have to give stoppage time. He can stop at 35 minutes, 30 minutes, 40 minutes. He doesn't have to give stoppage time. So, even if it's in the rule books, according to FIFA, he doesn't have to give stoppage time anyways, so, it's a moot point.

Becky McLaren: Okay. Any other discussion for? Not against, but for?

Mario Martinez: Mario Martinez, Referee Liason. I believe this rule may clarify the problem that we have in all the tournaments because the tournaments decide that they will be not adding time for water breaks.

Becky McLaren: But, it's – any other discussion against?

Seeing no other discussion, all those in favor of adding this proposed change to the rules, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed signify by saying nay.

Members: Nay.

Becky McLaren: Abstentions? The motion fails.

The next proposal has been withdrawn.

Okay, if we can go back, I'm sorry, guys, to 208 B. And the vote to – or actually it wasn't 208 B – yeah, 208 B. It was to table the motion - to table it, 3,462 for tabling; 2,426 against. So, the motion will be tabled and sent back to the presenter – to the proposer.

Now I'm going to 211.3. This was proposed by the same gentleman. Do we – yes?

Mike Strickler: I move that we table this as well along with the previous motion.

Member: Move.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: It's been moved and seconded to table the change – the proposed change for 211.3. Is there any discussion?

Seeing no discussion, all those in favor of tabling 211.3 please signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? It is tabled and it will – I will contact the presenter – the proposer.

402.4, the second one has been withdrawn by Mr. Strickler.

502.7. This was proposed by Larry Reisman from Indian River who is not here. Is there anybody that wants to speak on behalf of this?

(No response from audience)

Becky McLaren: I need a motion.

Member: I make a motion to deny as presented.

Becky McLaren: It's been moved to deny the rule as presented. Is there a second?

Member: I second it.

Becky McLaren: It's been moved and seconded to deny the rule as presented. Any discussion?

Seeing no discussion, all those in favor of denying the rule as presented signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Motion – the change is denied.

503.3. Mr. Kurzner. Can I have a motion to –

Member: Motion to approve.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: We have a motion to approve and a motion to second.

Mr. Kurzner, would you like to speak to your proposed change?

Jeff Kurzner: Yeah, sorry it took me so long to get up here, but I didn't know I was coming up as there's no page numbers in this book to follow things along.

The rule change is pretty self-explanatory. The way that it reads now, a coach or player that has been suspended can choose when and where they want to serve the suspension. If they have a big game coming up and they're suspended, they can say, oh, well, I'm going to go ahead and play in this game and then maybe I'll serve my suspension in the next one because there's no apparent penalty if they don't serve their initial suspension.

Becky McLaren: Anyone to speak against the proposed change?

Yes, Tessie. Speaking against the change, maám, or a point of clarification?

Female Speaker: A point of clarification.

Becky McLaren: Yes.

Female Speaker: Don't our rules already specify that if you get a red card for some reason you have to serve it at the very next –

Becky McLaren: Yes, they do, but this –

Mario Martinez: I can –

Becky McLaren: Go ahead.

Mario Martinez: Yeah, but the penalty basically is if you get at one game, you play in the next one and the next one, it goes back to the regular suspension of just one game. So, you can basically play all year and sit whenever you want and just serve that one game.

The rule says it goes back to the original suspension. So, this will make it more – it will –

Becky McLaren: What he's saying is if you get a one game suspension and you play in your next game, you don't serve it, the original – the way this rule is written, the original suspension goes back. So, that means they still only have one game. Well, if they decide they don't want to do it in the next game and they play in the next game, it still gives them – and they could play the whole season. This way if they don't serve their suspension in entirety, they have to sit out the remainder of the seasonal year plus a year.

Female Speaker: That's good, clarified. Thank you.

Becky McLaren: You're welcome. Anybody to speak against? Seeing -

Speaker: I just have a question.

Becky McLaren: Point of clarification, dear?

Speaker: Yes.

Becky McLaren: Yes, name and club.

Male Speaker: Gastone Rubio, Coral Estates. The question is, is – but that's the kid. Okay, as the coach I put the kid on the field and the kid is the one that's going to get punished. Does the coach get punished for making that call?

Becky McLaren: Yes, there's a separate rule for a coach that does that.

