

**United States Luge Association
Minutes of the Meeting
Of the Board of Directors**

Saturday, May 31, 2014

A meeting of the Board of Directors (the “Board”) of the United States Luge Association (“USLA”), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, was held at the Utah Olympic Park, located at 3419 Olympic Parkway, Park City, UT 84098, on Saturday, May 31, 2014, commencing at 9:00 a.m. Mountain Time, pursuant to notice duly given.

The following persons, comprising the entire Board, were present at the meeting for all or a portion of the meeting, as indicated below: Dwight Bell, Chris Mazdzer, Julia Clukey, Paul Baribault, Brian Martin, Pete Gillwald, Erin Warren, Jeff Stratton, Mary Ann Deignan, Adam Berlew.

The following persons were present at the invitation of the Board for all or a portion of the meeting: Jim Leahy, Dr. Gerry Tate, Mark Grimmette, Jon Owen, Gordy Sheer, Zianabeth Owen, Jason Carone, and Russell Biles.

Mr. Bell, President of the Board, presided and, at his request, Mr. Biles recorded the minutes of the meeting. Mr. Bell called the meeting to order and made introductory remarks and summarized the meeting agenda. Mr. Bell stated that all of the Board members had received and reviewed their Board materials prior to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bell stated that the first item of business was the review and approval of the minutes of the meetings of the Board held on April 10, 2014 and May 19, 2014. In response to a question about the how to record the resignation of Chris Welton, a director appointed, but unable to serve, Mr. Bell noted that Mr. Welton’s resignation had been accepted by the Board at the May 19th, and that such acceptance was reflected in the minutes. After discussion, upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the April 10, 2014 and the May 19, 2014 special meetings of the Board of Directors of the USLA be, and hereby are, approved, as modified at this meeting.

AFFIRMATION OF USLA MISSION STATEMENT

Mr. Bell directed the Board’s attention to the next item on the agenda, which was the affirmation of the USLA’s mission statement and organizational goals. Mr. Bell stated that, broadly speaking, the USLA’s goal is to develop athletes that can win medals in all levels of luge competition. Mr. Bell further stated that the goal of the incoming Board is to be best in class and a model for corporate governance by all National Governing Bodies (“NGBs”) that govern competitive sport under the United States Olympic Committee (the “USOC”). Mr. Bell stated that the Board desires to develop performance plans that

establish a culture of winning and a high level of performance. In response to a question from Mr. Bell, Mr. Leahy, CEO of USLA, explained that funding from the USOC is largely dependent upon achieving a high level of performance, particularly medal count in international competition. Mr. Leahy further explained that sponsors are also asking about luge medal count expectations at the upcoming 2018 Olympic Winter Games in PyeongChang (the “2018 Games”). Mr. Bell reiterated that the goal of USLA was to develop medal contending athletes in all levels of competition.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF USLA BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Bell introduced Dr. Tate, and invited him to present the next item on the agenda: Duties and Responsibilities of USLA Board members. Dr. Tate summarized the recent substantive changes to the USLA’s corporate structure and governance philosophy. Dr. Tate also gave an update on the activities of the Interim Nominating Committee in identifying and recommending Board members, who were ultimately approved by members and seated and present at the meeting. Dr. Tate explained that he believes the new governance structure will be the gold standard for all NGB’s. Dr. Tate then described the pitfalls of poor governance and how it could impact athletic performance and the NGB. Dr. Tate then related some examples of grievances against other NGB’s resulting from poor governance and lax corporate culture.

Dr. Tate then summarized the USLA’s retention of Ed Williams, Esq., an expert in the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act (the “Stevens Act”) and New York corporate law, in an effort to ensure USLA’s Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws were in compliance with both. Dr. Tate then summarized the Board’s fiduciary responsibilities under New York law. In response to a question from Mr. Berlew about corporate transparency, Dr. Tate explained that boards and board members are increasingly expected to do more with less, and that constituent members, sponsors, the media, the USOC, New York State, etc., all expect a high level of corporate governance and transparency. Dr. Tate then compared the prior National Luge Committee structure to the updated USLA corporate structure, citing the specific improvements that are intended to satisfy the compliance requirements of the Stevens Act and New York state law.

