



Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

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

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

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% to 49.9% 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

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. Replace the \$25 Team Registration Fee (\$50/year) with each player paying the BCAPL player annual membership fee. Alternate proposal is to raise the Team Registration Fee from \$25 to \$50 each season to cover cost of CSI/BCAPL membership for all.

Current: 3.3 TEAM REGISTRATION FEE - Shall be \$25.00 per team per season payable on the first night of season play. This fee registers the entire team and these funds will go into the SDPL operating fund.

Proposal: 3.3 PLAYER REGISTRATION FEE – All SDPL players must be sanctioned by CueSports International (CSI), the parent company of BCA Pool League to play. The annual membership fee (\$20 for 2025/2026) is due before a player may be added to a team on his/her first night of play. Payment may be made via Zelle or Venmo to our Treasurer.

- Zelle = 619 990 5172 or Rmortensonboyd@gmail.com
- Venmo = Russell Mortenson Boyd@Russm92107

Alternate Proposal: 3.3 TEAM REGISTRATION FEE - Shall be **\$50.00** per team per season payable on the first night of season play. This fee registers the entire team and these funds will go into the SDPL operating fund **and used primarily to pay for CSI/BCAPL membership dues.**

Why?

- a) The SDPL must pay CSI/BCAPL \$20 per member regardless of the number of games played. We still have to pay for a player that plays 4 games one night and then quits. Getting payment up front will ensure SDPL (and your team) only pays for those desiring to consistently play.
- b) CSI/BCAPL member dues pay for the FargoRate scoring system, Monday night BCAPL Scorer App, and the FargoRate App where you can see your schedule, team and individual standings.



Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

They're member dues also allow them to play in other BCA leagues in San Diego – and participate in Las Vegas nationals, get discounts, etc.

- c) This is NO DIFFERENT than the \$20 other BCA leagues and the \$30 to play in APA.
- d) If a player has paid their membership and is already sanctioned via another BCA league, no payment is required. Our statistician (or VP) can confirm if a player to be added to your team says they've already paid and are sanctioned.
- e) 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. If Captains do not pass this provision, we will need to raise the current team fee from \$25 to \$50 payable at the start of both the spring and fall season to cover membership dues for any player that plays any number of games.
- f) 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.

Meeting Discussion: Discussion primarily revolved around players being signed up, BCAPL dues paid, and the player subsequently failing to continue play in the SDPL. This has occurred in all divisions. By requiring players to pay their own CSI/BCAPL dues prior to play it will show their commitment to play as someone not willing to pay \$20 for a full year membership is likely going to struggle with paying \$10 on a Monday night. This replaces the \$25 team fee at the start of each season. If not approved we will need to raise the Team Registration Fee. 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:

Current

- 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.
- Failure to have team representation at a scheduled Captains meeting is a \$10.00 fine.

Proposed

Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

- ~~● 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.~~
- 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.

Why?

- 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.
- Raising the penalty for not having representation at captains meeting to engender greater participation – by any representative from the team.
- 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

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:



Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

- a) The divisional playoff format worked well.
- b) The C division winner opted NOT to go to the WCC even though most expenses paid by SDPL.
- c) 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:

- a) Give the Board the flexibility to determine if Divisional or Traditional team playoff format will be used in any given season.
- b) 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			

- c) 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

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.



Rules Committee Mtg Minutes

Board: Recommendation to hold on making an official change approved, seconded, and all in favor. As this was originally proposed by the President he is officially rescinding the request to present the change to the Captains at this time.

PROPOSED RULE CHANGE

1. **1.2 MATCH POSTPONEMENT** – With double posting and minimal forfeits, every effort should be made to play a match as scheduled. It is the team captain or co-captains responsibility to plan ahead and give opposing team captain a 24-hour notice ~~must be given to the opposing team captain and the Vice President~~ if a match must be postponed. Only if the reason for the match postponement is not acceptable to the opposing team captain, ~~or notice given the day of the match, the postponing team captain must call via cell matter must be referred to~~ the Vice President ~~or President~~ for an immediate decision on the reason's validity. The Vice President shall notify the appropriate Board members of the postponement ~~before the scheduled match~~ **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:

- 1) With double posting allowed a match postponement should be extremely rare due to unforeseen extenuating circumstances.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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.