Gastone Rubio: Okay, thank you.

Becky McLaren: Yes. Any other discussion? Seeing no other discussion, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Passes.

902.8. May I have a motion, please?

Member: Move to deny.

Member: Second.

Becky McLaren: There's been a motion to deny and a second. Okay. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, it has been moved to deny the proposed change. All those in favor of denial signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

Becky McLaren: Opposed? Abstentions? Move to deny passes.

Okay, I'm going to go ahead and let everyone know now that rule – the last proposed change prior to the FYC restructure, 401.5, the poaching, has been withdrawn from the floor by the maker of the motion so that we can go back and look at it a little further. So, that one has been withdrawn.

So, the last proposed change is the FYSA restructure – proposal of restructure and I am going to call Tommy Thompson to the podium.

Tommy Thompson: Okay. The proposed restructure of FYSA was approved by the Board of Directors back in January; therefore, we have to present it to you at this time.

However, based on discussions this weekend and based on discussions at some regional meetings, I do not right now believe that the affiliates have the full and true picture of what this ramification would be. So, I am going to make a motion at this time to table this back to the Board of Directors for a consideration in January.

It will give all of you affiliates between now and January to get with your District Commissioners, your Regional Vice Presidents and either say this is what we want to do or come up with a better idea or we do nothing.

I don't want to try to amend this thing on the floor with all the discussions. The Board did approve it, but I think the time now is to just send it back to the Board based on the comments we've heard this weekend. The District Commissioners can get with their affiliates, their Regional Vice Presidents and in January we'll readdress the issue.

Male Speaker: Question.

Tommy Thompson: Sure.

Male speaker: If and when the Board deals with this in January, does that mean it goes into effect or it has to come back here to be approved?

Tommy Thompson: It has to come back to you.

Male Speaker: Okay.

Tommy Thompson: Nothing – nothing the Board does must come back to the membership for approval.

Female Speaker: Everything –

Tommy Thompson: Everything we do, everything we do must come before here and that's why it's here right now and I've got to present it as their – I'm in favor of it, I think it's the best thing to do. But there's

enough discussion and dissention that we hear out there that we need to have everybody on the same page because it's too important to the Organization to get it wrong.

So, in January - District Commissioners get with your affiliates between now and January and see how their feelings are so when we come better in January we can have a discussion and like I said, either we move forward with the proposal, we modify the proposal or we do nothing.

So, I'll put a motion on the floor to table it. Yes, sir.

Male Speaker (Unnamed): I object to the motion to table. At this point I think we should have some discussion, we don't necessarily have to vote. We still can table it.

But I think you've got a lot of people in here that have got inputs that might not be able to be at the December meeting and who might collectively be able to come up with some resolutions and some points that we can bring back to our DC's. We're all here now. We're not all going to be here in January.

Tommy Thompson: Well, I know the affiliates won't – the affiliates not be here in January, that's why you have District Commissioners in your districts to get with you to discuss this and bring – I have no problem discussing it if we want to, but I'm not going to take a vote on it now.

Male Speaker (Unnamed): Well, that won't be your choice.

Tommy Thompson: Well, there's a motion on the floor to table it right now.

Member: Second.

Tommy Thompson: And it's been seconded.

Male Speaker (Unnamed): Correct, but I'm speaking to object to tabling the motion.

Tommy Thompson: Okay. Anybody for tabling?

Seeing no other discussion, all those in favor of tabling this motion.

Members: Aye.

Tommy Thompson: All those opposed.

Members: Nay.

Tommy Thompson: All right, let's discuss it, then.

(Laughter)

Tommy Thompson: Let's discuss it.

(Laughter)

Tommy Thompson: Okay. I have no problem discussing it if that's what we want to do. I don't think it's worth a vote count to get that –

Lou Confessore: Lou Confessore, the Soccer Academy of the Americas.

Member: Are you for or against –

Lou Confessore: Am I for or against what? We're going to discuss it.

Tommy Thompson: There's a motion on the floor right now to approve the –

Lou Confessore: I'm against the thing as it stands, obviously. I've been given my little speech in history, all right, there are about five of us in the room now when all of this started. This organization was formed – it was formed for a couple of different reasons and the two most important reasons were, because we had been playing soccer for ten years before the State Association was mandated by the Federation.