Dr. Tate then moved to a discussion of conflicts of interest, explaining that there exist competing interests, and reminding all Board members that their primary duty as Board members was to the USLA, not their constituent groups. In response to a question from Ms. Clukey regarding her responsibilities as a Board member representing the athlete constituent group, Mr. Bell and Dr. Tate both acknowledged the existence of the apparent conflict presented. Mr. Bell explained, however, that committees had been established that are intended to address some of the issues raised by athletes that could be perceived as conflicts. Mr. Bell expressed confidence that the new structure of USLA will better permit the processing and resolution of grievances that may cause conflicts, communicated through athlete representatives for example.

Dr. Tate then discussed the importance of separation of Board governance from the operation of the NGBs under the Stevens Act, and explained that it is the Board’s function to govern while not abdicating that governance responsibility to the staff. Dr. Tate described that the Board’s responsibility is so “determine the ship’s direction,” and that it was the staff’s responsibility to “operate the ship.” Mr.

Leahy then explained that the CEO's responsibilities are clearly defined in the by-laws, and that he anticipates full cooperation between him and the Board in setting the direction of USLA. Mr. Leahy then explained that he is the conduit for communications between the Board and USLA staff, reiterating the importance of separation between governance and day-to-day operations.

Dr. Tate then explained the process a complainant must follow to register a formal complaint alleging a compliance failure related to improper Board governance. Mr. Bell then discussed Board indemnification in response to a question from Ms. Deignan. Mr. Bell restated the experience of Ed Williams, Esq. related to NGB governance and New York corporate law. In response to a question from Ms. Deignan about whether New York law met the higher standards expected of NGB's by the USOC, Mr. Bell stated that one NGB remain organized under New York law. Mr. Leahy further described his communications with the USOC about the USLA's recent governance improvements, and, in response to a question from Mr. Berlew about the significance of the recent changes, Mr. Leahy explained that the USOC expressed a willingness to increase funding based on the improved governance structure. Mr. Leahy further stated that the USOC cited three primary reasons for the increased funding: 1) new Board of Directors; 2) updated organizing and operating documents, and 3) Erin Hamlin's Bronze Medal at the 2018 Games.

In response to a question from Mr. Baribault requesting clarification on Board responsibility, Dr. Tate explained that the Board encourages dissenting, but respectful, views. Mr. Stratten then pointed out that there is an expectation that regional constituent groups expect to have a voice at the Board. Mr. Leahy then reiterated that there is a process for addressing constituent group concerns, and Mr. Bell also acknowledged the need to balance the needs of the constituency base with the loyalty to the USLA. To that end, Mr. Bell explained that agendas for the regular meetings of the Board would include a recurring item soliciting input and concerns from the different constituency groups.

In response to a question from Mr. Berlow, Mr. Bell emphasized that the Board encourages club involvement at the Board level, explaining that the clubs are the pipeline of future athletes that feed into the USLA programs. Mr. Grimmette explained that the continued promotion of the sport was vitally dependent on a pipeline full of potential high-performing athletes. Mr. Sheer then explained the importance of promotion and recruitment.

Mr. Bell then summarized the discussion of Board duties and responsibilities, reiterating the governance improvements.

USLA OVERVIEW & CHALLENGES

Mr. Bell invited Mr. Leahy to present his review of the USLA's finances and operations, and the upcoming challenges facing the organization. Mr. Leahy began by giving an update of the USLA's financial condition. Mr. Leahy explained that the USLA began the fiscal year anticipating a large year-end loss, but that the staff of the USLA worked hard, and that he now anticipates a surplus. In response to a question from Ms. Warren regarding the levers that affect funding, Mr. Leahy explained that roughly 1/3 of funding comes from the USOC, and 2/3 come from sponsorships and direct member donations. Ms. Warren described the financial difficulties facing the USLA, including the USOC's potential funding

