SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 2017 SUN PEAKS, B.C.

PLENARY #1

CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON (2:00 P.M.)

INTRODUCTION – WELCOME – CHAIR OF THE BOARD RANDY HENDERSON

It is always a pleasure to have Vancouver Canucks host the Silver Skate Award luncheon. It was another great year to recognize all those successes. We'll now begin the business portion with the 1st Plenary.

I would like to welcome you all to the 98th Annual General Meeting of BC Hockey. It's always a pleasure to first introduce our Life Members in attendance. I'd like to introduce AI Matthews. Unfortunately, Frank Lento, Don Freer, and Bob Mullock, Ray Peebles and Donny Schmaltz are unable to join us this weekend, but on behalf of the membership I'd like to thank the Life Members for their continued love of the game and support of the Branch.

We are pleased to have a number of special guests joining us this evening, or this afternoon. I'd like to ask you to hold your applause until the introductions are completed. We have Murray Wiseman from Wiseman & Mills, BC Hockey's Chartered Accountant and Auditor, and Pamela Thompson, our Recording Secretary. I don't know why we're paying Murray because he didn't have anything to complain about with our audited statements this year, so I guess he's going to give us a freebee.

There are a number of Coordinators who Chair our Program Committees, or task groups, in attendance. Female Program of Excellence Committee, we have Whitney Juszkiewicz; School Programming Committee, Andy Oakes; Coach Committee, Aaron Hoffman; Safety Committee, Anne Deitch; Officiating Committee, Sean Raphael; Female and Male Midget AAA Committee, Sean Orr; Minor Operations Task Group, June McKenzie; Minor Relations and Communications Task Group, Dave Buck; Junior Committee with Phil Iddon; Adult Male Committee, Trevor Bast.

In addition, we'd like to acknowledge our Appeal Committee. I'd like to extend our appreciation to these individuals for their efforts on behalf of the Branch. The Appeal Committee consisted of Cliff Chiu as Chair, Wendy Steadman, Mark Bakken, Lawrence Kinch, and Wilf Liefke. Our Nominating Committee this year was comprised of Mike Bruni, Bruce Hamilton, Chuck Gallacher and Al Matthews. Finally, I'd like to thank our Board of Directors for a great year of service and I'd like to recognize each individual and their service to BC Hockey over the 2016-2017 season. Unfortunately, Dawn Bursey, couldn't join us this weekend and Chuck Campbell, but we have Bill Greene, Brian Harrison, Andrew Jakubeit, Darryl Lerum, Neil McNabb and Grant Zimmerman.

The information on the Credential Committee work group has been circulated for your review. For the record, the Credentials Committee Work Group for the AGM consists of Bill Greene as Chair, Darryl Lerum and Al Matthews.

I'd now like to call upon Bill Greene to present the Credentials Committee Work Group Report - Bill.







CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE WORK GROUP REPORT – BILL GREENE

Thank you, Randy. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to our meeting.

Credentials Report for the meeting, currently we have:

MINOR AND DISTRICT ASSOCIATIONS	91
MINOR LEAGUES AND TEAMS	398
JUNIOR A LEAGUES AND TEAMS	0
JUNIOR B LEAGUES AND TEAMS	20
JUNIOR FEMALE	0
SENIOR FEMALE LEAGUES AND TEAMS	0
SENIOR MALE LEAGUES AND TEAMS	0
DIRECTORS	
	516

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thank you, Bill. I'd now like to call upon CEO, Barry Petrachenko, to review the meeting procedures and deliver our financial report.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Thank you, Randy. A couple of business items before I start the Financial Report. Today for our election proceedings, our scrutineers will be our staff and coordinators, who will assist AI Matthews, as a Life Member, and I think we may even put our auditors into that mix as well and to ensure we get the answers back quickly.

The grey voting cards, the larger card for Resolutions and Voting, and election ballots, the smaller card with the names of the candidates for Board election should have been in your package and you should have those. Those are the cards we will be using today. If we do have a recorded vote, during our Resolutions we'll utilize the pull off tabs on the voting card for that.

Our Recording Secretary has asked me to remind everyone to announce your name and Association – Barry Petrachenko, BC Hockey – before you speak and please go to the mic when you do ask a question or have a comment.

Unless there are any questions on the meeting proceedings, I will move into the Financial Report.

FINANCIAL REPORT – BARRY PETRACHENKO

And to start, I really want to thank our Accounting staff, headed up by Carla Soares, who is here today, Sean Mitchelmore and Alex Kay. A special thank you to Lance Mayes, who departed in February, but had a lot to do with our year-end accounting, and to note that Lance's replacement, Deborah Brougham started at the end of May as our Finance Manager, so they all contributed to our Finance Department in some way, and I want to thank them for that. We've already acknowledged Murray Wiseman from Wiseman & Mills, but Murray is here and I want to say, thanks for everything through the audit process this year – Murray.





So our Financial summary today will cover the past and look ahead. I'll go over our audited Financial Statements which are in the AGM Proceedings booklet on pages 2 to 17. They were distributed on May 29, give you an overview of our operation and provide the assurances relative to our reporting that come out of our audit process, and then looking ahead I'll touch on our budget for the coming season that was distributed to all members on February 20 and touch on some items around fees with respect to membership, and insurance premiums.

So onto the Financial Statements, the audited statements. Our audit process includes now, as probably yours all does as well at the Minor Hockey Association level, a meeting between our Auditors and our Board of Directors, and I'm very happy to report on behalf of the Organization and our accounting staff that it was a clean audit with no management letter points, and in accounting speak, that's a really good report card. The management letter points are the ones you never want to get but sometimes occur, and we had a clean one this year, so that's very good, and kudos to our group for getting to that point.

You may have noticed that we did experience a deficiency of revenue over expense of \$352,210, and I'll give you an outline of the factors that affected that bottom line, they are as follows.

So they're covered in the Statement of Operations on page seven (7), and the deficiency really wasn't a surprise. We had anticipated a deficit in our budget last year. We had experienced several years of solid financial results in years prior and the Board had authorized the use of some of those funds to cover off some things that we wanted to do in this year. Our budgeted subsidies added up to \$255,000 of that amount. They related to capital upgrades, improvements to programming in the Program of Excellence staffing, and Minor Rec and office costs. The Board subsequent to that also approved last April a \$50,000 subsidy to the Female Midget AAA League to offset a player fee increase for one (1) season, so that the shock value was lessened somewhat and gave us an opportunity to work on that shock to the system to those participants, and both of those items were reported to the membership at last year's AGM and were covered by the Unrestricted General and Development Fund, which is on page five (5) of your materials, and the balance of that fund, as you'll see, is sitting just over a million dollars.

There were some additional factors in the deficiency of revenue over expense then that amounted to \$352,000. Last year's AGM was a cost to the Organization of \$56,000. That amounted from low registration and some AV additional needs that we had for some of the seminar setups because we had to actually run the AV in multiple spots. The low registration really hurts us at the AGM because you budget for a certain amount and there are costs that you can't change – you kind of cross your fingers, but when the registration comes in low it's usually fairly last minute that you realize that and so we weren't able to adapt to that.

Also, in our Programming, our Female Program of Excellence, we learned a lot last year in the Female Program, and one (1) of the things we learned was that some of the enhancements that we tried to put into last year's budget didn't work, frankly. The customer said that the camps we tried to run and the configuration we tried to have was not what they wanted, and that led to cancelled camps and that loss in that program, which I'll touch on a little bit more in a second when I go over the budget.







We also added some costs to cover the startup of the Zone Programming Pilot Project, so that factored in. And then when you add it all up, what also comes out in the wash is, we were very fortunate this past year that we received more funding from Hockey Canada than anticipated or that we had budgeted for. We had budgeted \$103,000 and we ended up coming in at \$110,000 over in funding, so thank you Hockey Canada, and certainly that helped us in our year-end bottom line.

Onto the budget, and this was, as I mentioned, distributed back in February; it's not in proceedings document because we don't need a motion on it, as it's been approved by the Board as per our process, but I did want to highlight a couple of items from it. We have increased the budget slightly, when compared to previous, to the amount of just over \$200,000. We've had an addition of some travel and meetings, as well as some programming enhancements. Of course, it's a balanced budget so we recover those costs, but Education, Male POE, MML and Officiating all had program enhancements. And we did offset our Female POE budget this year, based on what we learned last year. Ultimately, we eliminated a full Under 18 camp by combining two (2), we shortened camps by a day to reduce expenses, and did all of that to arrive at a suitable fee that our participants find palatable.

The budget also includes \$30,000 in subsidies from the Unrestricted General and Development Fund and those were approved by the Board at the June 2015 meetings, so we knew those were coming and they were just factored into the budget.

I'll give you the heads up that I just wanted to remind you of the membership fee adjustments that you had passed last year on a 3-year cycle of \$0.25 increments, just a fee increase that years ago the membership instructed us to follow, rather than getting to a point where we hadn't had a fee increase in five (5) to 10 years like we had experienced back in the early 2000's, and so those are the fees that will be in place over the course of the next three (3) years.

And then I just wanted to touch on the Hockey Canada Insurance Program, and a lot of pressure because Todd Jackson is here so I'm talking about insurance in front of him, but Hockey Canada continues to facilitate the renewal process for our insurance policy. We had a question on this, this morning but for the purposes of people who weren't here, that includes Directors and Officers Liability Insurance, and I know we have people who have been to a lot of AGMs before, so they will remember back when we used to promote going out and purchasing Directors and Officers Liability Insurance separately, and that's something that's always been a great addition to the Hockey Canada Insurance Program, and that continues to be included. However, as we mentioned this morning, you know, everything when you're trying to renew an insurance policy, as you know how your insurance policy has probably gone on your residence or your vehicles, it's always a challenge, and the report that we got back at the Spring Congress from Hockey Canada is that there's a possibility of an increase to insurance in the future. Before I tell you how much, I'm going to remind you that in 1993 when Hockey Canada got out of the self-insurance program and went into private insurance, we were paying almost \$40 per player for that insurance, and we've been paying less than half that for a number of years, so we've been doing well, but we're likely to have a fee increase in the future of between \$2 and \$5; Todd assures me he's going to not sleep until he gets it down to \$2, but we will have that coming forward and, of course, we will provide information for you on that as it comes available.







So that concludes the Financial Report. I'd like to thank the members of our Finance Committee – Chuck Campbell, who was the Chair, who couldn't be with us this weekend because of a bit of a health challenge, but did a great job as our Chair, and Dawn Bursey, Brian Harrison, Darryl Lerum, and Neil McNabb, thank you. And I can answer any questions you may have on any of that information. I see I already have one (1).

TERRY MARLOW – KITIMAT MHA

Yes, thank you for that report. Terry Marlow, Kitimat Minor Hockey Association. Although I haven't been a long term member at this AGM, I've certainly been involved in a number of different Association Boards, etcetera, and one (1) thing that comes to mind here, although I know BC Hockey does a great deal of great work, I do see the bottom line here of a deficit last year in 2016 of \$70,000 plus, and this year movement to \$352,000, and you've explained some of the expectations of deficits. However, I think most people would also argue that we have to be a heck of a lot more fiscally responsible in a lot of ways, and I think that a \$350,000 deficit is large. I know you've talked also about approved subsidies and voted approved subsidies from other funds, and again, in my mind we've also got to be cautious about robbing Peter to pay Paul and looking at the long term in terms of our other funds because, obviously, they are separate funds for a reason. I notice in Programs, for example, that seems to be the largest area of the deficits, if you look at the increases from 2016 to 2017, and again, Programs are a huge part of our, you know, BC Hockey and our Associations and we have a lot of benefit from those, but again, I bring back to my comment, and I will get to a question, about the fact that we do have to take a look at both our Board and our Financial Committee of being fiscally responsible. We have, as you've mentioned, fee increases over the next three (3) years and certainly, having been a parent of kids in Minor Hockey and being involved in hockey a long time, I know that it's already a great expense for parents with rep hockey, academies, you know, Midget AAA, now looking at Bantam and those types of things, and so we can't simply pass that onto the stakeholders. So I would ask, is the question, what our Board and Finance Committee and everyone involved is gonna do to look forward to try and rein it in and try and bring it back to where we don't have to look at the large deficits? Thank you.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Terry, I'll let the Board speak up in a second and because Chuck is not here as the Chair of the Finance Committee, I'll just make a quick comment. I would suggest, with respect, that we are very fiscally responsible and it always has been at the forefront. A couple of comments you made, if – and I'm appreciating that you haven't been here at a number of AGMs, but if we do go back to as recent as 2013/2014, we had two (2) years where our excess of revenue was over a million dollars. So we are not robbing Peter to pay Paul in any way. The money that was subsidizing the budget last year was a fiscally responsible decision by the Board to say, we brought in money to our bank account, our Unrestricted General and Development Fund is a fancy way of saying our bank account, so we basically said we made money in the past year, we have some odd expenses in the 2016-2017 season, and \$255,000 of those were subsidized. We did have some overages to the extent of an additional \$100,000. I would caution you, though, when you look at the Financial Statements for the Programing amounts, they don't always add up perfectly because there are other factors. Some of those programs have some marketing funds that come in and so the actual bottom line for those programs is a lot closer to zero, and I'd be happy to go over that with you if you wanted that information.







