

## 8/20/13 Conference Call

1. Opening of the meeting and Roll call.
  - a. Alan Sharpley
  - b. Doug Corrigan
  - c. Jeff Kolberg
  - d. Steve Daniels
  - e. Wendy Young
  - f. Gregg Jarvis
  - g. Greg Varnell
  - h. Otis Parker
  - i. Ron Watson (late)
  - j. Jerry Gallion
  - k. Kyle Lubbers
  - l. Travis Hughes
2. Introduction of the two newest members of the ACR4 committee
  - a. Otis Parker – Texas GU Div.3 Representative Director, Galveston RFC
  - b. Gregg Jarvis – West TU and Texas GU Director of Sevens, Dallas Harlequins RFC
3. The Grievance
  - a. Lots of discussion about the new documents that Alan supplied.
  - b. The grievance is at the appellate panel (USAR).
  - c. Alan has spoken with Jim Snyder of USAR and he has assured Alan that the RRRC has the authority to set a schedule and competitive structure for ACR4/RRRC.
    - i. Corrigan - Can we agree that we need to move forward and get a schedule on the board?
    - ii. Hughes - This has side tracked the other divisions as well, now that it has been clarified that we do have authority, lets get our schedules out there.
    - iii. Gallion - Since we are new to the TRU and had no choice on which competitive structure we were in, we are just trying to survive.
    - iv. Other discussion was held...
  - d. D3 will use November 16 as beginning date of schedule. Schedule in progress.
  - e. D2 will use November 16 as beginning date of schedule. One proposed schedule is currently at odds with RRRC proposal (Camm: 2 crossover N-S games instead of 4).
  - f. Jeff proposed moving D1 forward with one of the schedules going around starting Nov. 16, assuming we can get a promotion/relegation agreement for 2014-15 in place before that date.
    - i. Alan asked if we could do that by November would, is that acceptable to NOLA.
    - ii. Jerry says we need it locked down for all divisions. need to fix the 2014-15 # of D1 clubs before beginning 2-13/14 season.
    - iii. Doug: does not want to lock # of teams in a division, as long as all are competitive.
    - iv. Jeff: once we have been authorized as a committee, determining a relegation plan will be simple to accomplish by majority vote.

- v. Proposed (Jeff Kolberg): D1 16 game home and away with condition for NOLA to play back to back games in a couple of instances (Dodge compromise proposal), and we'll have an agreement before November 9 regarding 2014-2015 competition structure. Seconded by Ron Watson.
  - 1. Doug C: no answer
  - 2. Greg V: yes
  - 3. Gregg J: yes
  - 4. Jeff: yes
  - 5. Jerry: yes
  - 6. Kyle: yes
  - 7. Otis: yes
  - 8. Ron: yes
  - 9. Steve: yes
  - 10. Travis: yes
  - 11. Wendy: yes (via chat)
  - 12. Kirk: absent
  - 13. Alan: not voting, but supports
  - 14. Resolution passes.

4. New Business

a. Action items:

- i. Alan will inform committee immediately on response of appellate panel
- ii. Alan: arrange agreeable time for next conference call
  - 1. Friday lunchtime? Alan: will put out by email.
- iii. Kyle: work with Phil Camm on D2 schedule by Friday? (Kyle will have by then).
- iv. Otis: D3 schedule by Friday? (Otis: yes).

- b. Gregg Travis: Need to set a deadline to start 7s 2014 discussion. Will start putting some thoughts together (and discuss with Alan before Friday). Alan: this will get put on an agenda for discussion soon, to take that to the National Committee (as opposed to just receiving).

5. Adjourn

- a. Moved: Ron Watson
- b. Seconded: several.
- c. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned: 8:40 PM US Central Time.

---

**Minutes - June 12, 2013**

1. Call to order, roll call, and approval of agenda

- a. Alan
- b. Wendy
- c. Ron
- d. Greg (arrived late)
- e. Kirk (arrived late)

- f. Kyle
- g. Travis (arrived late)
- h. Jerry
- i. Steve (bloo)
- j. Doug
- k. Phil
- l. Lachlan Ferguson (observer from Austin Blacks)
- m. Agenda is approved

2. Men's Club Divisions (1,2,3)

a. Divisional Alignment

Call Notes:

Ron: It is proposed that the D1b (D2) teams will travel with the D1 teams. The proposed alignments are:

D1: HARC, Quins, Woodlands, Reds, Griffins, Huns, Ft Worth, Blacks & New Orleans.

D2: Shreveport, LR, OK, & Tulsa. Alamo City, Katy, Bay Area & HURT.

Alan: Received confirmation that LR & Tulsa will apply to the TRU.

D3 North: Ft Sill, Grand Prairie, Diablos, DARC, Denton & Tyler (new club).

D3 Central: San Antonio, Austin 3rd side, Huns 3rd side & San Marcos.

D3 South : Corpus, McAllen, Galveston & SFA (they may be backing out; may want to join the collegiate division).

Phil: Aren't the Diablos playing socially?

Ron: They are still playing in the D3 league but will be considered social and their matches will not be considered league matches.

Phil: Lets make sure we discuss discipline in regards to forfeits etc.

Travis: Why are we (McAllen) in the region? Corpus & McAllen are VERY far apart!

Phil: Why did SFA get moved to South as well?