cuts, and further explained that the United States Luge Federation Foundation (the “USLFF”), which manages an endowment intended to benefit the USLA, graciously stepped in to support the USLA during the recent reorganization. Ms. Warren explained that the USLFF was willing to step in as it saw improvements to the organization. Ms. Warren explained that the USLFF’s contributions saved cuts to the junior program and coaching. In response to a question by Ms. Deignan, Mr. Leahy summarized the history and purpose of the USLFF. Mr. Leahy further explained that the endowment is limited in size, and there has been a reluctance to draw from the principal of the endowment. Mr. Leahy explained, however, that there may be additional costs associated with managing the USLFF in the upcoming fiscal year.

Mr. Leahy directed the Board’s attention to the balance sheet, noting that there was a liquidity line of credit balance appearing as a liability on the books that he intends to pay down in the near future, possibly by fiscal year-end.

Ms. Warren and Ms. Clukey explained the “Funds Due Athletes” liability on the balance sheet, in response to a question from Ms. Deignan. Mr. Leahy then explained the Athlete Training Fund (“ATF”) line item liability on the balance sheet, and how it, in particular, is audited. Mr. Mazder requested that Mr. Leahy explain an apparent inconsistency between the ATF item on the balance sheet and the ATF item on the income statement. Mr. Leahy was unclear at the time and promised to get back to the board with an answer.

Mr. Bell solicited questions from the Board regarding Mr. Leahy’s financial update. Mr. Sheer noted that the line of credit was necessary because the timing of sponsorship payments resulted in cash flow issues from time-to-time. Ms. Deignan requested an expenditure projection for the remainder of the fiscal year 2013/2014. Mr. Leahy then explained for the Board the process for requesting funding from the USOC for the upcoming fiscal year, and Mr. Grimmette explained the timing. Mr. Leahy described that he had presented a preliminary draft for fiscal year 2014/2015 to the USOC as part of the USLA’s aggressive funding request, and summarized his meeting with the USOC in Colorado Spring following the 2014 Olympic Winter Games in Sochi, Russia (the “Sochi Games”). Mr. Leahy described that he made specific requests for funding and Value-In-Kind support from USOC sponsors. Mr. Leahy expressed that he was very encouraged that the USOC had increased significantly over prior years, although the USOC’s funding fell short of the amounts requested. Mr. Leahy explained that the USOC was impressed by three things in particular the led to the continued/increased funding: 1) the USLA’s new governance structure; 2) belief in the USLA’s operations as a whole; and 3) Erin Hamlin’s bronze medal at the Sochi Games. Mr. Leahy then explained that, despite the USOC’s continued support, he expected USLA’s funding for the 2014/2015 fiscal year to fall short without additional sponsorship contributions, and that the USLA has been in contact with current sponsors to encourage additional commitments.

Mr. Leahy then explained the significant expense of funding a full complement of sliders for international competition, especially to Europe. Mr. Grimmette then explained the athlete selection process, and discussed the likelihood that there would be a more rigorous selection process, with the goal of identifying high performing athletes likely to win medals in international competition consistent with the USOC’s performance goals. Mr. Leahy explained that funding is needed to keep junior sliders in the program to fill the pipeline, explaining that the USOC no longer funds developmental programs. In

response to a question from Ms. Deignan, Mr. Grimmette explained the difference between the junior and senior teams, and explained the different levels of funding typically provided for each. Mr. Grimmette further explained the Olympic Training Center residency program and its associated costs per athlete. Mr. Grimmette then continued to explain the complications of the athlete selection process and funding for those athletes. Mr. Grimmette described the funding policies and changes to those policies. Mr. Leahy reiterated the need to identify and focus on high-performing athletes, while acknowledging the difficulties of identifying them early in the careers. Mr. Sheer explained how USLA funding works for athletes who may receive outside, individual sponsorships. In response to a question from Ms. Deignan, Mr. Leahy explained that increased funding is intended for coaching, athlete funding, and technology.