<u> TERRY MARLOW – KITIMAT MHA</u>

Thank you for that comment and just as a quick follow up, I'd only say that, you know, I think it would be a better position for our Organization is to budget for those changes and plan for those within year to year rather than back and forth deficit, over-expenditure, those types of things, and I appreciate that we've been ahead at various times, but again, as a large Organization with over \$8,000,000 in revenue, I think that it's important that you budget ahead for that rather than expecting to go over. Thank you so much.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Any other questions?

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Jim Humphrey, Vancouver Island. One (1) of the things you mentioned, Barry, was that the Board approved the \$50,000 deficit for the Female AAA, but the actual deficit was \$82,500, so that's \$32,000 more than what the Board approved. We certainly can understand the zone pilot that came about last year, but one (1) of the ones that are giving us the hardest thing to understand is, the Major Midget League is supposed to be self-sufficient. It's supposed to be revenue/deficit neutral. I believe there's a BC Hockey policy that even indicates that, and the Major Midget League, \$144,000 over revenue last year. Can you explain how the Major Midget League, to my knowledge and I've been coming to these for a long time, has never been that much of a deficit?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Jim, yeah, I can answer that. The Major Midget League, I take it you're taking the \$144,000 as a deficit based off the income and expense listed in the Income Statement, is that it?

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Yes.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

So, roughly, \$80k of that would be offset by marketing that is directly related to the MML that the Board years ago – you may have been on the Board at the time – said that that is to be included in the MML budget. So that brings that \$144k down to \$64,000, and on top of that we get gaming money. That appears as gaming money on the gaming money line, but to the tune of say another \$5,000, all right? And then last year the remaining \$60,000 was the result of two (2) factors. One, we added a trip to Whitehorse, an outreach program, where we took two (2) teams up to Whitehorse and did some developmental programming with the Yukon, and we anticipated attendance in our planning with the Whitehorse group, that didn't pan out, and that cost \$25,000 as a result. And then we had \$35,000, because of the weather last year, as we all know the weather was poor, and so our travel was over because we had several trips cancelled that had to be rescheduled, but we had already gotten on the bus and gone and then had to come home. And unfortunately, all the weather hit, you know at the peak time of the hockey season and caused that overage. So, we definitely had roughly \$60,000 in overages directly attributable to those two (2) areas.





JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Okay, thank you. And the reason that is, is that in all the years that Major Midget's been around I don't ever remember being that deficit. I can understand cancelled travel and things like that, 'cause it costs us too. But what – what is the – there's too many things these day, whether it be federal government, provincial government, and now, you know, Branches, or whatever, live beyond their means. Like if I make a hundred grand a year for my family and I'm spending a hundred and fifty grand, it's costing me. What is BC Hockey going to do, moving forward, as the gentleman from Kitimat indicated we were \$70,000 short this – last year, \$350k this year. What is BC Hockey going to do to assure its members that you're gonna live within the means of the money that we provide?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Jim, I actually find that a little bit of an alarmist statement, considering our history. We provide complete outlines of our budget. We are, I think, one (1) of the most transparent organizations that you'll see in a provincial sport organization.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

I agree.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

If you go back to 2012, a million dollar – I'm not supposed to use this word as a non-profit, but "profit"; 2013, \$880,000 profit - sorry, I'm just going through my statements here - and then \$265k and \$356k. This is not an Organization that's living beyond its means. If anything, we're being responsible to our members by saying, "Look, we're not here to make a profit." We're not going on vacations or exotic trips beyond our means to have Board meetings. We're actually spending some of the money on programming that has been accumulated in surpluses over the years while maintaining safety valve reserve funds to cover a rainy day or problems that might arise. So, while I appreciate the observations, and I understand that I don't get a lot of questions when we make a million dollars, but I get questions when we lose \$356k, I have to remind you that we stood in front of the membership completely open last year and said that we were going to subsidize a \$255,000 loss. So, I appreciate that there's some concern that we would turn into an organization such as you compared us to but, frankly, I have to disagree that we're anything like them. I think our finances are in order and that we do a very good job as a staff and as a Board at maintaining the fiscal responsibility that the membership expects from us.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

I'm all – I do agree that we are transparent in all those things. I didn't – but our Board of Directors is elected to produce and provide a budget. I don't recall supporting a \$250,000 loss last year. I remember talking about some of the deficits and programs, and as you very well know some of these surpluses that we have received in the past are because of endowments that we've received from the one (1) person that left a million dollars or \$800,000, whatever, to BC Hockey, and that's all great and we use that for programs. But I would hope going forward that we don't rely on, well we made a surplus of a million dollars two (2) years ago and this much three (3) years ago and four (4) years ago, we can – it's okay 'cause we can cover off this much money with our surpluses in the past. I would like to see, as all of us do in Minor Hockey, we put – we have to put a balanced budget forward to our membership, and then that's the budget we work with, not whether we made a surplus or a deficit last year. Is that we're still pointed in the direction of?





BARRY PETRACHENKO

I would suggest, Jim, that nothing has changed. The amount in the financial statements this year is not indicative of any change from that. We know our membership and we know our expectations. We know what you're up against with your Minor Hockey Associations and I would again, I don't want to repeat myself, but I think we operate that way and the Board is crystal clear on that. Just to comment on your statement there about last year, the Board approves the budget but we reported; I'm sure it's in the minutes if you look it up from last year, we reported that that funding from past years was going to be used to offset that \$255,000. And to the point of planning years ahead, some of that money was like painting the office, which hadn't been painted in 10 years...

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Yeah.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

...right, so we could have planned a year ahead and said we're going to put aside...

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Yeah.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

...this money, we just did it all at once and...

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Yeah.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

...we had the funds there, and you know, we're there. I live by what you've just said every day.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

No, I agree with you, Barry, a hundred percent.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Every day, Carla and her staff are all over our finances, and I really don't think there's an issue with this Organization. I mean, our expenses are programming. So if we're living high on the hog, it's by providing programs to participants. And we make some mistakes sometimes, you know, we're not perfect but I think our fiscal responsibility is certainly not something that should even start as a whisper, and if it does we need to do whatever it takes to make you feel better about it.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Yeah. No, that's good. Thanks very much.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Any other questions? All right, well thank you for your attention. I'll turn it back over to Randy. We still have some financial business remaining. We'll need motions to accept the Financial Statements and appoint Wiseman & Mills as auditors for the coming year. Thank you.







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thank you very much, Barry. As per what Barry just said, Bylaw 908 requires that I now ask for a motion to approve the 2016-2017 Audited Financial Statements. Do I have a mover and a seconder?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Robert Nasato, New West, I'll move receipt of the Financial Statements.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thank you, Rob. Do I have a seconder? Lochie Bell from Abbotsford Minor Hockey. Any questions? Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

MOTION – AS PER BYLAW 908, APPROVE 2016-2017 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY LOCHIE BELL MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Under Bylaw 903, I would now ask for a motion to appoint Wiseman & Mills as the auditors for BC Hockey for the 2017-2018 season. Do I have a mover?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Robert Nasato, New Westminster.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Robert Nasato.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

I move that we appoint Wiseman & Mills as the auditor.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thank you very much, Rob. Do I have a seconder? Brian Harrison, BC Hockey. Thank you very much. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

MOTION – AS PER BYLAW 903, APPOINT WISEMAN & MILLS AS THE AUDITORS FOR BC HOCKEY FOR THE 2017-2018 SEASON MOVED ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY BRIAN HARRISON MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

The Minutes from the 97th AGM have been circulated. I would now ask for a mover and a seconder to adopt the 97th AGM Minutes as circulated. Do I have a mover?





CHRIS STUART – HOUSTON MHA

Chris Stuart, Houston Minor Hockey.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Chris Stuart, Houston.

LARRY HAYES - BURNABY MHA

Larry Hayes, Burnaby Minor Hockey.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Larry Hayes, Burnaby Minor. Thank you, Larry. All those in favour? Opposed? That motion is carried.

MOTION – TO ADOPT THE MINUTES FROM THE 97TH BC HOCKEY AGM AS CIRCULATED MOVED BY CHRIS STUART SECONDED BY LARRY HAYES MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Do I have a mover and a seconder for the adoption of the Coordinator and Director Reports from the 2016-2017 Annual Report? Motion by Neil McNabb. Seconded by Cindy Secord. All those in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

MOTION – ADOPTION OF THE COORDINATOR AND DIRECTOR REPORTS FROM THE 2016-2017 ANNUAL REPORT MOVED BY NEIL MCNABB SECONDED BY CINDY SECORD MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Under the requirements of the new Societies Act, I would move that the Board of Directors activities for the 2016-2017 season be ratified. Do I have a mover?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Robert Nasato, New West Minor.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Rob Nasato and Lochie Bell. All those in favour? That's carried.

MOTION – BOARD OF DIRECTORS ACTIVITIES FOR THE 2016-2017 SEASON BE RATIFIED MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY LOCHIE BELL MOTION CARRIED







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, we'll now move into the Resolutions portion of today's business. I will serve as your Resolutions Chair this afternoon.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Point of Order, Point of Order, Sir. Robert Nasato, New Westminster.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

I would like to say that I object to the Notice of Motion package that has been presented, and I have a question for you as the Chair. Do we as members in good standing have the right to put motions forward?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

A Resolution or a Motion?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

A Resolution as part of the package. Are we as members in good standing able to put motions forward, do we have that right?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

At this time or ahead of it?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

No, during, ahead of time.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Ahead of time, yes you do.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

So then, again, do you need my name again, but if not....

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

No.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

What I'm basically here to argue about is, the -I object to the placement of the Motion I made and it got moved out of the Notice of Motion and got moved into New Business. I believe procedurally it was incorrect and my rights as a member were violated. I want to know why I was forced to rename my Policy – to rename my Motion to have a Policy rather than a Regulation as I originally submitted it. Under what authority does the Governance Committee have that allows them to effectively strong-arm the rights of members to force rewording of Resolutions that we've tried to put forward?







