

# Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

SDPool.org



**September 12, 2026**

## ATTENDEE'S

|   | Name          | Team & Division |
|---|---------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Jay Wunderl   | Stadium Club 2  |
| 2 | Curtis Moore  | Alibi - 3       |
| 3 | Niki Dolecki  | SRO - 1         |
| 4 | Tamiko Lazar  | Break Room - 1  |
| 5 | Yuleni Laguna | Camels - 2      |

**Location:** Camel's Bar and Grill; 10330 Friars Road, San Diego

**1:20PM – Meeting called to order.**

Proposed rule and bylaw changes must be approved by the Board and subsequently by the Captains at the mid-season captains meeting.

## PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGES

**1. Modify number of Rising Star participants at WCC based on tournament participation. This change will go into effect Spring 2027.**

Current: **8.5 RISING STAR** - It is a best of 5, double elimination tournament and will decide the league's 7th and 8th place WCC Open Individual.

Proposed: **8.5 RISING STAR** - It is a best of 5, double elimination tournament and will decide the league's 7th and/or 8th place WCC Open Individual.

- One WCC position awarded regardless of B/C player participation.
- Two WCC positions to be awarded when 25% or more of eligible players participate in the tournament.

### **Why?**

- B/C participation in Rising Star dramatically lower than A player participation in Open Individuals. This change will allow an additional Open Individual position if B/C players do not participate in the Rising Star.
- 10% participation of B/C in Rising Star Spring 2026
- 54% participation of A in Open Individuals Spring 2026

## Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

SDPool.org



**Meeting Discussion:** Discussion surrounded fairness with A division players showing up in large numbers to participate in Open Individuals while B/C divisions players not showing up for Rising Star. For Spring Rising Star which is a WCC qualifying event only 6 B/C players showed up to participate. One recommendation was to eliminate the second slot for Rising Star entirely yet after discussing we opted to retain the second slot **IF** 25% of B/C division eligible players show up to play in the Rising Star tournament.

*Board Motion to approve and seconded, all in favor*

### 2. Modify threshold percent of games to participate in League Tournaments prior to WCC (Spring season) to:

- a) 50% of all eligible games during Spring season OR
- b) 50% of all eligible games during both the prior Fall and current Spring season combined.
- c) Fall non-WCC season tournaments remain open to all players active at end of season.
- d) This would change bylaws:
  - 8.2 OPEN INDIVIDUAL'S TOURNAMENT
  - 8.3 WOMEN'S TOURNAMENT
  - 8.5 RISING STAR

#### Pro's?

- a) Aligns with the 25% for team playoff participation yet requiring 2 seasons at 25% for WCC eligibility promotes the SDPL and commitment from highly advanced players.
- b) Would allow more individuals to participate in advance of WCC – especially those who'd like to but are unable to commit to 50% play during the season.
- c) Increases participation and revenue generation for these tournaments

#### Con's?

- a) The other cities all have a 50% or more minimum for WCC qualification.
- b) Highly advanced players could game system and join near end of season just to get into the playoffs and earn a birth at WCC. These same players could eliminate very strong players from WCC qualifying who have played the entire season. (This boils down to who we want to reward – part-time highly advanced (semi pro) players or full-time very strong players.)
- c) The SDPL pays for most of participants WCC expenses and requiring 2 seasons at 25% or more helps fund their WCC participation and other SDPL expenses.

## Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

SDPool.org



### Alternative additions to rule change

- a) Allow those that have played at least 25% in two consecutive seasons to play in League Tournaments. This would show their commitment to SDPL and bring their financial contribution up to help pay for WCC.
- b) Approve rule yet charge those with 25% of regular season games played a higher entry fee for each tournament and cover 50% of WCC expenses. (Bylaw 8.0 – TOURNAMENTS allows the Board to “determine and communicate in advance all tournament entry fees”

### Meeting Discussion: Discussion was related to:

- a. Is it fair to include part-time players with less than 50% who could “knock out” a strong full-time A division player from the WCC. E.g., “semi-pro/highly skilled” players with the minimum of 25% eliminating a very strong full-time A division player from the WCC.
- b. Is it fair to include players only playing 25% as they’ve not contributed to the financial viability of the SDPL or WCC expenses. They would in fact cost the SDPL money as their WCC expense would vastly exceed their weekly dues paid.
- c. That said, the SDPL should consider ways to include those highly skilled players as SDPL representatives. These players conceivably also support recruitment of other highly skilled players to grow the league.

### Motion to approve and seconded with all in favor of the following modified version of original proposal re: tournament and WCC eligibility.