Mr. Berlew then asked a question about brand value USLA was creating for athletes and potential sponsors. In response, Mr. Leahy described barriers to access to sponsorships. Mr. Stratton then explained the difficulties of maintaining a high level of competition in the sport of luge at the club level that can keep younger athletes in the USLA pipeline. Mr. Sheer explained that there was a constant tension for track time with the other disciplines of bobsled and skeleton, as well as the sliding facilities trying to generate revenue from public use. In response to a question from Mr. Berlew about how many runs were typical for training, Ms. Clukey emphasized the importance of the quality of ice to training as well. Mr. Leahy further explained that budget cuts at the facilities have further limited ice time, and reiterated that ice time is critical to developing high performing athletes. Mr. Leahy then explained the competitive nature of being awarded World Cup competitions, and how it becomes more and more competitive as tracks are built around the world. Ms. Clukey then explained the differences between U.S. training and European training. Mr. Grimmette explained for the Board the different types of luge tracks. Mr. Sheer described opportunities to develop smaller luge tracks.

Mr. Leahy then explained that he expected the salary line item on the budget to increase.

Mr. Bell then invited Mr. Grimmette to update the Board on USLA sports programs. Mr. Grimmette discussed that the USOC is looking for a solid performance plan from the NGBs first, and that winning medals is of secondary importance. He stated that the USOC is looking to integrate with the NGB's to better customize funding. Mr. Grimmette explained that the USOC's distant goal is to fund the senior teams, moving away from funding developmental teams. Due to limited resources and difficulties due to its structure, the USOC would like NGB's to narrow the funded groups to narrow, international competitive groups. Mr. Grimmette explained that incongruity of the USOC requesting a four-year development plan, but only funding for one-year periods.

Mr. Grimmette then summarized what the USOC is asking NGB's to consider: 1) how they are currently operating; and 2) whether the NGB is improving. Mr. Grimmette cited Erin Hamlin's bronze from the Sochi Games as evidence the USLA was improving, but indicated the goal for the 2018 Winter Games was to see improvement in all the sliding disciplines. To that end, Mr. Grimmette said the USLA's focus is on national team coaching, but reiterated that due to funding constraints, team travel is limited. Mr. Grimmette explained that the USLA would like to build sled specific workshops to focus on improving the quality of team sleds, stating that the USLA must improve its ability to build and maintain competitive sleds. In response to a question from Ms. Warren about the use of the USLA's start training

facility in Lake Placid, Mr. Grimmette explained that it was very busy at certain times during the year, and always available for athletes.

Mr. Grimmette described for the Board the three biggest challenges to the USLA's success: 1) track time; 2) quality sleds; and 3) access to technology. Mr. Grimmette explained that, to have the best athletes, they need to slide on as many tracks, on quality ice, as possible. Mr. Grimmette stated that he would like to see yearly training plans. He further explained that the USOC is looking for specificity in seeing how the competition is superior, and what the USLA intends to do to bridge any identifiable performance gap. In response to a question from Mr. Mazder about expediting the process for improving performance analytics, Mr. Grimmette stated that the USLA was working to enhance its learning of the athlete/sled relationship through data acquisition, but that it would take years to compile sufficient data to reach meaningful conclusions.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Mazder and Ms. Clukey described summer training.

In response to a question from Mr. Bell, Mr. Grimmette explained how the start facility could be extended to improve the athletes' "settle" into the sled. Mr. Leahy explained that, while the start facility could be modified, there was no budget currently for capital improvements. Mr. Bell suggested that Mr. Leahy look at the cost of such improvements to the start facility and present to the board at a later time. Mr. Leahy also discussed the idea of building a start facility at the Utah Olympic Park with the park's cooperation. In response to Mr. Bell's suggestion, Mr. Grimmette and Mr. Leahy agreed to review proposals for the improvements to the start facilities in Lake Placid.