I would like to call upon Grant Zimmerman, who I believe had some lengthy conversations with you about this, Rob, to clarify whether you were restricted - Grant.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

Thank you, Randy. So when the Governance Committee receives Resolutions from members, the Governance Committee does a review of the content of the Resolution to determine, first of all, whether or not the Resolution is out of order. For example, there are a couple of member Resolutions to change Bylaws, which are in the package under the Notices of Motion. So when we look at those Resolutions we determine where they're appropriately placed, and your Resolution, or the Resolution that came forward from the New Westminster Minor Hockey Association, in the opinion of the Governance Committee, was a Resolution that was impacting a Policy as opposed to a Regulation. We've been working hard over the last few years with the work done by Bill Veenstra, and moving forward with that to make sure that our Bylaws, our Regulations are organized in such a way that makes it easy for members to find things, as well as to be efficiently organized so that they are logical in their sequence. So, for example, in the first two (2) – in the two (2) member Resolutions that are in the package under Notices of Motion that were put forward by Vancouver Island District and Pacific Coast, we looked at those when they first came into us and said, those Resolutions already exist in our Bylaws, and went back to those Organizations and said, they're already there but you haven't seen them, and then they - we went through a process to look at what was in our Bylaws, to look at how to amend them in a way that would still achieve their objectives but have them in the Bylaws. But the first point there was, they were already there in our Bylaws and in our Regulations, but they had not known that, or they hadn't been able to find it. So we don't want to put things in our Regulations and in our Bylaws that aren't logical, unable to be find, and one (1) of the things that's been happening in the last few years and under the work of Bill Veenstra, we had a lot of Resolutions last year at the AGM, is to clean up the Regulations to remove hockey playing rules out of them. So when your Resolution, or when the Resolution of New Westminster came forward with respect to "Cross-ice hockey", we looked at it and believed that the logical place for it was to make it as part of the Policy, which is where all of the Crossice hockey playing rules are. We went back to you and said, the same way we did with the other Resolutions, and said, we believe this is out of order because it's not properly part of the Regulations and more properly part of the Policy, and we indicated that - we didn't - I don't think straight-arm would be the

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Strong-armed.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

Strong-arm, or the word you used. We went back to you and suggested or recommended that you look at consider changing it to a change to Policy as opposed to the addition of a Regulation. We went through some discussion on it and at that same time we were working with Vancouver Island and Pacific Coast District with regard to changing their Resolutions, and at the end of the day we agreed, or you agreed, that you would change your Resolution to make it a, what's in the package, which is a recommendation to change the Policy with regard to that. So, again, I don't think we straight-armed, or strong armed, I think we talked about what the Governance Committee believed was the issue. I mean, I'm certainly not an expert in Robert's Rules or in these kinds of points, but I have a lot of







experience. The Governance Committee reviewed the stuff, the Board reviewed it, and we stayed on that course to say to you and to New Westminster that it was, in our opinion, out of order for those reasons.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, so let's clarify. I was told that if I didn't change it, it would be ruled out of order and not be in the package at all. The only reason I agreed to move it to a Motion was so that it would be put in writing so people could read it, that's the first one. Hold on, let me make a few points here.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

Okay.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

The second point is, I don't believe the Governance Committee has that authority. The rules that we made last year were made here on the floor. The power is on this floor to make those decisions. I would have preferred you took my Resolution and put an asterisk beside it and said, the Governance Committee feels it's a non-compliance and should be a Policy. That would have been fine with me to argue the issue. I don't believe you had the right to take it out of the Resolutions package, because until we got here, until we got the written notice, most people never even saw that that was there. That's the whole purpose of these Resolution package, to let every member in this Society know that something's going to be debated. I'm not a hundred percent sure I'm right or wrong on it, but I'm sure I have the right to put something forward, and it's my rights that I think you failed.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

Well, and if I may respond to that, when we discussed it we never said that we were going to remove it totally from the package. The intention was to put it in the package with a star to say that it would be ruled out of order. The problem with a Motion that's ruled out of order by the Chair is the Chair, once they make that decision that it's out of order, it squashes the discussion with regard to it and the membership would have to bring it back to the floor with a special Resolution. So, as we discussed it, the discussion would have been lost. So, I appreciate your point, there's a difference between a Regulation and policy, and we talked about where this should properly fit in, but the concern would be, if it was ruled out of order as you suggest, then the discussion would have been gone on the point. It would have just been ruled out of order and gone, unless the membership brought it back by way of a special Resolution.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, and again, forget the actual wording, I don't care about the wording, I care about the process and our rights to put Resolutions forth. I don't believe the Governance Committee has the ability to rule it out of order just because they think it's worded in the wrong place. It wasn't anything illegal, it wasn't contravening anything from BC Hockey or from Hockey Canada, so there's - in my opinion, this is where it's a process problem and it's our right to put things forward. You may disagree with it. I expected you to disagree with me. God, people, you know I want you to disagree with me, but I expect a debate, and so I'm just thinking – I'm just saying, going forward, what I would much rather have you do, because I know we do this at Pacific Coast, I don't know how other Districts do it, a Resolution can come forward and make no sense at all, but if it's legal it goes in the Resolution package with a







recommendation of non-concurrence from the Governance Board, that's how you process these things and I – you know what - and you make the discussion/debate whether it should be Regulation or Policy, you know what, I don't have a problem with that, but I think squashing it at Committee is beyond the power of Committee, and that's why I have a real problem with this package.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

And I would go back, though, Rob, and we – the Governance Committee never ever said that it had the authority to squash it, and there was never the intention of the Governance Committee to squash it. The intention of the Governance Committee was to recommend that that was out of order for the reasons that I was talking about.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, so then I'll say this. I'll give you the benefit of the doubt, but it is clearly not the message I felt I got, okay.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

Yeah.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, that's all I wanted to say on that. Thank you.

LYNNE KIANG – PACIFIC COAST AHA

It's Lynne Kiang from Pacific Coast Amateur Hockey. I would have to concur with Rob in terms of the conversation that I had with you. My understanding from the conversation with you was that if I did not change the motion it would not be in the package and it would not come forward for discussion. So that the only way that I could get it to be a part of the package was to actually have it changed to part of New Business as a Policy. I guess I think that – on Friday night we had a talk from Corey McNabb, and Corey McNabb said, it's not the outcome, it is the process that's important, and I would urge the BC Hockey Board to pay attention to that phrase, because it is really important to a lot of people in this room. It is very important to us as District Presidents, and part of the conversation that we had with Barry and Randy and Bill at the Minor Committee meeting on Friday, is about the process, and people have to feel a part of the process to be able to then buy into the concepts that the Board wishes the rest of the membership to achieve, and that's where success comes from. We have to all be on the same page, and so I'm just – I'm just urging you to please pay attention to that concept because I think that's what we're talking about. We're not necessarily talking about the outcome, we're definitely talking about the process.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

No, and I appreciate that point, and if I could just take a moment to respond because that was a personal statement about what things I said so. I mean, I wrote memos to the Governance Committee and addressed this to the Governance Committee and to the Board of Directors on this point, and I think I was clear that it was always a recommendation. So I very much apologize that if there was any misunderstanding, that there was a belief that the Governance Committee was going to take it out of the package, 'cause that was never the intention through any of this. And what we talked about on the phone was that there would be a recommendation to rule it out of order and if it was ruled out of order







there would be no opportunity to discuss the actual content of the Resolution, and that's why the recommendation was to – from Governance Committee was to not look at it as a Regulation but to shift it over to a Resolution to amend the Policy. So if there was a misunderstanding, certainly I apologize for that. I thought I was clear, and I had been through the process for a bit, so I'm surprised that there was a misunderstanding, but I apologize for that.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Jim Humphrey, Vancouver Island. Just a point of, not to extend this, but I do Chair quite a few between provincial and national committees. I do believe, and you're the lawyer, so we'll refer to you, Grant, but others – a Chair can rule somebody's motion out of order or whatever, but then the next, according to Robert's Rules process, is that person can challenge the Chair, then discussion stops. The Chair has been challenged, there's a vote, which is a simple majority that it takes if the Chair has been challenged, and if the person, in this case, Rob, would get 50% plus one (1) of those in the room saying, no, we believe it's not out of order, then it gets dealt with. But it's not up the Chair or a Committee to say it's out of order. The person that puts it in and is being called out does get an opportunity to challenge the Chair.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

And on that point, I mean, my understanding was that, and again, the Governance Committee never intended to say, and I don't believe we said, that we would rule it out of order, that we would recommend that it be – that it is out of order. And it would go to the Chair, the Chair has the ability to call it out of order, if they deem it to be out of order, and it's not – my understanding was, it's not a simple majority but a special Resolution to bring it back on the floor. Somebody could clarify that for us, but that was my understanding, Jim. Are there any other questions on this point?

(NOTE: NO FURTHER QUESTIONS AT THIS POINT ON THIS ISSUE AT THIS TIME)

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thank you, Grant, for that clarification. Now, our Resolutions that we have and our Notices of Motion that we have in front of us today are divided into kind of three (3) categories.

The first nine (9) are 01 to 09, are dealing with changes as a result of the Societies Act, and as you see they're prefaced by being called, "Transition Resolutions".

Resolutions 10-36 are, "Changes proposed as a result of the work of the Board of Directors, BC Hockey Committees, and BC Hockey staff."

The "Member Resolutions", Resolutions 37 and 38 are proposed by the members.

Is it the wish of the group to have Resolutions 2017-01 to 2017-09 considered as a block? Okay, may I have a mover and a seconder for that, please?

CHAD RINTOUL – PENINSULA MHA

Chad Rintoul, Peninsula.







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, Chad...

CHAD RINTOUL – PENINSULA MHA

Rintoul.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

...Rintoul, from...

CHAD RINTOUL – PENINSULA MHA

Peninsula Minor Hockey.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

...Peninsula, thank you. And

CHRIS STUART - HOUSTON MHA

Chris Stuart, Houston Minor Hockey.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Chris Stuart, thank you. All those in favour? That motion is carried.

MOTION – RESOLUTIONS 2017-01 TO 2017-09 TO BE CONSIDERED AS A BLOCK MOVED BY CHAD RINTOUL SECONDED BY CHRIS STUART MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

So I would now like to have a mover and a seconder to approve Motions 2017-01 to 2017-09, do I have a mover?

<u>RYAN SMITH – NORTH OKANAGAN MHA</u> Ryan Smith, North Okanagan.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON Lance Smith, North Okanagan

RYAN SMITH - NORTH OKANAGAN MHA

Ryan Smith.

<u>CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON</u> Brian – sorry, Brian.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Ryan Smith.







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Long ways away, I'm getting old. And Lynne Kiang from Pacific Coast. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

MOTION – APPROVE RESOLUTIONS 2017-01 TO 2017-09 MOVED BY RYAN SMITH SECONDED BY LYNNE KIANG MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

So now, what is the wish of the membership with regard to Resolutions 10 to 36, do you want those considered individually? We did talk about them yesterday with the – briefly with the Minor Committee. Would you like those considered as a block, it is your discretion?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

No.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, hearing, no, we'll move on to number 10. Can I have a mover and a seconder for these motions in sequence and we'll use the same mover and seconder? Jim?

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Can I just ask – I'll put that motion forward, but can we just maybe to have some time, does anybody want to pull out a particular Resolution and then we'll vote on the rest as a block, 'cause I understand there might only be like one (1) or two (2) Resolutions in all this?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

I'd be happy to entertain that. Do you want to take a minute to.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

I'd like to - Robert Nasato, New West. I'd like to move 10 through 13 for a group motion.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

10 to 13; any others? Okay, 10 to 13 as a block. Mover, Rob Nasato – no, Jim moved; Rob second. All those in favour? If there are no objections from the mover and seconder, that's carried.

MOTION – RESOLUTIONS 2017-10 TO 2017-13 CONSIDERED AS A BLOCK MOVED BY JIM HUMPHREY SECONDED BY ROBERT NASATO MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

If there are no objections from the mover and seconder, we'll move those motions. All those in favour of Motions 2017-10 through 13? Opposed? That's carried.







MOTION – RESOLUTIONS 2017-10 TO 2017-13 MOVED BY JIM HUMPHREY SECONDED BY ROB NASATO MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

So, 2017-14. This is a – oh, we have a speaker, all right, Rob.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Well, do you need me to make a motion to move it first?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Yes, please.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, motion to move Resolution 2017-14, Robert Nasato, New Westminster Minor Hockey. I want to speak to it, so I need someone else to second it first.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Yeah, Jim Humphrey, V.I.