First one was we, private clubs anyhow, needed insurance, okay, and this was the easiest way for all of us to get together and get insurance for our kids.

The second one, which to us, was the most important reason for joining an organization like this was to have an objective observer certify that that team was really under twelve because we were having a little problem with that, okay, and we couldn't go by age – by height or weight, you know, like football.

But, anyhow, that was the main reason. The organizers, when it came to that, the organizers said, yes, that's what we need to do. But, the organization was formed as a service organization. This is a service organization and you can't have service without personal contact, okay.

The DC's were originally evangelists, we used to go out to parks and try to convince them to make a club and join the organization. Now we can't do that anymore because you guys in your infinite wisdom have decided that if you're 15 miles away, you can't do that. So, now, they're trying to merge, okay, and the clubs are doing that themselves.

But, the DC's, if they're not doing what they're supposed to be doing, then give them a job description. But, the vice president is not going to go to my league meetings. The vice president is not going to come and talk to the clubs. I mean, it's almost 200 miles from Key West to Port St. Lucie. Even Patty can't do that.

So, I'm definitely against losing DC's. Readjust them a little bit, yes.

The last thing that I'm going to say is taking an organization from 31 votes to 10 or 11 is an insanity.

Member: Are you for or against?

Female speaker: Well, I'm kinda like both.

(Laughter)

Tessie Goicoechea: First of all, I'm Tessie Goicoechea of the United Soccer Club. I'm from Region D and we have definitely miles between our Region, which goes from Madison all the way to Pensacola.

I have served as both a DC and a Region VP, so I can see all sides of the equation. I was also present on this Board when the original discussion was brought up about doing this type of thing, okay. And at that meeting I remember that it was told that we were going to try to put together a committee to work out how all of this was going to be done.

What I would like to see is instead of coming back in January and going back to the DC's and having them go to the affiliates, put that committee together, whether it is the DC's or some affiliates, put a job description together what it is you're wanting to do, how it's going to work so that that can go back to the affiliates with all of that already there.

If you're looking to take the DC's away as a voting person, the lady that was at the rules thing yesterday made a very good point: don't eliminate the DC's but have them answer to the VP's so they still have a say in what's going on and the affiliates have someone locally that they can go to that knows the concerns within their districts.

That's what I'm trying to get at.

Tommy Thompson: Okay, Tessie, actually part of - we have a proposal that we have drafted based on the conversation yesterday and we will present that in a couple of minutes here to accomplish what you said.

I challenged the Board last September - August at the AGM that we were going to discuss this in January, so they had reasonable time to put a- whether an outside committee or a committee formed to do it, the Board was challenged to do it and that's why we presented it in January based on the feedback that we had gotten from the Board.

So, anyway. Cody, do you want to put that proposal up there, please?

We'll take the first issue right now. Out of the Rules Committee meeting yesterday it came up that some lady and I'm sorry, I don't remember who it was from region B said, why don't you do this, why don't we maintain the DC structure we have now, local elections, affiliates and stuff like that, but let them report to the Regional Vice President and the Regional Vice President would represent the Region on the new Board of Directors.

So, that's what you're seeing before you the language that was drafted last night. So we would still maintain the DC's, they'd still be electing the district, still be your touchy-feely to the affiliates, but they would report to the Regional Vice Presidents who would then carry their wishes to the Board of Directors.

(Inaudible)

Tommy Thompson: Well, we're dealing with the top issue right now, Issue Number One. I don't know how to separate things like that. That's the second issue that will come up in a few minutes.

Becky McLaren: You may go to the mike.

Gastone Rubio: Gastone Rubio, Soccer Academy Coral Estates, whatever.

(Laughter)

Becky McLaren: That's a good title.

(Laughter)

Gastone Rubio: I don't know anymore.

Tommy Thompson: We know you.

Gastone Rubio: Right. Doesn't that eliminate the votes, then, what Lou was talking about earlier where you went from 31 to 11 and you still have 7 – what is it, 7 on the Executive Committee versus 4?

Becky McLaren: There would be 10 on the Executive Committee.

Gastone Rubio: Very well.