Mr. Grimmette concluded his report explaining that an additional challenge to the programs was the USOC's elimination of the housing subsidy used to cover athlete stays at the Olympic Training Center in Lake Placid. Mr. Grimmette calculated the significant cost of developing a D Team athlete from beginning through the Jr. National Team, and that that expense was difficult for some families. Mr. Leahy explained for the Board the USOC's training center model changes, and the value of the training centers to the NGBs. In response to a question from Ms. Warren about whether the USLA was doing enough to scrutinize and identify the raw material of a high performing luge athlete, Mr. Leahy indicated that the current goal is to supplement the programs currently in place to identify candidates.

Mr. Grimmette then introduced Jon Owen to provide his update on sled development, and his new role as Technical Manager. Mr. Owen provided a brief history of sled technology and the different component parts of a luge sled for the Board. Mr. Owen then described his experience as a sled builder, explaining that a constant need for sleds in Park City hastened his building experience and knowledge. Mr. Owen then described his production approach to sled construction, and his problem solving process. Mr. Owen described how he is approaching his new role as Technical Manager to standardize the sled development process. He described that he prefers a consensus driven approach to gain agreement on all sled components and hardware, from which new uniform sleds will be developed and assembled. He described certain technological changes made possible by partnership with sponsors that has made uniformity possible: 1) pod designs are now digitized in a CAD file, and can be easily resized; 2)

computational fluid dynamics has now made it possible to analyze subtle shape changes that can make sleds more aero-efficient.

In response to a question about how USA sleds compared to our international competitors' sleds, Mr. Owen explained that our sleds were very competitive, and improving. Mr. Owen explained that he is working with some of the principal sponsors to convert sled experience into data to improve durability while maintaining flexibility. This began with taking certain components to failure using a breakage test and recording many different points of data. Mr. Grimmette explained that performance is a top priority and that Mr. Owen is well aware of that priority and will now move to create high-performing sleds with the help of process and technology. Mr. Owens explained that he and Mr. Grimmette are working on a specific set of scientific testing protocols to evaluate and test sleds and components. In response to a question from Ms. Warren, Mr. Owen expressed his hope that the first new sleds developed under the new program will be ready by the 2014 season, while testing for future production is ongoing. Mr. Owen then explained the significant intangible contributions to sled improvements by principal sponsors. Mr. Owen expressed his gratitude for sponsors' invaluable time and use of equipment given to the USLA to improve sleds, none of which are reflected in the budget.

In response to a question from Mr. Bell about the competition trajectory of the USLA's new sled program, Mr. Owen stated that the sleds were no doubt improving. Stressing the importance of a solid developmental athlete program, Mr. Owen explained that sled development is best done down at the developmental programs level, away from the prying eyes of competitors at international competitions. Mr. Owen stated that his goal was to have sleds fully developed, and all athletes on the new generation sleds one year prior to the 2018 Games. A discussion ensued about the measures taken to protect the secrets and intellectual property of the sleds. Mr. Leahy then mentioned discussions with apparel vendors about improved suit designs and testing.

Mr. Bell then invited Mr. Sheer to give his report on sponsorship generation and associated challenges. Mr. Sheer summarized his role as Director of Sponsorships. Mr. Sheer explained that the Marketing Department of the USLA is responsible for the promotion of athletes and public relations. Mr. Sheer stated that the Marketing Department is currently focusing on fundraising as well as increasing private donations. Mr. Sheer then discussed the history of the relationship with Verizon Wireless and its growth into a large global company, and explained that large companies tend to market with much larger properties than USLA. Mr. Sheer highlighted the positives that will improve fundraising, namely the improving quality of U.S. luge athletes. Mr. Sheer described the shift from reliance on a principal sponsor to diversification among multiple smaller sponsors. Mr. Sheer then described currently available title sponsorship opportunities, including slider searches and the luge challenge. Mr. Sheer then described that the USLA's relatively small membership base made receiving private donations very challenging. He described efforts to keep alumni members involved.