MOTION – MOVE RESOLUTION 2017-14 MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY JIM HUMPHREY

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, so the only question I had about this one (1) is, it says, "The Board is accountable to the Members. The Board is responsible for rules, policy", etcetera, etcetera, and it talks about doing it through the Chief Executive Officer. Although I agree with that statement, do we have covered that the Board actually monitors the Chief Executive Officer, because really, the Chief Executive Officer runs hockey but he's supervised by the Board, and it doesn't really say that here and I'm wondering have I missed it, is it somewhere else, or should we amend this to include? So, it's first a question probably to Barry, do we have it covered somewhere else that I've missed?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

I'll defer to Grant to answer that part, as far as if it's elsewhere?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

The specificity around it is that Barry is the only employee of the Board. Barry is our employee, so everything that operationally occurs, it is Barry's responsibility and we do hold him accountable for that. Now, is it covered specifically? I believe it is in the Terms of Reference, Grant, in 502 – yeah.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

So it's covered under the Terms of Reference of the CEO's position?







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

502, if you take a look at that.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Bylaw 502 says, "The Board may delegate any, but not all, of their responsibilities. The Board shall have the authority to delegate those responsibilities, duties and authority that may be lawfully delegated to the Chief Executive Officer or to a Committee, Workgroup of member of the Society, or to any Third Party to assist in carrying out its responsibilities."

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, so it's covered under 502, then I have no further questions, thank you.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Done deal. Would you like to add anything, Grant? No, okay, good. All right, so all those in favour of Resolution 2017-14? That motion is carried.

MOTION - RESOLUTION 2017-14 MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY JIM HUMPHREY MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

2017-15, and if anyone wants to throw some blocks in here and getting us going before five, and I'm the first guy you want to talk to. Rob?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Robert Nasato, New West Minor Hockey. I'll move 2017-15 for discussion.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, do I have a seconder?

CHAD RINTOUL – PENINSULA MHA

Chad Rintoul, Peninsula Minor Hockey, I'll second.

MOTION – RESOLUTION 2017-15 – MOVE FOR DISCUSSION MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHAD RINTOUL

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

So, really, quite simply, I have to ask the question of, why? As members, we pretty much have two (2) avenues of power; one, is electing a Board, and one (1) is making Resolutions at an AGM. We're diluting our power by appointing a Board member that isn't elected, and although I've had the answer, I'm going to ask the question, 'cause Chuck Gallacher gave me the answer. One – one of my concerns that first came up was, what happens if, you know, for example, you, Randy, you lost an election and







the next day the Board decided to appoint you while the membership had decided not to have you do it, and I understand Resolution 19 does protect it, that wasn't one (1) of the questions, but why do you need to appoint a Board member? You've got the ability to call in subject matter experts all the time, so you're – the concern I have, and again, I'm not gonna say absolutely no to this, I need to understand why you need this.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, I can give this a good kick at the cat. We got a couple of other subject matter experts in here as well and I'm gonna call on Mike Bruni, as past Chair and President of Hockey Canada. This recommendation is in line with something broader, in that, once we – once we develop a matrix for skills that we want on the Board, we might have a year where we are looking to have a member that – a member of the Board of Directors that has a specific skillset, be it legal, be it medical, whatever the case might be. It might be someone who has a medical or psychiatric background that we don't possess on the Board and we think would be valuable to add to the Board for the year. Now, Mike, can I ask you your opinion on this, please?

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Absolutely. I expected this type of conversation; I appreciate you bringing it up. One (1) of the things that you'll notice and one (1) of the reasons for this, and we did face the same type of discussion at Hockey Canada when we did put in a similar provision for appointed Director. First of all, I appreciate your comment about saying, "diluting". It's not about in any way diluting, I think it's enhancing. One (1) of the things that you are gonna be doing today, you're going to be voting for your Board of Directors, and once you vote for the Board of Directors you're entrusting them to do things in the best interest of the organization. As you can see, the process for the subsequent motion is that it's the Board that's gonna decide if there is a need, and if there is, then they would - they would appoint it. But one - one of the more fundamental aspects, other than SME's, which are "Subject Matter Experts", is, is the fact that if you notice the last bullet, "a broader perspective". The Nominating Committee had many, many people that are interested in being on the Board, but one (1) of the things that a lot of these very qualified people were reluctant to be embarked upon was an election process, and I think that there is a real opportunity to enhance the whole Governance structure if you have the opportunity to include people for one (1) year, it's only one (1) year, that could bring a perspective, a freshness, not that this Board doesn't bring that, but I think it's a opportunity for enhancing the whole decision-making and Governance model. So now, I can appreciate the comment that we want to elect people that are governing the Board, well, you're gonna to have only one (1) of those nine (9) that would be appointed. So, the people that you have elected will be controlling, or will be enhancing what your views are because you have elected them. So I don't really see it a matter of dilution at all, it absolutely is not. I think it's an enhancement. I really believe, as well - I know Hockey Canada has not gone this route. Quite frankly, I think BC Hockey is well, well ahead of the National Organization in a lot of ways, and I'm not being critical of them. I'm just saying BC Hockey has a lot more progressive approach to a lot of these things and I think this is a real opportunity for hockey – for BC Hockey to really take charge of something that I think will be a model for others, and I think it's a benefit for all of you to have these types of individuals. One (1) last point, very good point, a loser in the election, oh, they're gonna come through the back door and they're just gonna get on there by appointment, absolutely not, absolutely not. There's a process in place where the Nominating Committee would be involved in recommending and clearly, clearly individuals that would be recommended would be those that we really feel that







would – would enhance the process, and we have to be respective of the democratic process as well, and if the Board would ultimately make that decision, so I don't see that as a risk. I do not see that as a risk, given – we have formulated a process, in terms of our due diligence as a Committee, that would – a detailed process if this Motion was to be approved that would, I really think, avoid that from happening.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, thank you for answering that. I'm not opposed to it, I just needed to understand why. Thank you.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

And I – thank you for bringing it up, and I'm glad you brought it up because it's important that we discuss these matters and – and thank you for bringing that up - I forgot his name already – Robert, Robert. I'll shake your hand tonight.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

You might be the only person in the room that doesn't know my name.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

He's an import. Thanks very much, Mike

LYNNE KIANG – PACIFIC COAST AHA

Randy, can I ask a question? I know you can't see me but

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

I sure can, my glasses are clean.

LYNNE KIANG – PACIFIC COAST AHA

I just like to ask a question. I also don't oppose the motion, but I don't actually see anywhere in here that would preclude the person from being subsequently reappointed. So that part of the explanation that came to me as well was that, this is only a one-year term. Is there anything that would preclude the person from being reappointed on perpetuity, for example?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

No, there's – there's – there's nothing in there that says they couldn't be reappointed, but Lynne, I don't see that as something if we're gonna – go ahead, Mike.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Thank you for raising that. There is no provision that would prevent a reappointment, however, the process that - the individual would have to go through the process again, and quite frankly, you know, sometimes if they're – they're – that continuity may be beneficial, but there is not, and that was deliberate, but they would have to go through the same process and would have to be appointed again by the Board. It's – nothing would be automatic.







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

After recommendation by the Nominating Committee after they'd called for that type of person – Grant.

GRANT ZIMMERMAN

I think that it would be expected that they would proceed to go through the election process if they wanted to, or if we believed that they should be maintained on the Board, that's – that's the belief.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, any further questions? Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? That's carried.

MOTION – RESOLUTION 2017-15 MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHAD RINTOUL MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, 2017-16, Rob?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Motion to move 2017-16 through 2017-20 as a group.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Do I have a seconder?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Sorry, Robert Nasato, New West Minor Hockey.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Chuck Gallacher.

MOTION – MOVE RESOLUTION 2017-16 THROUGH 2017-20 TO BE CONSIDERED AS A BLOCK MOVED ROBERT NASATO SECONDED CHUCK GALLACHER

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

So we're going to first of all vote on having 2017-16 through 2017-20 together as a block. All those in favour? Opposed? That motion is carried.

MOTION – MOVE RESOLUTION 2017-16 THROUGH 2017-20 TO BE CONSIDERED AS A BLOCK MOVED ROBERT NASATO SECONDED CHUCK GALLACHER MOTION CARRIED







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

May I have the permission of the mover and seconder to use them to move those forward – good. So Motion by Nasato and Gallacher that we approve 2017-16 through 2017-20, all those in favour? Opposed? That motion is carried.

MOTION – RESOLUTION 2017-16 THROUGH 2017-20 MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHUCK GALLACHER MOTION CARRIED

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Robert Nasato, New Westminster Minor Hockey, motion to move 2017-20 for discussion – 21, I apologize, 21.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Do I have a second? Chuck Gallacher, Okanagan.

MOTION – MOVE RESOLUTION 2017-21 FOR DISCUSSION MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHUCK GALLACHER

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

I'd like to speak to this motion, please. I have real concerns about this one. When I first read this it seemed like innocuous wording, but then I read through the rationale and I really – the red flags went up in my – and particular, it relates to the point that says, "Monitors the implementation of the Long Term Athlete Development Program at the MHA and team levels and makes recommendation on changes required to meet the standards." I don't know about you, but I want to say, no, but I want to say actually, hell no, you're going to be monitoring my Association. I'm gonna propose an amendment and hope that I get support on it.

So, basically, leave the sentence as is, but instead of putting down (period) at the end of level, put a (comma) and then say,

"For all BC Hockey Program of Excellence teams and Midget AAA teams. Local Minor Hockey Associations and District Associations will retain autonomy and program delivery unless they request the Player Delivery Group to become actively involved at the local level."

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Rob, can you do me a favour and write this down, because I think we need to have it up on the screen, please. I'm sorry, I'm not trying to be a pain in the butt but....

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Randy, I've got it written down here.





BARRY PETRACHENKO

Randy, if I may while Rob's writing, I just want to make a comment, Rob, it might help, I don't know, but monitoring the implementation is not - first of all, it's in the Rationale, so it's not in any way a part of the Bylaw. Secondly, monitoring – monitoring is simply intended to see what is happening out in the grassroots and be able to report that back as a Committee through our Committee process to the Board or through that process that we already have in place, to say, make an adjustment to Policy. That wording in the Rationale in no way should be an alarm bell that this is intended for a centralized Branch personnel or Committee to the run the Player Development Program in a Minor Hockey Association. Our Organization does have the ability to set policies around player development, but that would be an inclusive process where we would go out and we have to find out. We have to monitor what's actually happening out there to try to help it, and that monitoring could include, and would include, a gathering of best practices and sharing with other Associations. So I actually don't think your reaction to the word "monitor" is accurate to what's intended here. And again, it's in the Rationale, not the proposed changes. This is to set up a Committee. Nobody is overseeing this directly. Our biggest participant is our players, and nobody is monitoring the development model that we are all using. This is to help you have a great development model, not to come in and run it for you. We don't have that capacity, nor that desire to do that, we really don't.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, Barry, and I understand that, but it is so open-ended the way it's worded that it could absolutely be interpreted that way. That's why I'm making the Motion to Amend. It absolutely – you can't deny that it could be read that way. You may not interpret it that way, it may not be your intention.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Isn't this the same wording that would be used for Safety and other programs? I mean, our other programs have this same type of wording. I appreciate where you're coming from, I do, but nothing we do....

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

There's a distinctive....

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Nothing we do is designed to go in and run a Minor Hockey Association and that doesn't change this. This is to assist Minor Hockey Associations however we can in this very specific area, just like we already do in Safety and Coaching and otherwise.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, and again, I read it differently because BC Hockey does do the programs for coaches, BC Hockey does do the programs for Safety, you're doing that. We're running the development models for players and that's why I see it as different.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

The only thing I would say, Rob, is that we don't run the programs. We act within the policy that you have input in, that you can always suggest changes to that gets for us and then we support, we provide coach education and we provide clinics, and that would not change here. This wording – the changes







you're – or the wording that you are worried about I think is contained in other programs as well and has not been a problem, historically. Go ahead.

TOM OBERTI - WEST VANCOUVER MHA

Sorry, Tom Oberti, West Van Minor Hockey. No offence, Rob, but I don't read it as an implementation issue, I don't see the word "implementation" in this – in this proposal. That could be something that could be considered in terms of adding on a sentence where, you know, programs, development programs are to be implemented by Minor Hockey Associations. All it is, is monitoring, providing technical guidance, not unlike what Hockey Canada already does, so that's just my comments. I really don't have a question, other than the fact that – other than the proposal of including a word "implementation" to clarify that implementation of these programs is by Minor Hockey Association, that's it.