Tommy Thompson: There would be 10 on the Executive Committee – or 11 depending –

Gastone Rubio: So, our voice votes shrinks. So, how is that a good thing?

(Laughter)

Male Voice: Here! Here!

(Applause)

Tommy Thompson: Well, it was mentioned at one of the meetings that maybe that should be a weighted vote to the Board of the vice presidents.

But, again, that's - we had a lot of ideas thrown out yesterday and the last couple, three days. That's why I wanted to table it so we could get all these ideas back into one package, but that didn't go away.

So, the gentleman over here.

Joe Grammer: Joe Grammer, DC D4. I move to sever – this is the only proposal we've got that has two rules in one proposal. I move to sever the 3. – 3007.2 and 3.01 – 3.1 for discussion and vote. One is about the registrar and one is about the Board of Directors. We should take those two issues up separately.

Tommy Thompson: Okay, let's get through the discussion and then we'll get to the proposal to put before everybody so we don't do it in pieces.

I think Marco is next and then Mary.

Marco Ortega: Good Morning. I'm here with Linda Sorter and Lucia Vargas and myself, Marco Ortega. We're the DC's for Region A and we're absolutely against this rule.

The DC's are the main source of customer service, the outlets that the organization has with the affiliates. This organization is based on the membership and the children that, you know, are members of FYSA. We're their outlet, we're their voice.

Reducing the voting as far as the Board of Directors, we're going from, I believe, a 6 to 1 reduction. I don't believe that, you know, that the membership is looking for a touchy-feely type of relationship with their DC's. What the membership wants out of their DC's is the communication, the support, the help. It's not about - you know, it's more than touchy-feely.

And a lot of subjects were touched on, not only at the rule changes workshop, but at our own Region A roundtable. One of the reasons why this is being proposed is to streamline. You know, we live at an age with lots of advantages with technology.

Another, you know – another – another topic or another issue that was brought up is that at this – for example, at this particular Board of Directors meeting there was some of the DC's absent.

But, I'd like to see the tendencies of not this last meeting, but a couple, you know, count four, five, six meetings and see how many of the DC's were there present and said their voice as far as what the membership felt. We were challenged to speak –

Tommy Thompson: Do you want me to address that question for you? You asked a question as to how many were there.

Marco Ortega: I just want to try to finish and then –

Tommy Thompson: Okay.

Marco Ortega: Thank you. We were told to stand up and speak. We were told that, you know, as far as what you perceived as a Board approval of this rule, we can say together here that, you know, that's not what we felt was said at the Board meeting. What we felt was that this rule was going to be presented at the AGM and with all due respect, it was going to be presented with that approval or without it.

If you truly care about what the work of the DC's, what these people have done over the years and what they've been able to express as far as the upcoming officers, Tommy, Marino, Lou, the VP's, they all started out as DC's. They learned the structure, they learned the procedures as far as how FYSA is runned and what those – what the primary concerns and needs of the membership is.

You're eliminating a position where basically that contact with the membership is going to be gone. So, when those people, the future officers, get up to the VP's, the President's position, they will no longer have that exposure with the membership.

I just want to say to our Region, thank you for giving us the opportunity to serve. And if you have something to say – if you have something, you know, positive or negative, stand up and say it. If you're unhappy with how things are being done, stand up and say it. Don't stay quiet because by staying quiet, nothing will happen. Stand up and speak, at least that's what I was told to do.

(Applause)

Tommy Thompson: All right, let me just address a couple of your questions.

You asked about the DC's and their participation in the last – the only thing I know is the last two Board meetings. At the recent Board Meeting that was held on Friday there are 21 DC's, 7 of them were not present or represented by a proxy. So, a third of them were not here or by proxy.

At the vote in January there was 26 votes on this subject. There are 33 members of the Board of Directors. So, by simple logic you can find another 7 were not at the meeting, or another third of the DC's failed to show up or have a proxy at the January Board meeting.

So, that was – you asked the question, so I'm just answering it. I can't go back further than that because I don't know, but I remember those two.

Barry?

Barry Witlin: Barry Witlin, South Florida United. I have a question.

My concern with this approach is that the Regions lose a lot of their voting power and the Executive Committee, the Executive Board gains a lot more power. So – and I understand the concurrent issue as to it's more difficult to run an organization with 31 people on it.