Mr. Sheer then discussed the USLA's relationship with NBC. Mr. Leahy described how exposure could be increased with time-buys on the network. Mr. Sheer stated that the USLA did get good exposure from televised international competition the past season. He expressed that his goal was to create an awareness of the sport by cementing a bond between luge and its recreational counterpart, backyard sledding. In response to a question from Ms. Deignan about what is the luge brand, Mr. Sheer

stated that the message was different for different audiences. A discussion ensued about whether there are opportunities to tell a compelling story of luge. Mr. Berlew identified several aspects of the USLA and luge that were amazing stories to support a brand, including superior sled construction, the fact that it's the fastest sport on ice, there are incredible athletes, the team, and dedicated coaching. Ms. Warren then described how Verizon as a sponsor was able to successfully humanize the sport and make it accessible to people who otherwise had no exposure to it. Mr. Leahy explained how another sponsor has activated its employees to take ownership of the sport and the success of the team. After further discussion, upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED, that the President of the USLA Board be, and hereby is, asked to establish a working group to create a brand strategy for marketing the USLA to potential sponsors, donors and other potential sources of revenue.

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF NOMINEES FOR STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. Bell then introduced the next topic, which was the population of several standing Board committees required and established under the USLA By-Laws. Mr. Bell made reference to a list of committees distributed in advance of the meeting by Mr. Leahy. Mr. Bell then described the purpose of the different committees, and the ideal background for members serving on those committees. After a discussion of the various committee candidates presented to the Board for approval, and upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED, that the following individuals be, and hereby are, appointed to serve on the following committees of the Board, to serve a term consistent with the By-Laws, or until the committee member's successor is appointed, the committee member's earlier resignation, removal, incapacity, disability or death, or the discharge of the committee by the Board:

Safety Committee: Jason Terdiman (Athlete Rep), Carl Roepke;

Nominating and Governance Committee: Mary Ann Deignan (Chair), Scott Arnold, Svein Romstad, Julia Clukey (Athlete Rep), Russell Biles;

National Team Committee: Frank Masley (Chair), Matt Mortensen (Athlete Rep);

Racing Committee: John Mowry (Chair), Dave Garland, Jay Edmunds Dawn McGladdery, Gigi Jenkins, Pete Gillwald, Emily Sweeney (Athlete Rep), Taylor Morris (Athlete Rep);

Complaint and Grievance Hearing Committee: Preston Griffall (Athlete Rep), Summer Britcher (Athlete Rep);

Finance/Compensation Committee: Erin Warren, chair, Bonnie Simi, Kathy Borowy, Jason Carone, Chris Mazdzer (Athlete Rep);

Audit and Ethics Committee: Chair TBD, Steve Hurst, Joe Regg, Adam Berlew, Tucker West (Athlete Rep);

Fundraising/Development Committee: Deferred.

Mr. Bell then gave his Federation Internationale de Luge (“FIL”) update, explaining that, as a member organization, the USLA was entitled to submit representatives to serve on the FIL Commission, to be seated at the next annual FIL congress. Mr. Bell indicated that Svein Romstad and Claire DelNegro are the individuals nominated by the USLA board to serve the Executive board as General Secretary and Vice President of Sport respectively at the FIL, with elections to take place at the next annual FIL Congress scheduled for Innsbruck, Austria on June 20-21, 2014. Mr. Bell then discussed the opportunity to submit nominees to serve on several FIL commissions.

The Board then excused all non-Directors to convene an executive session. The Board meeting reconvened at 3:50 p.m., whereupon Mr. Bell continued with a discussion about the various FIL executive commissions. After a discussion of the various executive commission candidates presented to the Board for approval, and upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED, that the following individuals be, and hereby are, nominated by the USLA as candidates to serve on the following executive commissions of the FIL:

Sports Commission: Mark Grimmette;

Natural Track Commission: Tammy Wills;

Court of Arbitration: Ron Rossi;

Youth Commission: Zianibeth Owen;

Medical Commission: Dr. Eugene Byrne;

Technical Commission: Deferred.