DEREK GULLMES – RIDGE MEADOWS MHA

May I just offer – Derek Gullmes, Ridge Meadows Minor Hockey. I think the points that I've heard Rob try to make today in many cases have to do with the intention of these Amendments and Policies and Bylaws and Regulations. The unfortunate thing is is that years down the road people will read these as written and then make their own interpretations as to what the intention was. When we have documents that detail what the intention is, I think it's in our – all of our best interests to ensure that what the actual intent is, is somehow documented so that it can't be twisted down the road. Things need to be very clear, very concise, they don't need to leave a lot of room for interpretation and when they do, they provide people the opportunity to change their views, etcetera, the actual intent to these policies. So, in – in respect to this particular policy, I don't know that I necessarily see it the exact same way Rob does, but I respect his – his willingness to put his voice up there over and over again to talk about what the intention is needs to be very clear, and not provide a lot of latitude so we don't have a problem down the road.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

And one (1) of the ways that we do, or are able to ensure that the intent is captured is by having these meeting minutes verbatim. So, Barry, any further comments with regard to this?

DEREK GULLMES - RIDGE MEADOWS MHA

I'll just add then, if that is the case that you – the meeting minutes are here, can we please ensure that this discussion as far as there is no intent to go in and micromanage Minor Hockey Associations is noted very clearly?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Absolutely.

LYNNE KIANG – PACIFIC COAST AHA

It's Lynne Kiang from Pacific Coast. I wonder if perhaps the issue is – is the second paragraph, which is actually only a sentence, but it says,

"The Player Development Delivery Group is responsible to deliver the program components at the expected level."







So, that actually sounds to me like the Program Delivery Group is actually doing, or delivering the Hockey Development Program, which maybe speaks to the concern that Rob has identified. Perhaps simply eliminating that sentence would be sufficient to capture the intention here.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Operationally, Barry, do you have any comments?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Not really. I mean, I respect what Rob is saying. As others have mentioned, it is in the minutes what the intent is. I think this is how we operate all of our programming. Whatever changes the membership wants to consider, fine. I mean, I'm perfectly clear on what our job is with respect to athlete development and what we're trying to achieve by way of this Committee. It's just really to serve the members to provide you with the ability to implement a better program for our players.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

So, I guess - Lynne's just pointed something out to me. The first part of this proposal I don't have a problem with. It's the second part that comes open-ended and if we removed the second part, the second where it says, "New ###", would it still get the objectives that you want, 'cause that would have removed the open-endedness that I'm concerned about?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

It's intended by the use of the word "components" to not be open-ended, so we're not delivering the program, Lynne, contrary to what you suggested. That line says,

"The Player Development Delivery Group is responsible to deliver the program components for each expected level."

So, that's to deliver those components to Minor Hockey Associations, not to deliver on the ice.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

You know, we don't have the capacity to go into every arena and deliver that, nor do we have the desire to. So, you know, I suppose you could put "to members" after "components", and that might clarify it.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

So would this clarification be then,

"...program components to MHAs and District Associations"?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

I would just say members, "to member Associations".







ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, I would move amendment then that we add after components "to Member Associations" at the expected level.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Yeah, that's good.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

That's my proposed amendment.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

"To member Associations."

LYNNE KIANG – PACIFIC COAST AHA

I'll second it. It's Lynne Kiang.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

All right. Okay, I'll accept that as a friendly amendment. Any further discussion? All those in favour? Now we're voting on the amendment first. Opposed?

MOTION – RESOLUTION 2017-21 (FRIENDLY AMENDMENT) TO READ "THE PLAYER DEVELOPMENT DELIVERY GROUP IS RESPONSIBLE TO DELIVER THE PROGRAM COMPONENTS TO MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS AT THE EXPECTED LEVEL" MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY LYNNE KIANG MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, the motion as amended, all those in favour? That motion's carried.

MOTION – AS AMENDED - RESOLUTION 2017-21 MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY LYNNE KIANG MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

22, "The Chair of each Divisional Committee and any Vice-Chair shall be appointed by the Chair of the Board." Mover – Rob?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

I'm gonna make a motion to move items – Robert Nasato, New Westminster Minor Hockey. I'm gonna make a motion to move items – Resolutions 2017-22 through to, I guess, 2017-36 as a block.







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Please see me at about 6:30. Seconded by Chuck Gallacher, OMAHA.

MOTION – MOVE RESOLUTIONS 2017-22TO 2017-36 TO BE CONSIDERED AS A BLOCK MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHUCK GALLACHER

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

All those in favour of considering – so that one's carried.

MOTION – MOVE RESOLUTIONS 2017-22 TO 2017-36 TO BE CONSIDERED AS A BLOCK MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHUCK GALLACHER MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

We got a speaker at the back.

PETER SCHMID – MERRITT MHA

Peter Schmid from Merritt Minor Hockey. I have a question about 2017-27 and its wording. It speaks of coaches, qualifications, Divisions Below Atom and then Divisions Above Atom. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

There is a glitch there, my apologies. Rob kinda caught me off guard. That's called a super block, Rob, by the way.

There is - well I'll point it out right now, 2017-27 should read, halfway down the page it's got, "Divisions Below Atom", it should read,

"DIVISIONS ATOM AND ABOVE"

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Randy, just to clarify, it's where it says, "Divisions Above Atom", that's a typo. It should say,

"DIVISIONS ATOM AND ABOVE",

Otherwise, Atom would be excluded completely. And that was a typo, so I think we can just acknowledge that typo and still stay within the block as long as the movers are okay with that.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Yes.







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

All right, we're on a roll. Any other discussion? All those in favour? So 2017-22 through 2017-36 are carried.

MOTION – RESOLUTIONS 2017-22 TO 2016-36 MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHUCK GALLACHER MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

So, 2017-37.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Motion to move 2017 – Robert Nasato, New West. Motion to move 2017-37 and 2017-38 as a block.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Do I have a seconder to have those both considered as a block? Chuck Gallacher, OMHA. Discussion, any discussion at all, in favour, against? All right, all those in favour considering them in a block? Carried.

MOTION – MOVE RESOLUTION 2017-37 AND 2017-38 TO BE CONSIDERED AS A BLOCK MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHUCK GALLACHER MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Any discussion with regard to the motions? Seeing none, all those in favour? 37, 38 are a done deal.

MOTION – RESOLUTION 2017-37 AND 2017-38 MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY CHUCK GALLACHER MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

We have now concluded the Resolution section and are now going to go into General or New Business. We do have two (2) items for consideration - Rob? I caught you before you ever said your name.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

A procedural question, do I need to make a motion to move this as well for consideration?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

You will, yes.

<u> ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA</u>

Okay, so I'd like







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

So you would like to move this as a recommendation to the Board?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

That's correct. I'll make that motion first and then I'd like – once a seconder, I'd like to speak to it quickly.

DEANNA COX – CLOVERDALE MHA

Second, Cloverdale Minor Hockey.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Sorry, way too fast.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Deanna Cox, Cloverdale.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Diane Cox, Cloverdale. <u>ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA</u> Deanna – Deanna Cox, Cloverdale.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Deanna. Did you get that, Carla?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Close enough.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Oh, you're still doing registration, okay. All right, Rob?

MOTION – MOVE ITEM #1 – CROSS-ICE PLAYING SURFACE SIZE - RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY DEANNA COX

DISCUSSION

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

Excuse me, Point of Order, before he starts. I do believe there's a policy in place that changes to Minor Hockey, any changes to Minor Hockey is to go through the Minor Committee, so would it not be appropriate for this, rather than the members voting to go directly to the Board, that this goes to the Minor Committee and then to the Board?







CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

I believe that would be the process we would need to follow, Jim, you're correct. So, Rob, your motion would be taken to the Minor Committee and if ratified by the Minor Committee, then it would be moved to the Board as a recommendation.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, so this is for – for the discussion at the very beginning for those of you who aren't aware, this is the one (1) that I wanted in Regulation. Regulation binds BC Hockey's management and how they have to monitor and implement programs. They're at a higher level than Policies. Policies of the Board can change in a moment's notice. We can get a hundred percent approval in this room and the Board could say, forget it. Now, I - I acknowledge it's unlikely if they got a hundred percent support in this room the Board would say, forget it, but it is conceivable. That's the reason I wanted it as a Regulation. It's a reason I made a bit of a stink there at the beginning. I believe certain things need to be in Regulation. I will, for the betterment and to speed this up so we can get to drinking, not ask to amend it but have people understand that when we put things forward there are different levels we can put things forward to, and I really believe certain things do need to be in Regulation, but I'm prepared to say I'll give you a shot, consider it, and I'd like to move this forward as a – as a Policy and try to get it through so that it by the start of next season this Policy is implemented. Thank you.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Rob, a question for you on it. Are you familiar with what we have produced with respect to ice surface size?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

So, Barry, I wrote this in November when you came to our meeting in Pacific Coast.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Okay, All right, a lot has changed since then, yeah. Yeah, I appreciate that, yeah.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Yeah, it has, but I want it in writing and I want it supported. So, yes, I'm aware, but I've had this since November, so my point is...

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Right.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

...I think it's still a direction that the membership can still give the Board and if the policies....

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Mine wasn't a question about timing, though. I just want to clarify...

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Yes, yes, yes I am aware, yes.





BARRY PETRACHENKO

...because our intent on rink size is that cross-ice means cross-ice, and if you're anything less than a standard size, an Association contacts us, we work with that Association to set out the configuration of what cross-ice means on that particular rink. We issue that clarification to the District. We communicate it back to the Minor Hockey Association and everyone knows when they go into that rink what the configuration is for cross-ice. So all I'm saying is, in the time that transpired from November when you wrote it to now we actually have a policy in place that takes care of this issue, and my question to you is, do you not like that policy and you want it changed to this?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Yes, and so again, the issue, if you read the wording, I've given a bit more of a parameter. Rather than being hard-balled and having BC Hockey monitor every single arena for variances, my intention was to have a Policy that had a – that fully worked within the framework of small area games but gave a bit of a broader dimensions that would allow Districts and Associations, so if you read it, Districts and Associations could make those decisions quickly, they don't have to involve BC Hockey. We're trying to get away from games for hockey 1 to 4 or Initiation Novice, and so why the requirement to be so precise? Why not just leave these type of decisions – you have a global policy of small area, you call it cross-ice, I want it changed to this because it gives a little bit more flexibility and we get rid of the bureaucracy, with all due respect. I don't need BC Hockey to come and tell me. I think that the league – the league within – in the Lower Main, there's many leagues. The one (1) I'm in Presidents League, a small group of Associations, we can make a decision for our group. Other groups in the north, or wherever, can make a decision that's best for them. It's making certain decisions that are best for them. I agree with the concept that the Board has got that wants small area, but I'm saying that you've over-regulated it and created more problems than you think.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

My response would be two-fold. One, I prefer simplicity when it comes to these things. I think our process is much more simple than the one you've laid out here, and two, I just don't agree that ambiguity or that ability to set your own. The reason why we had to address the rink size issue of cross-ice is because throughout the province people do show up for games, like it or not, and they get angry when an Association is doing something during a tournament, or otherwise, so they come from another District and it's not what they're doing, because that Minor Hockey Association is dealing with their issues back home and people who are in their ear about their rink size and wishing it was different. And then they show up at New West, and oh, we're at a tournament at New West and boy oh boy, the rink is exactly the way we wanted it and our Association wouldn't let us. So ours is simple, cross-ice on a regulation size. I don't believe we have to go into every arena. I believe there's a handful of arenas around the province that will apply to us. We will sit down with them, give them a diagram of options and communicate that to the District, be completely up front about all of that and everybody knows, because the bottom line is, part of what we're dealing with here is people who walk into an arena and don't like that somebody's doing differently from they're doing. That's my take on it, Rob, and I don't mean to argue it with you, I just – that's our point of our process.





ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

So, Barry, I'm not terribly surprised you disagree with me, I'm not surprised at all. Point being, I still do think it's a better policy to have a little bit of flexibility. This is supposed to be the throwback to playing pond hockey where it's not static and fixed.

The second part of my argument is, Hockey Canada just mandated Hockey 1 to be cross-ice or halfice, and this falls into that, whereas the BC Hockey policy actually flies – flies in the face of the Hockey Canada policy. So this is actually more aligned with the Hockey Canada policy than the BC Hockey policy. That was part of the rationale for doing it.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

It doesn't fall in line, Rob. The recommendations and the mandate from Hockey Canada are not like this, particularly with regard to point 4.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

That's because Hockey Canada doesn't mandate cross-ice or half-ice hockey – Hockey 4.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

They are. That has been -1 – we just came back from a meeting in Newfoundland where it is getting mandated. It's recommended for this year and mandated for 2018/19.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Cross-ice or half-ice?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Cross-ice or half-ice, yes.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Right, well if you look at the dimensions I proposed they would fall within the cross-ice or half-ice model. So, you know, I think it's ridiculous that Associations that have paid thousands of dollars for boards to divide their rinks at center line are effectively being punished and told, no, you can't do that. Oh, go buy a second set of boards so you can do two (2) cross-ice. You're punishing some of the leaders in this field in BC, aren't supposed to be using their boards because they've spent the money to go half-ice.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

That's why I think this policy needs the flexibility so the people locally can make that determination. It still falls within the guidance of that small area. So, again, I've made the Motion, I've talked to it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

All right. The speaker at the back.







GORD SITTER – QUESNEL MHA

Gord Sitter with Quesnel Minor Hockey. I've heard a lot of things here about concern about micromanaging and what's gonna happen and looking over the shoulder of the Minor Hockey Associations and I hear, we're not gonna do that, that's not the intent, but I get up here 'cause I, what I hear is micromanaging and not trusting the Associations and the Districts to do what works for them.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Another speaker?

TERRY SHEIN – BURNABY WINTER CLUB

My name is Terry Shein, Burnaby Winter Club, and I'm going to speak in favour of this motion, but through the Chair, I'd like to ask, Barry, let's apply this to real life for a moment. I have two (2) non-regulation size ice sheets. If I apply for a variance to you, can you tell me what the criteria will be? So in other words, would your criteria fit into point 2?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

I can't profess to be an expert on what Rob's put forward here, so I guess the best answer is, the criteria would be worked on with the Association, and the reason for that is not micromanaging, the reason for that is following the mandate that our Minor Committee recommended to our Board last year to go to cross-ice. There's a lot of talk here about half-ice and changes and we're fighting those same battles, but a year ago the Minor Committee directed our Board that they wanted it to be cross-ice hockey. So I feel like, and this is one (1) of the reasons why Policy should be recommended as Policy and Regulation as Regulation, because we're debating something that actually happened a year ago where we were told by our Minor Committee representatives to mandate cross-ice hockey. If that's something that people want to change, then that's where you should bring that forward and say, we want cross-ice or half-ice, that's okay. I go back to your question of, does it fall in? We would sit down and look at your rink, and to me, that would be a better scenario and not micromanaging, but a better scenario to work with you, because what we learn in your rink might help us when we deal with a rink in Kelowna or Smithers, for that matter. I mean, we're not trying to micromanage what you do, we're trying to do what you told us to do, and if that has to change along the way we're open to that.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thanks, Barry.

CHRIS BIRKETT - NORTH VANCOUVER MHA

Chris Birkett, North Van Minor Hockey Association. So, you brought up what happened a year ago and I believe it was in July that the Director came down to do cross-ice hockey, if I'm not mistaken. We awaited instructions until September and they didn't come. We went ahead and we implemented what we saw as the concept of small area programs. When it fit cross-ice that made sense. We – we had worked with a couple different situations. I'm the Treasurer of North Van Minor. We've made investments and now those investments are gonna be pointless if all we do is go to cross-ice. I'll be supporting the motion to do cross small area games.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thank you. Yeah.







GORD SITTER – QUESNEL MHA

Gord Sitter, Quesnel Minor Hockey. I think it's safe to say that people want half-ice or cross-ice.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thank you. Okay, do we have one (1) more speaker coming, yeah?

DEREK GULLMES - RIDGE MEADOWS MHA

Sorry, it's Derek from Ridge Meadows Minor Hockey again. Again, as you've heard, the concept of half-ice/cross-ice and whatnot in small area games, I know that for my Association, we're part of the Fraser Valley North League in Pacific Coast, we implemented cross-ice/small area hockey a year before BC Hockey decided to mandate it, and I can tell you that that transition was actually very, very smooth. The transition into BC Hockey mandated cross-ice hockey was unbelievably painful when all we really added was one (1) more division. The key in that statement is that we're - the Associations I don't think are against the concept and the idea and the benefits of cross-ice or small area hockey, it's the implementation. The one (1) thing that's become abundantly clear to me as I've gone through the past few AGMs, the needs of the Associations are radically different depending on what community you are in. We live – I can tell you – I mean, I heard Barry said there might be a handful of – of rinks in the province that might be affected, I can think of six (6) right now in the Lower Mainland, just in the Lower Mainland I can think of six, and I'm probably wrong, it's probably more than that, that are way below standard size that Minor Hockey takes place on. Now I can tell you again, living in Maple Ridge we have standard size rinks, the cross-ice thing is not a big deal. I had 5000 emails from coaches, parents this year asking me, why can't we go half-ice, and I don't have a good answer for them, 'cause it's illogical. It doesn't make any sense to have a hundred foot wide surface of ice to go half sheet. The cross-ice is the way it has to be. We could go a hundred feet long and it would be far more appealing to eye for most of our parents. Directly across the river from me, Langley Minor Hockey has the benefit of small sheets. They get to play lengthwise, north/south hockey there. I have to listen to my parents tell me all the time about, why can't we do what they do; they're doing it different? Well they have a different reality. And I don't think that BC Hockey, it feels in this day and age, that you don't seem to understand, things are very different depending on where you live and what your realities are, and making policy that is very specific is very problematic for some Associations. It's brutal. We had to redo - we redid our ice schedule last year, I think, four (4) or five (5) times in the summer because of the cross-ice mandate. That cost us a ton of money, a ton of time and an unbelievable amount of heartache, all so that we could make sure that we had the right equipment on the right sheets of ice, 'cause I got two (2) facilities, five (5) sheets of ice and I only had two (2) sets of cross-ice equipment. These are serious problems for Minor Hockey Associations to deal with. I know for sure Pacific Coast brought all of these concerns to this Board, to the Committees last year and nothing happened, nothing. There was no, hey, we need to give you a reprieve; there's no, hey, we can back off a little bit, none of those things happened. I don't know how many other Associations and Leagues made any kind of commentary, but we need to feel that you're much more open to hearing what we need.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

That point, this was taken back, and it's no sense in reinventing the wheel, but did BC Hockey just ignore it; no, we didn't. Go ahead.







DEANNA COX – CLOVERDALE MHA

Deanna Cox, Cloverdale Minor Hockey. I'm not sure what the reality is for the Associations that really have their own rink, but here in the City of Surrey we have three (3) Associations with over 900 members, we're all battling for the same ice. If you do not allow us to use the small area sheets that are available to us we will have to turn children away, we just cannot get the ice. So this is our concern, that we're gonna actually have to tell children they cannot play hockey because we cannot get enough ice to accommodate these changes.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

We would not tell you that you couldn't use those ice surfaces. I don't know where that came from.

DEANNA COX – CLOVERDALE MHA

It's in the Regulation that was just put out three (3) weeks ago, so – and we would have to apply for a variance for all of our initiation programs, and Semi[sic] and Surrey would be in the same boat.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Sorry, I don't know what you're talking about with respect to we put in the Notice. If we put it in and it appeared that way, that was wrong on our part. We're not looking to shut down the use of ice surfaces in Associations, it's not a part of this.

DEANNA COX – CLOVERDALE MHA

The guidance that was published on May 10th said that all ice must be cross-ice so....

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Yes, and we recently put out the information that if you don't have a standard size rink to play crossice on, contact us and we'll tell you the setup to use, and we'll work with you on that.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

We'll work with you on it.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

So that – we're not gonna shut down that rink. I mean, that's not even part of what we're thinking.

DEANNA COX – CLOVERDALE MHA

I'm just saying that there is – there are viable options for high density areas and we just want to make sure. I mean, this is why I support Rob's motion, is that....

BARRY PETRACHENKO

And we agree, we agree.

DEANNA COX – CLOVERDALE MHA

This - this is adding a lot of bureaucracy and uncertainty when - our Associations, we book our ice two (2) months.






Believe me, the Board – the Board of Directors does not sit up late at night trying to figure out ways to make your lives more difficult. We are all....

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Okay, sorry just one (1) – Robert Nasato, New West Minor Hockey. Barry, just to the point you made, it was a recommendation from Minor Committee, it fooled, I would bet, almost everybody in this room last year when Minor Committee did – made the recommendation. I'm saying that what my proposal does is give the power back to the membership and give direction. No disrespect to Minor Committee. They have no time to consult with the rest of the membership. Now the members can choose, and that's why I want their support, is because I think it's a much stronger message to the Board if it's coming from the entire membership than coming from Minor Committee, in particular when Minor Committee last year did not have time to consult with their members. So again, I understand how it happened, Barry, I'm just....

BARRY PETRACHENKO

It's a great comment, I understand where you're going with positioning it that way, Rob, however, again, I bring it back to simplicity. I'm just suggesting to you, if you want cross or half-ice, then just say that. I just find your wording more confusing than what we put out there. If you want half or cross-ice, it still doesn't answer the Burnaby Winter Club's question of a small rink that you can't play half of cross-ice on, so I'm with you on this for simplicity, let's say half of cross-ice. I don't want to talk about what the Minor Committee said to us a year ago or why even the Minor Committee when the Pacific Coast asked for leniency didn't want to support that, I don't want to get into those things, 'cause we've been talking about it for a year and I'm the one (1) who's taking the brunt of it, so I understand it. What I'm saying is, our current setup, our current policy does account for any of this. If you feel that there's a need to go half or cross-ice, just say that. Our policy would still be in place for the small rinks and we would work with those, what I think are probably a smaller number, and we would have certainty. And I'm going to say that I am the guy who gets the call on everything. So when a team shows up for a tournament, and as much as you may want to dismiss that, if an Okanagan team comes into a tournament and plays on an ice surface different than they're allowed to utilize in the Okanagan, I want to have an answer for them, because I'm the guy who has to give an answer. I can't deflect it, I can't hide, I have to give the answer, that's all I'm saying. And so if we're - I don't even know what we're debating here, frankly. If we're debating half or cross, just make a motion for half or cross and we'll determine with the Minor Hockey Associations how to deal with non-regulation rinks, that's all I'm saying, Rob.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

I think we're overcomplicating this. Go ahead.

DAVE KACZOWKA – CRANBROOK MHA

Dave Kaczowka, Cranbrook Minor Hockey. I want to speak against this motion and actually speak in favour of BC Hockey's stance on the cross-ice hockey, and by allowing the flexibility, by going away from that and allowing the flexibility to the member Associations to be able to dictate how they want to regulate that versus, you know, north/south, east/west, you're taking away, or you're potentially running the risk of taking away the prime objective of cross-ice hockey. The intention is to play in a small area,







higher puck touches; I don't need to go on, all the statistical analysis on how much benefit that is for our kids, but if you play a north/south game and you've got a three (3) on three (3) hockey game, what difference is that than playing five (5) on five (5) full ice, you're completely eliminating the benefit of the cross-ice hockey game. And my fear is, by allowing these member Associations to just dictate things themselves and go with their own variations, I think Regulation like BC Hockey has put in place needs to be there so that – that we keep the fundamental idea of cross-ice hockey and the benefit of the children involved, you know, to go forward so....