My question is: Is the concern the amount of votes that each Region would have, or the fact that you need – that 31 people would be on the Board? Because you can do the voting by representation based on registration where each Region has a number of votes based upon the number of registrants in FYSA, while eliminating the amount of people that'd be casting those votes and make it easier for the Board to work as a unit.

Tommy Thompson: There was never any discussions about weighted voting, voting worry about that the Regions would lose their DC votes because they're basically considered – even if the DC's were going to get any extra votes. I don't think that was ever part of the conversation.

That's why I think if it's something that we think is important to wait the vote based on the Regional, whether it's by registrations, by the number of DC's, whatever it is. That's why we need to go back and come back later with a better proposal because we're getting a lot of good input here that we didn't have that didn't come forth in the January Board meeting and it didn't come forth at the meeting on Friday. But, it's coming forth from the membership as we meet with you guys and the Rules Committee and talking in the street and the Region A roundtables. A lot of things are being brought up now that have not been brought up before and realize when you draft something you're not going to get all the options, you're not going to come up with every scenario.

Your idea of weighted based on registrations in the Regions to give the Regional Vice Presidents a weighted vote, it's worth consideration, but I don't want to run to a rash decision today that doesn't address – come back with the best proposal for this Organization. That's the point.

Yes, over here.

Male Speaker (Unnamed): Tommy, I wanted to talk about to 3.1. If everybody is still talking about the DC part of it, I'll wait and – if we're going to sever those two issues, I'll talk at that time.

Tommy Thompson: Yep.

Male Speaker (Unnamed) Okay.

Tommy Thompson. I think Miguel is up first.

Miguel Denney: Miguel Denney, DC from C5.

(Applause)

Tommy Thompson: He hasn't said anything yet, Lou.

Miguel Denney: Some – a DC from Region A mentioned that we learn this system from volunteering as ADC's, DC's and we do so much for our – for our neighborhood clubs, our community clubs.

One of the things that we always took pride in is representing their voice, what their concerns are to bring to this – to this - to the Board meeting.

And if I get it right, you're sending me back home to tell my – my affiliates that they don't need me anymore, there's a better thing in place. And I don't think – we take great pleasure in doing that. We want to make sure that all our clubs are – has a voice at the Board meeting and we think it's important to keep our DC's and keep bringing in DC's to keep this Organization alive.

We - we've – we've – like you mentioned, most of you up at that table were a DC at one point. So, the times has changed where we don't, as you keep mentioning, that the – we don't sign anything and pass it anymore. But we have to empower our DC's, get them Got Soccer – Got Soccer educated. Let them – empower them to help do more for their Regions and keep their voice for the smaller clubs.

Most clubs as I spoke to some people this weekend, they're big enough, they can handle their own business. But, there are clubs out there who needs that personal relationship to keep them going. And I think that's how important we are and it's – and they do need a voice at the meeting. I don't think we should take that away from them.

Tommy Thompson: Okay.

(Applause)

Tommy Thompson: Go ahead.

Mike Webber: Mike Webber, South Florida United. My first comment is, is everyone on the Board has been a DC at one time. But, my only comment is, is that if we table this issue, I do not want to see it tabled until January because I would like to have a say on this. If we do table it, I would like to see it tabled until next year's AGM so that we all have a say on it.

Tommy Thompson: Well, Mike, you misunderstood that. I was tabling it back to the January Board of Director's meeting. It'll still have to come back to this organization next year at this AGM.

Mike Webber: Okay, thank you. I just got the impression that it was –

Tommy Thompson: No.

Mike Webber: – going to be decided on by the Board.

Tommy Thompson: Remember, everything the Board of Directors does or the EC does has to be affirmed by this body, so that anything we do comes back before you.

Mike Webber: Okay. I just want to make sure that if it does get tabled that we all get a say on it.

Tommy Thompson: Next August we'll be having this conversation –

Mike Webber: I get it.

Tommy Thompson: - hopefully with an agreement out there that everybody has looked at, supports and is ready to do or not ready to do. But, I mean, for example, in January if the Board of Directors said we don't want to do anything about this, we want to leave it just as it is, we'll stay just like we are.

Mike Webber: Thank you.