- a) 50% of all eligible games during Spring season OR
- b) 25% of all eligible games during the prior Fall season and 25% of all eligible games during the Spring WCC qualifying season.
- c) SDPL Board to establish suitable tournament entry fees and WCC expense cost sharing percentages for those playing 25% vs 50%
- d) Fall non-WCC season tournaments remain open to all players actively playing Monday nights at end of season.
- e) This would change bylaws:
  - 8.2 OPEN INDIVIDUAL’S TOURNAMENT
  - 8.3 WOMEN’S TOURNAMENT
  - 8.5 RISING STAR
  - 8.4 TOPS & BOTTOMS (Hi-Lo)

*Board: Niki made motion to approve, Jay seconded and all approved.*

## Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

SDPool.org



3. **CSI / BCAPL Membership change.** Effective January 2027, SDPL shall become its own BCAPL league.

### Why?

- a) Currently we are a division of Josh Watson's league. He helped us test it out in 2026.
- b) This change will give us independence from Josh easing both his and our Admin challenges.
- c) Brings recognition of the SDPL and the rights/benefits that go with that to the BCAPL.

### Boar motion to approve and seconded, all in favor

*Board: Niki motioned to approve and Russ seconded, all approved.*

4. **Players shall pay annual BCA membership dues directly AND the SDPL will eliminate team fees for both Spring and Fall seasons (currently \$50 in total). This will change any current bylaw or rule that speaks to the SDPL or Captains payment of \$20 BCAPL dues.**

### Why?

- a) Player payment directly to CSI/BCAPL ensures they get all benefits of their membership. (Eliminates SDPL from playing middle-man in payment and confuses CSI/BCAPL when we pay for people.)
- b) This is NO DIFFERENT than the \$20 other BCA leagues and the \$30 to play in APA.
- c) During our test of BCAPL membership a good number of players were added to teams, the SDPL paid their \$20 dues, they played a few games, then no longer showed up. We will need to raise team fees to cover these scenarios so the better solution is to have players pay themselves.
- d) By requiring players to pay their own dues, they are 'committing' to be a participating member of your team. E.g., they're committing financially and will have a higher probability of actually staying on your team. If they can't afford \$20, then they likely can't afford \$10 weekly dues placing a burden on the captain and team during regular season. That said, if the BCAPL fees impose a substantial hardship on a league member, and the captain willing to risk adding him/her, the player may ask the league president for assistance with the BCAPL dues.
- e) They're CSI/BCAPL payment allows them to play in other BCA leagues in San Diego – and participate in Las Vegas nationals.

**Meeting Discussion:** Discussion primarily revolved around c) and d) above where over the course of both the spring and fall seasons we have had expenses related to players being signed up, BCAPL dues paid, and the player subsequently failing to continue play in the SDPL. This has occurred in both the A and lower divisions. By requiring players to pay their own CSI/BCAPL dues directly it will show their commitment to play as someone not willing to pay \$20 for a full year membership is

## Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

SDPool.org



likely going to struggle with paying \$10 on a Monday night. With the cost savings the Board determined we no longer would need to charge the \$25 team fee at the start of each season. As a reminder, we get significant benefits (like the scoring App and reporting of results on FargoRate) with the BCAPL membership.

*Board: Jay motioned to approve and Curtis seconded, all in favor with one abstention*

### 5. Modify 2.5 TEAM FINES as follows:

**2.5 TEAM FINES** - As required by these Bylaws, Team Fines will be assessed by the following:

- Failure to have team representation at a scheduled Captains meeting is a **\$50.00** fine.
- Failure by captains to identify a date to play a postponed match within 1 week of postponement will result in a captains fine of \$25 each. The Board has discretion to waive a fine if circumstances warrant.

**Deleted:** <#>Failure to submit match scores or weekly match fees within 24 hours after the start of your match will result in a \$5.00 fine per occurrence. 📄

**Deleted:** <#>10.00

### Why?

- a) With BCA Scoring via the App scores are submitted timely unless there's a system challenge and it's not fair to fine a team for a system issue.
- b) Raising the penalty for not having representation at captains meeting to engender greater participation – by any representative from the team.
- c) With double posting we've reduced match postponements yet when they do occur, we still have significant problems with captains rescheduling and that's not fair to the rest of the division who are relying on the standings.

### Meeting Discussion:

- The \$5 fine for not turning in score sheets is a holdover from paper scoring and no longer needed.
- The increase in Captain meeting fine from \$10 to \$50 is needed as we've been challenged getting a quorum of team representatives to vote on rule changes at the captains meeting. We will remind captains that co-captains, or any other representative from the team may attend – but someone from each team must be present to avoid the \$50 fine.
- The addition of a \$25 fine for not scheduling a postponed match timely is needed as we have captains that consistently fail to work with each other and schedule a postponed meeting. It's not fair to the opposing team, or all other teams in the division when a match is delayed too far out in the future.