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

We've got two (2) others before you, Rob, and then let – let's try and wrap this up.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

A Point of Order, Mr. Chair.

UNKNOWN MALE

I'm sorry, I think I had the floor. JIM HUMPHREY – VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA With all due respects....

UNKNOWN MALE

I have a question through the Chair to Barry, just one (1) more time.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

I have a Point of Order and that goes before the question...

UNKNOWN MALE

Okay.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

...sorry.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Point of Order does, go ahead, Jim.

JIM HUMPHREY - VANCOUVER ISLAND AHA

We've been standing up and with all due respects to Rob, he gets to speak first and he gets to speak last. Last time I checked we weren't allowed to be debaters here, so please, can we get on with hearing the Motion. It was to move this to the Minor Committee, and everybody can hit their Minor Committee guy up alongside the head, or girl, and we'll deal with it. Loud and clear we heard what you want, crossice, half-ice, but let's just do it according to....

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

So again, through the Chair to Barry, it speaks to process. When it goes back to this Committee, would it be in your – would it be your intention to have this ready to go in the next 45 days, the next 90 days,







like - like when will this be – the Board, a variance or however you're going to put that, whatever that mechanic looks like?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Yeah, if you contact our – we're very sensitive to the fact that this needs to be done quickly. We are ready to do it, and if you contact – I'll guarantee you, if you contact our office by Tuesday of this week we will have that direction to you by the end of the following week.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Okay, sorry, Barry, I want to clarify. It was for – what I understood was this Motion being presented by Rob has to go to the Minor Committee?

BARRY PETRACHENKO

Oh, that – that I don't know how long that's going to take, sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

No, but – but – like if it shows up September 15th it could be an issue.

BARRY PETRACHENKO

No, I – no.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

We – we will expedite this as quickly as humanly possible. Now, what I want to point out again is, if the intent of this, and tell me if I'm wrong, Rob, if the intent of this is to request that we have cross-ice or half-ice at Novice, is that sufficient?

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

No, no. So, if you read it carefully, the reason I picked the numbers I picked was, it would account for, and again, my apologies to the Winter Club, 'cause they're the only one (1) to fall outside that, the 135 feet captures all the mini rinks. It solves – I agree with small area games, I completely agree. It doesn't actually say that Associations could choose, it says the Leagues and their Districts, so no one (1) Association could choose. I want to make that clear, this is not a – not every Association in the province, the way I've written it, would be able to choose, the Leagues and their Districts would choose how to do it.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Right.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

But what this does is it addresses cross-ice, half-ice and it addresses mini rinks, with the exception of the rinks that are above 135, and the only one (1) I know of is at the Winter Club, so if there is others, I apologize.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Good.







ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

And I think it captures the mini rinks as well, so that's part of the reason I wrote it the way I wrote it, okay?

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, do I have a – all those in favour of this Motion going to direction to the Board via Minor Committee, all those in favour? Opposed? That Motion is carried.

MOTION – CROSS-ICE PLAYING SURFACE SIZE -RE-PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE CURRENT BC HOCKEY POLICY ON CROSS-ICE PLAYING SURFACE SIZE GOING TO DIRECTION TO THE BOARD VIA MINOR COMMITTEE MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECOND BY DEANNA COX MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

All right, next one (1) is Pacific Coast. Lynne, would you like to move this?

LYNNE KIANG – PACIFIC COAST AHA Yes, Lynne Kiang, I'll move this. CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON Okay, do I have a seconder? Rob.

MOTION - DISCUSSION - ATOM TRANSITIONAL PLAN MOVED BY LYNNE KIAN SECONDED BY ROBERT NASATO

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Lynne, would you like to speak to this?

LYNNE KIANG – PACIFIC COAST AHA

Yeah. So at the time that this Motion came forward to you was prior to the date at which you released the Atom Transition Plan, and part of the reason why some of our – the – why Pacific Coast decided to submit the motion was, at that time we had no idea if there would be an Atom Transition Plan and we felt that there did need to be an Atom Transition Plan. I had taken this issue to Minor Committee; it had been turned down. Subsequently, of course, we had put it through, the March 15 deadline came and passed. Subsequently, around about that same time a Policy was released. I thought about it a lot, should I just withdraw it or should I let it stand, and I decided the reason why I wanted to have it come forward for discussion was because it's a process issue from my perspective. The issue for me is, I represent when I go to Minor Committee the Pacific Coast Minor Hockey Associations which comprise 40% of BC Hockey. I have 43 Minor Associations I'm trying to represent, many different, very small, very large, urban and rural Associations. It's a very difficult position to have, to be honest with you, I can't always make everybody happy. But when I go to Minor Committee I have one (1) vote, it is one (1) vote out of eight. Usually I am going to be outvoted, and there's not even a chance because for the







Minor Associations within my District to have anything even heard because it really is only vote and the rest of the province significantly outweighs us in the voting at that level. So I thought it was better to try and put it through as a Motion as a Resolution because then it would be in the Rule book and it would be something that was required. Subsequently when the Atom Transition Plan came out, the Atom Transition Plan indicates that this should occur between approximately August 15th and September 15th. Many of the Minor Associations in the Lower Mainland indicated they do not have ice for their programming of the younger age levels at that time, and besides which, many of the families are still on vacation until Labour Day, and they wanted to be able to do the Atom Transition Plan in the last couple of weeks, or month or so, of the season. I had put in January 10th, just because that was sort of a convenient day. I would be fine with February 10th, or you know, something along that lines, but the idea was that they actually wanted to move the ability to run this program to the end of the season. It is also more complicated to try and figure out how to do this when half of your Atom group actually has already played a full year of full ice hockey. So that was the reason why I - I let it stand. I don't actually know at this minute in time whether we – whether it even needs to go to a vote, because it is actually partially covered in Rob's Motion as well, but I did want to have that conversation to be able to have that discussion on the floor.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Thank you, any further discussion? Okay, seeing none, all those in favor of this recommendation to the Board? Opposed? I am going to rule that one (1) as carried as well.

MOTION - ATOM TRANSITIONAL PLAN – RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD MOVED BY LYNNE KIANG SECONDED BY ROBERT NASATO MOTION CARRIED

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

Okay, that wraps that up. I'm now going to ask – yeah, we're in good order. We'll now move into Elections and I will call upon Nominating Chair, Mike Bruni.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

I've been given direction to be timely and nimble in this process, so I'm starting out that way. Thank you very much, I can't whistle, but thank you very much.

Again, good afternoon, everyone. I think you know who I am, I'm Mike Bruni, I Chair the Nominating Committee for BC Hockey. And on behalf of the Nominating Committee members consisting of Al Matthews; Al, where are you Al, you're here, you haven't vacated; Chuck Gallacher and Bruce Hamilton, who is not here, I'm really – I really appreciate their input and support throughout this whole process.

And I'm pleased to lead this election process through the 2017-2018 BC Hockey Board of Directors. As a result of the new Bylaws and Regulations put in place by members at the 2015 AGM, we have still a relatively new process that I would like to briefly review, so bear with me.







A report has been circulated from the Nominating Committee. This report, pursuant to the Bylaws and Regulations identifies the following key operational steps that bring us to this point of the election process.

On February 1st, the Membership Information Bulletin was circulated. On February 15th, Membership Bulletin and Website Release was issued calling for nominations. On February 22nd, the advertisements and requests for nominations began. On April 1st, set as the deadline for any Notices of Interest. On April the 12th, the first nomination deadline. At this time six (6) candidates had been nominated. On April 26th, the memo to the membership announcing nominees, along with nominee profiles, and those nominee profiles are in the book that everybody's been referring to. On May 11th, a deadline for the second and final call for nominations. On May 24th, the memo to the membership announcing the final slate of seven (7) nominees, along with nominee profiles again.

Okay, all of this supplemented by excellent videos and these profiles, as you have been able to review, I hope, are all put forth in a very clear, succinct objective and consistent form so that you can very ably evaluate each of these candidates. And the focus throughout this process has been on transparency and accountability so that everyone is aware of exactly where we are in the process, and we culminated that this morning with a forum with questions, six (6) questions that were posed to five (5) of the candidates that are present.

For the position of BC Hockey Director, we have received six (6) nominees in compliance with the Bylaws and Regulations. These six (6) are trying for four (4) Director positions and they are in alphabetical order, bear with me in terms of pronunciations:

- T.J. BABEY
- SHELINA BABUL
- CHUCK CAMPBELL
- BRIAN HARRISON
- ANDREW JAKUBEIT
- CINDY SECORD

And please note, that on the ballot that you have received there is a name of Matt Fisher. Matt has withdrawn his name from the slate due to personal reasons. Please disregard his name on the ballot. As well, Chuck Campbell is not present for health reasons, and during the latter part of this process when there is the two-minute speeches, there will be a - his video will be viewed by you.

Again, at the outset, you know, the Nominating Committee would like to congratulate these individuals for coming forward. Their courage and commitment to do so is second to none. It is a "blue ribbon" slate that is before you, and as I said many, many times, there's nothing more powerful than – than being a volunteer, and I really commend these people for coming forward.

I would like to explain the process which is outlined in Bylaws 531 to 535. The 2017 AGM needs to elect, as I said before, four (4) Directors for a two-year term from the slate of six (6) nominees, which I have just listed for you. The process will take place on one (1) ballot unless there is a tie. The four (4) nominees receiving the greatest number of votes will be elected for two-year terms, and I will – I will







name the successful candidates in alphabetical order, not in order of the number of votes. If there is a tie for the final Director's position or positions, the names of the tied nominees shall appear on a new ballot and the voting procedure shall continue until all of the Directors positions have been filled. In the event of the candidates remaining tied for the final position or positions through three (3) consecutive ballots, the final Director's position or positions shall be filled by a random draw conducted by the Chair of the Nominating Committee from among the tied nominees; heaven forbid that that would happen. I was going to suggest a shoot-out but you don't have time for that.

Okay, each delegate or Director in attendance at the Annual General Meeting shall receive a number of ballots equal to the number of the votes that the delegate or Director is entitled to cast. Any ballot containing votes for a number of nominees greater than the number of available Director positions, which are four (4), shall be considered spoiled and shall not count as a vote cast when calculating the number of votes necessary to constitute a majority.

Now prior to voting, Regulation 10.12 states each candidate may choose to have up to two (2) minutes at the Annual General Meeting to address the members. So now we're at the point for these two (2) minutes speeches. And what I'm going to suggest, and I don't have the music like the Academy Awards, but we do have a big clock here, and I think all of the candidates are aware of this, there's two (2) minutes, and when they commence their speech, the two (2) minutes will start and they will be aware of when the two (2) minutes will be up; it will be a minute and a half, 30 seconds left. I really hope I don't have to interject. I would prefer not to have to do that, but I am prepared to do that. So what I'm gonna do is, I'm gonna call on the nominees in alphabetical order and – and as well, when Chuck Campbell's name comes up, then you will view his video, which is a two (2) minute video here on the screen. So why don't I start, and again, when you start – when your name is at the start of the alphabet, that's one (1) of the risks that you have and you have to be one (1) of the first to start. So the first one (1) is T.J. Babey.

T.J. BABEY

Hi everybody, T.J. Babey. I just want to say, thank you, for this wonderful opportunity to be here, I really do appreciate it. And I just want to let you know that my passion for hockey is incredibly strong and I would like nothing more than the opportunity to serve on this Board and help develop the policy and the strategies necessary to help to continue to move BC Hockey in a very positive direction, and I hope that I can take my business, education, and experience and really bring some fresh and creative ideas and some new – new energy to the Board. So, thank you again for the opportunity and I hope everybody had a great remainder of the weekend. Thanks.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Good luck, T.J. The next one in alphabetical order is Shelina Babul, Shelina.