Robert Baldwin: Robert Baldwin with Melbourne United. I have a couple of things. First of all, you were talking earlier, there was some discussion about the attendance levels of the various DC's.

I think that would be great information for you guys to push back out to us because if our DC's aren't there and we don't know it, I'm sure we could go find it in the Minutes once they're approved at the next meeting, but then, it's – there's a latency effect there. So, if you guys could do a better job communicating out to us how our people are doing in attendance and in representing us, that would be great information for us to have. And I'm sure that's an easy thing to push out.

The second point I was going to make is that I hope that – I mean, there's tons of technology out there today. I mean, even our league has begun having every other meeting by phone. You know, there's tons of – you can use Go To Meetings, WebX, there's lots of ways for us to communicate. And I would just encourage – I mean, you guys are a big organization with millions of dollars in the bank, so, certainly it's not a resource shortage. I'd like to see you spend some money to try and solicit input, you know, through, you know, monthly webinars or round tables, you know, town hall type meetings so that we don't wait to hear feedback from people, you know, at the – two days before or the day before the AGM vote. I think you could get a better feel for where people are on issues and have more of that input so that when you come here it's almost a rubber stamp. I mean, a lot of the motions got approved in that manner. But, you know, for the ones that are a little bit hairier I think it would be easy for you to solicit input even from - directly from the member clubs themselves. Thanks.

Kathleen Shelton: Kathleen Shelton, Charger Soccer Club.

Now, I go back to Black Watch, I've been around for a lot of years. The DC role is critical, just critical to the masses, the clubs, your affiliates. It's critical for information, education and representation. Over the years I've seen really terrific DC's, a lot of them sitting right here. I've also seen not so good DC's.

This year I have received one e-mail of information, one, that's from – that's – that's for everything. And it was about it's time for you to renew your affiliation. That's it.

I have other clubs that call me asking for help on where do I find this and what about that, because a lot of the smaller clubs have their volunteer boards and all of a sudden you get a new registrar or a new VP on a Board and they don't know.

And if they don't have the DC's that they can go to, educated, knowledgeable DC's that communicate with them and are there for them, they can't do anything. And that's the – luckily I've been around for a long time so I know at least where to get the information if I don't know it myself and a lot of things I know. I'll call Dave, you know, we have no trouble with that.

But, the smaller clubs with new people just coming up, they don't have the DC's to hear from, learn from and then communicate up, then you're not hearing the whole picture.

(Applause)

Marcus Fernandez: Marcus Fernandez, Southern Soccer Coalition. At this time I wanted to address the issue of Executive Board voting on things and going back to the membership for authorization or confirmation or whatever.

Last year after this – after last year's AGM the Executive Board voted to implement the requirement to have five games for State qualification.

Tommy Thompson: No, no, that's a State Cup Committee rule.

Marcus Fernandez: But it was voted – regardless of the committee, most teams already had declared in June or July where they were going to participate in. It didn't come up at the AGM and then after the Executive Board in September it was a requirement to add additional games in order to qualify for State Cup. It didn't come through the membership, it was actually pushed through the Rules, okay, and it wasn't added - highlighted that it was changed. So, it was basically slipped through the Rules.

Tommy Thompson: As a point of clarification, the rules for State Cup are not voted on by the EC or the Board of Directors. That came from the Competition Committee and they did the rules for State Cup. We did not do that, Fernandez.

Marcus Fernandez: And who does the Competition Committee report to?

Tommy Thompson: Do you want to address that, Sandy?

Sandy Parker: Well, I'll take a point of clarification that there was a recommendation that came from the Competition Committee that was not in full agreement with everybody and it was not a recommendation of mine. And it was – the Rules of Competition were approved by the EC and it was on a phone call.

The Competition Committee meets after we get the qualifications from Regional Championships and National Championships and make recommendations related to that. After the FSP ruling was passed at this AGM last year that's why the Rules went back and readdressed to ensure that our teams that were participating in our competitions, were the ones who are going to be competing in our State Cups and with proper advantage.

The Rules were published and communicated to all when they were approved. And as I indicated, it was not a unanimous recommendation but they were approved and the Rules of Competition were approved by the EC.

Marcus Fernandez: They were approved by the EC. Okay, so, they were approved by the EC but not by the membership. In other words, this is what I'm getting at, that the Executive membership can approve things that the membership, the general membership, does not – is not aware of.