TSE Consulting Report & USLFF Update

Mr. Bell then invited Mr. Leahy to discuss the report prepared for the USLA by TSE Consulting (“TSE”), which has been previously provided to the Directors. Mr. Leahy described TSE and the services performed for USLA at his request. Mr. Leahy explained that TSE had been hired to help determine the value of USLA as an NGB with a grant from the USOC intended for that purpose. Mr. Leahy described how Dale Neuberger, of TSE, counseled him on how NGB’s may approach fundraising differently than

sponsorships, and how to craft a consistent message. Mr. Leahy described certain conclusions related to the interaction between the USLFF and the USLA, and how there could be better integration with the goal of improving fundraising.

Dr. Tate was invited to join the conversation to provide his USLFF update. Dr. Tate explained that the USLFF had reviewed the TSE report, and that he was in alignment with its conclusions. Dr. Tate described his experience and background, emphasizing his fundraising experience as a manager at the USOC. Dr. Tate discussed the skillset of a successful fundraiser, and the increasing sophistication of potential donors and sponsors. Dr. Tate suggested that potential sponsors and donors will be asking two primary initial questions: 1) what percentage of the Board donates personally; and 2) what percentage of the donations received go to the direct support of athletic programs. Dr. Tate expressed his satisfaction with the creation of a working group to create a brand strategy and message, but expressed some initial concern that the USLA's story, while compelling, is not unique to it as an NGB, and that fundraising among NGB's is very competitive. Mr. Bell then explained that one of TSE's recommendations was that USLA and the USLFF should not be in competition for fundraising dollars, instead coordinating fundraising efforts. Dr. Tate then opened the floor for a discussion on coordinating and to establish the USLFF as the primary fundraising arm for both the USLFF and the USLA. The Board discussed concerns about an entity other than the USLA controlling access to funds intended for use by the USLA and athletes. Ms. Deignan was reluctant to support the idea not knowing the level of justification the USLFF would require before granting the USLA access to funds. In response, Mr. Leahy shared TSE's case studies, and pointed out that collaboration is the essential component of successful NGB/endowment fundraising partnerships.

Dr. Tate then discussed the importance of developing relationships with potential donors and sponsors, and how certain sponsors may be inclined to establish philanthropic relationship with the USLFF rather than the USLA for various reasons. A discussion ensued about the skillset required to develop these types of relationships. Mr. Leahy mentioned that the TSE report anticipated certain initial fundraising expenditures, which the USLFF has not previously incurred as a foundation charged with maintaining the corpus of the endowment for the benefit of the USLA. Mr. Leahy explained that it would be a philosophical shift to move the work of fundraising and its related expenses to the USLFF, which, up to this point, has managed the endowment and has historically been appropriately parsimonious. The Board further discussed the complexity and time required to cultivate relationships with major donors and sponsors.

Mr. Bell then opened the floor for a discussion about whether the Board should take any specific action to explore potential collaboration with the USLFF. Mr. Bell suggested that, preliminarily, the USLA could approach the USLFF to form a working group to discuss collaboration. Ms. Deignan reiterated her concern about shifting control over monies to an entity outside the direct control of the USLA. Mr. Bell acknowledged Ms. Deignan's concerns, referring to the USLFF by-laws, which describe its purpose and its discretion to determine when funds are to be released. After further discussion, upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED, that the President of the USLA Board be, and hereby is, asked to approach the President of the USLFF to establish a

joint working group to better define the role of fundraising in collaboration; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the following members of the Board shall serve on the joint working group: Mary Ann Deignan, Julia Clukey, and Chris Mazdzer.

REPORT OF ATHLETE REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Bell then introduced Mr. Mazdzer and Ms. Clukey, and invited them to present their report as Athlete Representatives. Mr. Mazdzer stated that the 2013 season had been very successful, and expressed that athletes seemed optimistic about the new technology. Mr. Mazdzer also expressed that athlete morale has lifted in response to the new governance structure of the USLA. Mr. Mazdzer communicated the three principal concerns expressed by athletes: 1) the need to discover the sled/athlete relationship; 2) equal levels of coaching and support of all athletes at all team levels; and 3) weakness in the doubles program following athlete retirements.