*Board: Jay motioned to approve and Niki seconded, all in favor*

## Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

SDPool.org



### 6. Team Playoff scenario's going forward:

**Why?** This past season we tested divisional playoffs vs. the old inter-divisional (Traditional) playoff format. We need to establish how to move forward following that test. In that test the SDPL offered to pay for the winner of each division to go to the WCC.

#### What we learned:

- The divisional playoff format worked well.
- The C division winner opted NOT to go to the WCC even though most expenses paid by SDPL.
- Some members of the B division winning team came with a majority of expenses paid by the SDPL. However their participation and support during the WCC was not fully engaged in by those members. E.g. we didn't get the desired participation we were hoping for from each player.

#### Team playoff options going forward:

- Give the Board the flexibility to determine if Divisional or Traditional team playoff format will be used in any given season.
- Spring 2027 - continue Divisional playoff format and again offer WCC participation to the winning B (and C) division teams. (One more test to assess their interest in WCC – but also require them to take on Board assigned duties to help run the WCC.)

| DIVISIONAL TEAM PLAYOFFS |        |          |                 |
|--------------------------|--------|----------|-----------------|
| Event                    | Date   | Division | Match Play      |
| Playoff Wk - 1           | 15-Jun | C v. C'  | 1 v 4 ; 2 v 3   |
| Playoff Wk - 1           | 15-Jun | B v B'   | 1 v 4 ; 2 v 3   |
| Playoff Wk - 1           | 15-Jun | A v A    | 1 v 4 ; 2 v 3   |
| Playoff Wk - 2           | 22-Jun | C v. C'  | Winner v Winner |
| Playoff Wk - 2           | 22-Jun | B v B'   | Winner v Winner |
| Playoff Wk - 2           | 22-Jun | A v A    | Winner v Winner |

Winner of each division invited to WCC in Palm Springs

- All future playoffs - Revert back to the "Traditional" playoff format going forward.

| TRADITIONAL TEAM PLAYOFFS |                                       |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Week 1                    | C vs. B                               |
| Week 2                    | Winner vs. A                          |
| Week 3                    | Finals for leagues 1st thru 4th Place |

## Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

SDPool.org



**Meeting Discussion:** It was recommended and approved to hold off on making official whether to move forward with Divisional, or the Traditional Team playoff structure. Rather rules committee participants agreed to ask captains for flexibility to test Divisional team playoffs in Spring 2027 an additional time. It was also agreed IF lower division teams are invited to the WCC 86 invitee's will be assigned and required to completed duties that support the running of the WCC 86. It's not intended to be a free trip to Palm Springs but rather a trip to experience the WCC.

*Board: Motion to hold on making an official change approved, seconded, and all in favor*

### PROPOSED RULE CHANGE EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

- 1.2 MATCH POSTPONEMENT** – It is the team captain or co-captains responsibility to PLAN AHEAD and give opposing team captain a 24-hour notice if a match may be postponed. Only if the reason for the match postponement is not acceptable to the opposing team captain, the matter must be referred to the Vice President for an immediate decision on the reason's validity. The Vice President shall notify the appropriate Board members of the postponement as soon as possible. The captain postponing shall work with opposing team captain to schedule the match within the week and the match to be played within 4 weeks or no later than 2 weeks prior to end of season. Postponing captain must notify the Statistician within one week when the postponed match is to be played at a time and place mutually agreeable. If the match is not played within the announced time period the Vice President will affix responsibility for the match not being played and recommend punitive action including Captain fines to the Board of Officers.

**Meeting Discussion:** The changes to this rule are intended to clarify it is the Team Captains (or Co-Captain) responsibility to contact opposing team captain with a minimum of 24-hour notice regarding a possible postponement. IT IS NOT THE VICE PRESIDENTS RESPONSIBILITY. The changes further establish a time limit to schedule, and the play the make up match. Again, this is designed to support correct team and individual standings. A match postponed can have an impact on all team's placement in the standings for playoffs.

*Board: Jay motioned to approve and Curtis seconded, all in favor. Jay to assess if this is a "clarification" or actual change to the bylaw. Clarification would not require Captain approval. The provision to schedule and play within a set time period suggests captain approval needed.*

Deleted: A

Deleted: must be given to the opposing team captain and the Vice President

Deleted: must

Deleted: If

Deleted: before the scheduled match