As a matter of fact, the Rules and that specific change, okay – in other words, the National Championship series requires you to have – participate in a league with four different teams, play at least three different games. The FYSA Executive Committee approved to increase that to at least five games after other teams had participated in it and after the AGM last year so it was not even brought up to the AG – to the membership because it was a Rule of competition, not an FYSA rule. There's a big difference.

Rules of Competitions does not get approved, just like any other tournament that has Rules of Competitions are not approved by the Body.

Tommy Thompson: And you think that's fair?

Marcus Fernandez: I'm not saying whether it's fair or not, but not in any of our Rules or Bylaws it dictates the Rules of Competition. That's a separate issue.

Okay, I understand that, I'm just pointing out - and I know that's not the topic here but I'm just pointing and addressing Tommy's comment that it's going to be brought to the AGM.

I understand that you're telling me about the Rules of Competition versus an FYSA Rule. But, I think the membership regards of Rules of competition. You can't start a race and then change the rules while the race is going on. Okay?

Tommy Thompson: Okay.

Marcus Fernandez: But, that has nothing to do with the DC's or the Board of Directors or anything like that. That's the Rules Competition, that's – okay.

Tommy Thompson: Okay. The gentleman over there.

Randy B (?): Randy B (?), Florida Juniors. You know, this is supposed to be our organization and I heard Tommy say well, this is the first time we got any feedback. Well, when were we asked? Because I don't remember our Board ever being asked anything about this. I mean, today this wasn't a surprise because our DC informed us a little bit about what was going on. But I don't remember getting anything.

Tommy Thompson: Well, all I can tell you is at the January Board Meeting, your DC hopefully was there.

Randy B (?): He was.

Tommy Thompson: He was there. Did he communicate back to you after that about what we did in January?

Randy B (?): Yes. Yes, but we haven't heard anything from you all.

Tommy Thompson: Well, he - he's on the Board.

Randy B (?): I understand that, he's on the Board but there was no – that I know of, there was no- there was some – there was some information we received on line, but again, I mean, where was the mechanism put in place for us to feed back to you to tell you we liked stuff or we didn't like stuff?

Tommy Thompson: I'll tell you where the feedback was. I went to the Region's AGM and presented the proposal.

Randy B (?): Okay, that's one. Did Region A get the same treatment?

Tommy Thompson: Yes.

Randy B (?): Did Region B get the same treatment?

Tommy Thompson: I did not go to Region B but I had a representative there at Region B. So, we went to your meeting and I walked up - I stayed there for an hour presenting this. Were you there at the meeting?

Randy B (?): No, but our DC was there.

Tommy Thompson: I was there for an hour and when I left there anybody that had any questions was asked any questions and I answered every question that was asked. I don't know how much more you want me to do. I went to that meeting there, Miguel had the information to communicate to you guys.

I went to Region A's meeting and did the same thing, right, listened to any questions anybody had on the proposal, explained it as best as I could at those two meetings. I did not go to Region B, but Alice did represent us at Region B.

Randy B (?): Okay. Okay. And the last thing is if we've got a problem with DC's which I keep hearing DC's don't show up at meetings, and one thing or another, maybe we need to hold VP's responsible for the DC's. If they aren't showing up maybe the VP's need to be contacting their DC's and asking them why aren't they there, what's going on, how can I help you if you have to be at a business meeting or you're out of town and you can't be at that meeting, how can I represent you as a DC at this meeting at this upcoming meeting, then nobody will be absent.

Tommy Thompson: I'm not arguing your points at all. The point of the restructure was not, per se, just to get rid of DC's. It was a reorganization of the structure of FYSA that what we felt – or when I presented I felt, and the Board approved, what the organization needed to look like moving forward, a more lean mean reactive organization.

That's what it was put for, not to get rid of DC's because we keep bashing DC's because they didn't show up for meetings or anything like that. But people have asked those questions so I did - I wasn't going to bring up that seven DC's didn't show up on Friday, but the question was asked so I put it – I answered the question.

If you're not getting information from your DC's the first thing you need to do is complain to your DC or to your Regional VP who comes to the Board of Directors with the issue.