Ms. Clukey expressed that the athletes are committed to competition, but suggested that coaching should be more individualized, especially sled set-up. In response to a question from Dr. Tate, Ms. Clukey discussed employment and educational opportunities and programs available to athletes, explaining that they were underutilized because they require athletes to be proactive to access them. Ms. Clukey and Mr. Martin then described the USOC's post-athletic transition mentoring program available to athletes. Mr. Bell then described that the USLA by-laws support athletes in the formation of an athletes' council. Mr. Bell suggested that the USLA would support an athletes' council to convey the various needs of luge athletes to the Board and the CEO if athletes believed it would be helpful. Mr. Bell then described various opportunities for membership and leadership within the USLA and the Board for athletes.

Mr. Mazdzer requested that the USLA improve communications with athletes, explaining that they would like more information about the direction of the USLA. Chris described his and Ms. Clukey's efforts to solicit input through an athletes' survey. Mr. Leahy addressed some of the reported responses, describing changes within the USLA intended to improve the culture of accountability by both coaches and athletes. Mr. Leahy expressed his confidence that Mr. Grimmette's improved communications plans previously described to the Board would be an improvement. Mr. Leahy then described Mr. Grimmette's role prior to, and after the Sochi Games.

Mr. Martin then asked a question about the USLA's anti-discrimination stance. Mr. Leahy explained the USOC's non-discrimination policy, and the requirement that NGB's remain in compliance with the USOC's policy. Mr. Leahy affirmed that the USLA is and will remain in compliance with the USOC's non-discrimination policy.

REPORT OF CLUB REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Bell introduced Messrs. Gillwald and Stratton, the club representatives seated on the Board, and invited them to present their reports.

Mr. Gillwald explained that he was the Director nominated by the western club, the Wasatch Luge Club, located in Park City, Utah. Mr. Gillwald gave a brief history of the Wasatch Luge Club, explaining its membership base, and recent governance activities. Mr. Gillwald explained to the Board that 2014 marked the 20th anniversary of the club. Mr. Gillwald then explained the club's association with the Youth Sports Alliance (the "YSA"), an organization formed in Park City designed to act as a unified voice advocating and supporting primarily youth winter sports programs in Utah. Mr. Owen described the influence the YSA's unified voice has had with the Park City schools, in particular, in addressing issues like early release and athlete travel schedules. Mr. Gillwald then concluded his report.

Mr. Stratton introduced himself as the Director nominated by the eastern clubs, which included the Adirondack Luge Club, the Muskegan Luge Club, and the Upper Peninsula Luge Club. Mr. Stratton described the membership bases of the three clubs, explaining the differences between the eastern clubs and the western club, and how they included natural tracks. Mr. Stratton described the sliding schedule and fees. Mr. Stratton described how the Muskegan Luge Club in particular is primarily recreational, but attracts many curious public sliders because of its proximity to Grand Rapids, MI and Chicago, IL. Mr. Stratton then described recruitment efforts in cooperation with the USLA, and how the eastern clubs act as good feeders into the USLA's developmental programs. Mr. Stratton described recent efforts to upgrade its equipment. Mr. Stratton explained that clubs are low cost to the USLA, and that club sliders are avid supporters and excellent ambassadors of the sport.

Mr. Stratton explained how the Upper Peninsula Luge Club has recently bid to host two natural track world cups during the upcoming season.

Mr. Stratton expressed his concern that creation of new clubs has stagnated, stating that no new clubs have been established in the last two decades. Mr. Stratton expressed his desire that the USLA begin looking for additional communities that will embrace luge and grow the sport's base. Mr. Stratton then concluded his report.

Mr. Bell thanked Messrs. Gillwald and Stratton for their reports. Mr. Bell then explained to the Board that Mr. Carone would be presenting his full Wasatch Luge Club report to the Board during a dinner hosted by the club later that evening.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Bell next opened the floor to discussion of other items. Mr. Bell discussed the possibility of future telephonic meetings, and reminded the Board of the annual meeting scheduled for August 2014. Mr. Bell then thanked everyone in attendance for their participation and attention.

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned.

Russell L. Biles
Secretary of the Meeting