SHELINA BABUL

Good afternoon. It would be an honour and a privilege to be able to sit on the Board of Directors for BC Hockey. We really need to bring back fun in the game and ensure that the game is as safe as possible for our young players. It is the responsibility of all of us to ensure that we instill a level of respect amongst players themselves, for their teammates, and for parents respecting coaches and coaches respecting parents as well. It's not going to happen overnight, it's a generational change, but







we really need to instill this culture – a culture of respect in the game. So what I bring to the table is trying to move the mentality of treatment to prevention. 90% of injuries are predictable and preventable, and I would bring almost 20 years of sports injury prevention experience, as well as an avid player for 35 years in competitive hockey, and from a parent's perspective as well, so thank you very much.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Good luck, good luck, Shelina. Now we will have Chuck Campbell's video, and where is our video friend – oh, there he is right there.

CHUCK CAMPBELL (VIA VIDEO)

Hello, I'm Chuck Campbell and I'm running for re-election to the BC Hockey Board of Directors. I'm sorry I am unable to attend the Annual General Meeting this year, but I am recovering from surgery. Over the last 20 plus years I have been involved in Minor Hockey organization in New Westminster as Treasurer, and as President and Treasurer again. I've also served as Chair of the Audit Committee for Pacific Coast Minor Hockey, as Finance Chair for Hockey Canada's Esso Cup competition in 2013, and for the last two (2) years as a member of the Board of Directors and Chair of its Finance Committee and Risk Management Committee. When not working for hockey I am a member of the Faculty of the Sauder School of Business at the University of British Columbia where I teach advance financial accounting to those who are to become Certified Public Accountants. Under the new Governance model for BC Hockey it's very important that we have someone on the Board who has subject matter expertise in finance, and that's one (1) of the qualities that I bring to the Board and will be able to bring to the Board in following years, future years, if I'm re-elected. My philosophy with respect to Minor Hockey is that the purpose of Minor Hockey, like many other youth activities, is to provide a forum to enable adults to pass values on to young people. In order to do that we have to have the young people doing something that they want to do. It's our responsibility to make the game safe, to make the game fun, and to try as much as we can consistent with the first two (2) to reduce the red tape to make it easier for people to play. That's what I have tried to do in the 20 some odd years that I've been involved in Minor Hockey. That's what I will continue to do if I am re-elected. I'd like to thank you for your support in the past and ask for your support in re-electing me to the Board. Thank you.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Thank you, Chuck, and good luck, Chuck. The next one, Brian Harrison.

BRIAN HARRISON

I have been fortunate over the years to have served BC Hockey at the local level and also at the executive level for many years and in many positions. I think that this experience that I've had in serving you folks will leave me in good stead to carry on as a Director of the Board. I believe that this valuable experience really does help and it enables me to work on your behalf. I also know that experience that in order to be a good Board member requires cooperation and collaboration with not only the membership but also the fellow Board members and also the staff. This is absolutely crucial if we're going to move the organization forward. As a member of the Board of Directors this year I served on the Finance Committee and also on the Standing Committee to do with conduct. My committee reviewed the whole conduct policy and rewrote and redrafted it, which will be coming forward to you folks, making it simpler and certainly making it easier for us to understand. I also realize that in order to be effective one (1) has to be able to work with everybody within the group and to make the







organization carry on. If elected I believe my understanding and knowledge of the Governance side of the organization will help me and will help move the organization on. I would appreciate your support and welcome the opportunity to serve the membership as a Director in this coming year. Thank you very much.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Thank you, Brian, and good luck, Brian. Andrew Jakubeit, Andrew.

ANDREW JAKUBEIT

Well this is like, I don't know, the 20th AGM that I got to come to. In my bio or background, or things I bring to the Board are in the back of the book, but what's not in there is maybe some of the reasons why or how, and why I was a coach and stepped down to be a referee and then went to Minor Hockey, continued with the Above Minor Program, went to the Board of Directors here, why I was a President of a business improvement area, and subsequently went into City Council and became the Mayor. And obviously, I love the game and love the community, but more so, having a passion for what I believe needed to change or have improvement to, wanting to be part of making a good thing great, and sometimes it was because I disagreed with the vision or the direction or a bad experience and didn't want anyone else to have that bad experience, but for me it's always been sort of put your money where your mouth is, and if you think you can make a difference, you want to make a difference, you want to give back, then you should step up and do so, and I do want to make a difference and be part of something special. I still play, it's sort of the highlight of my week, and by no means am I an all-star player, but hockey has given me opportunities at the Board level, obviously to help recently with Governance. And to have Hockey Canada validate that we're progressive or a leader, that's a pretty cool thing and pretty exciting to be part of. As an official I got to participate in the game at a higher level that I could ever as a player and I get to build relationships with some of my hockey heroes of the past, 'cause I organized the Canucks Young Stars Classic and it certainly set me up for politics being a referee. No matter what you do, if someone doesn't like it or if you can handle the hockey parents, you're set for any other political things. But to follow kids through the careers and see them giving back I think is the biggest thing. If I didn't have a positive experience with Minor Hockey 30 odd years ago I wouldn't be here today. So that's really about building the positives of lifelong experiences, that's what validates that. So I think that's my time. I would humbly ask for your support. Thank you.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Thank you, Andrew, and good luck, Andrew. I was going to start singing but I saved you the pain. And finally, Cindy Secord, Cindy.

CINDY SECORD

Good afternoon. Thank you for this opportunity. Thank you for this opportunity to step forward and to be part of the organization of BC Hockey. For those of you that don't know me, I have served most of my volunteer time with the big organization, Pacific Coast, largest – the largest District, however, I ask you not to hold that against me. I really believe that we are stronger when we work together. We're stronger in our Minor Hockey Associations, we are stronger in our Districts, and with our Districts working together we are stronger as a Branch, and so on, up to Hockey Canada, and I tried to bring that into our District when we were there and work together with the other Districts in the Branch. I have a number of years on our Board as an Officer and I've also volunteered outside of our local







organization and BC Hockey with the IIHF and with, of course, Vancouver 2010, and I ask for your support. That's all I have to say, thank you.

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Thank you, Cindy and good luck, Cindy. Well that is a "blue ribbon" slate in my opinion, and you know you have some difficult decisions to make, which is great, great.

Now just some final instructions about completing and submitting your ballots so it is absolutely clear. The bottom portion of the election ballot card, including the six (6) candidates' names should be detached, and if you don't understand that I think Bill – Bill Ennos can suggest that, how you do that. Now keep the remaining portions of the ballot, sections 1, 2, and 3, in case a subsequent vote is required. Place an "X" beside each candidate you are voting for, remembering – remember that more than four (4) candidates marked with an "X" will be spoiled, unfortunately, and any four (4) or less is okay, and that's reference to Bylaw 533.

We ask that you don't fold the ballots, to save time for the folks counting them; it makes it a lot easier for them. Once completed please place the ballots into a ballot box. We'll be coming around the collect them and each delegate can only submit a maximum of three (3) ballots, based on the voting forms submitted by the membership at the voting registration table. I wish you luck and let's commence the election.

(NOTE: AT THIS POINT THE VOTING PROCESS BEGINS, BALLOTS ARE COLLECTED AND AWAIT ELECTION RESULTS)

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Excuse me; excuse me. Ladies and gentlemen, we now have the election results, and it is my pleasure to introduce your BC Hockey Board of Directors for 2017-2018 and would ask them to take their place at the front of the room. BC Hockey Board Chair, surprisingly, RANDY HENDERSON. BC Hockey Directors entering their 2nd year of a two-year term – BILL GREENE, DARRYL LERUM, NEIL MCNABB, GRANT ZIMMERMAN, and the winner is, La La Land. No, I just wanted to lighten up the moment here, 'cause this is – and I don't want to minimize it.

Those elected to a two-year term, and this is in alphabetical order:

- CHUCK CAMPBELL
- BRIAN HARRISON
- ANDREW JAKUBEIT
- CINDY SECORD

I have some final – first of all, what I would like to say is that I would like to entertain a motion to destroy the ballots.

ROBERT NASATO – NEW WESTMINSTER MHA

Robert Nasato, New West.





MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

Rob. How about Lynda [sic] - Rob and Lynda, great? Okay. All in agreement?

MOTION – DESTROY VOTING BALLOTS MOVED BY ROBERT NASATO SECONDED BY LYNNE KIANG MOTION CARRIED

MIKE BRUNI – BC HOCKEY

I have some concluding remarks, and with all seriousness, I want to – I want to serious it up here. First of all, I want to convey my admiration to all the candidates for having the courage and commitment to put your names forward. I do not see this as a win/lose scenario, but as an identification of those who want to contribute to the youth of this province. Each of you should be congratulated. For those who did not attain the votes required, I encourage both you and BC Hockey to continue to work together, as I am sure you will be able to offer your special vision and expertise in many different ways.

A special congratulations to the new members of the Board of BC Hockey, and I wish you the best of luck leading the game in this province. It has been again a privilege to assist BC Hockey in this process and I extend my thanks to Chair Randy and the Board of Directors for giving me and my Committee colleagues this opportunity to serve BC Hockey.

I also thank – thank you to Committee members – Bruce Hamilton, Chuck Gallacher, and Al Matthews for their continued commitment and focus to what is in the best interests of BC Hockey, and again, to the youth of this province.

Bill Ennos has been incredible in his creativity and leadership throughout. We could not have done this without him. The process is a state of the art, as you have heard, and has prepared you, as members, so well in identifying and evaluating the potential candidates for your BC Hockey Board.

I've have the opportunity to work with several organizations, including the Law Society of Alberta, and again, I emphasize, this model is on the path to being a template for "not for profits" in this country. The proof is in the pudding with the incredible slate that was before you today, truly a "blue ribbon" slate, but always it can be better. We look forward to any feedback that any of you might have and you could offer. The Committee – the Committee's work is not complete. We will be again preparing a report for the new Board with some observations and recommendations. BC's hockey leadership and progressive approach towards a renewed Governance framework has been incredible. You're truly leaders in the country. Talking change is easier than implementing change.

You know, one's strength is one's weakness. Hockey, the game, is steeped in tradition, that's a strength. Its weakness is, it's steeped in tradition. The journey towards BC's hockey ultimate goal to renew Governance is not over. As I said last year, it's a marathon, not a sprint.

The nominating and democratic process free of the political desire to control is a critical part towards achieving a renewed Governance perspective with a competency- based Policy Board, I can't







emphasize that enough. It is the persistent leadership of your Chair and your Directors, with the support of the blue ribbon Operations team lead by Barry that is required as an ongoing basis to achieve this.

Last year I left you with the late Calvin Coolidge's words, and I'll leave it with you again,

"PERSISTENCE AND DETERMINATION ALONE ARE OMNIPOTENT"

I wish you luck and Godspeed. It's been a pleasure and a privilege, I again say, to be a part of this and I look forward to chatting with you this evening. Thank you. Thank you, Randy. CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON

This just about concludes our business for this year. The 2018th BC Hockey Annual General Meeting will take place here again at the Sun Peaks Grand Hotel and Conference Centre June 8 to 10.

Before closing, I want to say that in my mind the integrity of Grant Zimmerman has been called into question today and I've very devastated. In my mind his integrity is very much intact for me.

I will now ask for a Motion to Adjourn the 98th Annual AGM.

LOCHIE BELL – ABBOTSFORD MHA

Lochie Bell.

CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON Lochie Bell.

Lochie Bell.

LARRY HAYES – BURNABY MHA

Larry Hayes.

<u>CHAIRMAN RANDY HENDERSON</u> Larry Hayes, Burnaby Minor. All those in favour?

MOTION – TO ADJOURN 2017 BC HOCKEY AGM MOVED BY LOCHIE BELL SECONDED BY LARRY HAYES MOTION CARRIED

That adjourns the proceedings, and the cocktails start at six (6).







LEGEND

[sic] – Indicates preceding word has been reproduced verbatim and is not a transcription error. (ph) – Indicates preceding word has been spelled phonetically.

CERTIFICATION

I, Pamela Thompson, certify that this is a true and accurate transcription of the Draft Minutes of the 2017 BC HOCKEY AGM held at Delta Sun Peaks on Saturday, June 10, 2017 to the best of my skill and ability.

Pamela A. Thompson

Pamela A. Thompson, C.V.C.R. Recording Secretary/Certified Verbatim Court Reporter