You can see in the Rules there once a DC is elected there's a procedure to get rid of them if you want to get rid of one or replace one that's not doing the job at the local area or you don't elect him in two years. So, that's the point. But this whole process was not to necessarily just to get rid of the DC's.

Randy B (?): But again, that's contact to the VP's to the – outreach to the clubs. I mean, the VP's should know which DC's are doing their job and which are not< I would think.

Tommy Thompson: That's a Regional issue.

Randy B (?): Okay.

Tommy Thompson: If you look at my proposal up here it would move the DC's down to the Regional level under the direction of the Regional Vice Presidents, give them more Regional issue rather than the State up here trying to get everybody –

Randy B (?): This was drafted last night? This was drafted last night?

Tommy Thompson: This was drafted last night after the meetings yesterday afternoon. That's why I don't want to have a rash decision today one way or the other. I want it to come back with a decision that everybody has thought about, talked about, discussed and then we'll do what's best for the Organization.

Lou Confessore: I'd like to call the question on your original motion.

Male Member: I so move.

Male Member: Second.

Marino Torrens: It was seconded by who? Whoever seconded it has got to come up to the microphone, please, so we can have it in the Minutes.

Joe Grammer: Are we going to sever these two or can we talk about the other part of that motion?

Marino Torrens: Well, the vote has been called.

Joe Grammer: Well, I came up earlier saying I wanted to talk about the Registrar Motion.

Male Member: Move the question to vote.

Male Member: Second the Motion to move the question to vote.

Tommy Thompson: You want to move the question on the original proposal as – with no amendments?

Male Member: On the original motion.

Tommy Thompson: On the original Motion. Well, there was a discussion that the gentleman did want to talk about the Registrar question. So, can we deal with that first? Lou?

Lou Confessore: When you put this back out, we were talking about withdrawing this and then you said that you would like for us – or someone came up and asked if we could discuss it first and then we started discussing it. And what I'm saying now is we're done discussing this.

I would like to call the question so that if it is defeated you can do what you wanted to do in appointing a committee or discussing it and bringing it back. But, this whole discussion would be at an end and we would start over again in your January meeting with – whether you decide to appoint a committee to restructure this thing or - by defeating the original Motion, does that mean that we're telling you that we don't want you to go –

Female Speaker: No.

Lou Confessore: - into restructure? No. I just want to end this discussion.

(Laughter and Applause)

Tommy Thompson: Okay. I tried to do that by tabling it but we decided we wanted to discuss it. Now we've discussed it for about an hour. So, the question has been called, I can guarantee right now we might as well pull out Ballot B.

(Many voices speaking at the same time)

Marino Torrens: Time for the vote. The Motion on the floor was to – the Motion was made to approve this as it is.

Tommy Thompson: Right.

Marino Torrens: And it was seconded. That's what we voted on.

Male Speaker (Unnamed): No, that that.

Marino Torrens: No, not that.

Tommy Thompson: Take this down, Cody. Point of order, the Motion on the floor is to move the vote.

Marino Torrens: Right.

Tommy Thompson: But it has to be voted on first.

Marino Torrens: Uh-huh.

Tommy Thompson: If that Motion is approved -

Becky McLaren: If you call the question, you vote on the Motion. You don't have to vote on calling his question.

Marino Torrens: Somebody called it so we've got to vote on it.

Tommy Thompson: I'm not Robert's Rule of Order, guys, so I don't know.

Becky McLaren: When you call the question you don't have to vote on calling the question.

Marino Torrens: Yes.

Tommy Thompson: So, the three of you have called to close the debate or whatever you have to do to close this discussion.

Marino Torrens: Go ahead.

Tommy Thompson: All right. All those in favor of the Motion as presented -

Becky McLaren: No -

Marino Torrens: In your books.

Tommy Thompson: Take this down. Take this down. The one I mentioned, that one, is gone. All those in favor of as presented and approved by the Board of Directors signify by saying aye.

Members: (No response)

Tommy Thompson. Okay, that's easy. All those opposed?

Members: Nay.

Tommy Thompson: Okay, we'll come back in January then.

(Applause)

Becky McLaren: We need to break to have everybody -

Marino Torrens: Okay, I guess we're done with the Rules. So, we're going to take a fifteen minute break.