Ron: There was only three teams and we needed a fourth.

Kirk, Ron & Travis: If SFA drops out we may consider joining the Central and South leagues together and play home/away.

Travis: If that happened, we would be OK with joining those leagues. We are OK with a 12 game season as long as it is spread out.

Kirk: Moved that pending confirmation of SFA status, that the merging of the South/Central happens.

Alan: I'm not sure what the alignment is, can we clarify the motion?

Ron: covered the clubs again (see notes above)

Kirk: Moves that the D3 South/Central (pending confirmation of SFA) is merged.

Ron: Second

Alan: Discussion? None

Alan: Opposed? None. Motion carries.

b. Competition Structure

Call Notes:

Kirk: Moves that the D3 teams will play a home and away schedule. This would include semifinals (1v2 cross region). Winners of the two semi finals would play in a final to

determine the D3 Champion.

Bloo: Second

Ron: Second

Alan: Discussion? None

Alan: Opposed? None. Motion carries.

Alan: D2? Any thoughts on competitive structure? D1b could be home/away with 14 matches. D2 would be home or away with 10 games. What is the playoff?

Ron: I would like to suggest that the different divisions play against each other to find 3 winners. The fourth winner would be a wild card. The wild card would not have to play a club from their division in the first round.

Alan: This is the same format as last year. For the semi finals we would want to make sure that it is teams that haven't played each other twice before.

Kyle: Motions that Alan's proposed structure is passed.

Ron: Second

Alan: Discussion?

Phil: D1b play 14 games, D2 plays 10 games. Then the playoff is the same as the D3 last year?

Alan: Correct.

Alan: Opposed? None. Motion carries.

Alan: D1, lets talk about that! 9 teams, agreement on the 9 teams? Any objections? None. Now, structure...the floor is open.

Doug: I'd like to start off the discussion, there has been some lively emails over the last week. Reading those emails and trying to get a handle on what's best for everyone....as the current TRU men's rep I decided to contact the current TRU clubs (not New Orleans) and had a hard time getting ahold of Ft. worth. The rest of the clubs all expressed strong feelings of having a 16 game cup schedule. They were quite adamant that their D1b and D1 teams travel together as well.

Alan: Thank you for talking to the clubs, but keep in mind that this is data. This committee has been tasked with choosing the competitive structure.

Kirk: I'm looking for some clarification...Phil sent out a proposed/draft schedule of what a 16 game schedule (home and away) would look like. This proposed sched reduced the TX Selectside Cup games, so my clarification would be from Ron...is that an option? Can we reduce the number of games for the TX Cup (rep side) season?

Ron: If the schedule is changed or made longer, the TX Cup (rep side) can be adjusted. It is flexible.

Kirk: So in other words, we can start a schedule in Nov and we can have D1 matches and TX Select matches going on the same weekend?

Ron: Yes, you are correct.

Alan: Again, this is data, it is irrelevant as far as a D1 national playoff competition as the TX select Cup is a local competition.

Phil: The good thing is that currently that is mute because the events don't conflict.

Alan: They could become conflict, but as Ron said it is flexible.

There was TONS of discussion but it was too hard to type it all...lots of talking.

c. Number of league matches

Alan: Ok, lots of discussion, does anyone have any proposals or motions to make?

Wendy: From a referee perspective I would recommend 12 matches...16 is tough. That would be 96 matches...with a shortage in the North and South (especially in regards to higher level referees).

Kirk: In reality it would only add 10-20 more matches to the whole schedule since New Orleans will be covering their own matches. But there is a referee shortage and we need to be aware of that.

Ron: Can we have a vote Alan?

Alan: I haven't heard anyone make a proposal?

Kyle: I would like to motion that we do 16 games.

Phil: I would like to propose 16 games, home and away. No CR playoffs.

Alan: Second?

Doug: Second.

Alan: Opposed? None.

Kirk: Second proposal of 10 games, with semis and playoffs. Home or away and cross conference if desired. Semis would ensure that teams don't play from their own conference.

Jerry: Second

Alan: Opposed? None.

Alan: We have two proposals, 12 game & 16 game. We will do a roll call vote:

Wendy 12

Ron 16

Greg 12

Kirk 12

Kyle 16

Travis 12

Jerry 12

Steve (bloo) 12

Doug 16

Phil 16

6-4 in favor of 12 games.

(Alan only votes in case of a tie.)

d. Playoffs

3. Accountability (Eligibility) – requirement for use of CMS

Call Notes:

Alan: We will be using CMS. All divisions/leagues. We only have a few new teams that haven't used it before, so it shouldn't be a steep learning curve.

4. Referee and Disciplinary responsibility

Call Notes:

Alan: Texas will cover all teams except for New Orleans. They will cover their own disciplinary issues.

Kirk: Will we have to cover LR & Tulsa?

Alan: Yes, we are covering those matches. We are hoping that referees from that area will join the TRRA.

Wendy: We already have two referees from HOA (Oklahoma) that are willing to help us out. But we need more!

Wendy: New Orleans is covering their matches with South referees?

Alan: Correct, they are covering their matches with South referees.

Jerry: In regards to disciplinary and referees, the South are prepared to cover all D1 matches. I have already bridged the gap with the South Referees and they are ready to do what they need to do to get our home matches covered.

5. AoB (Any other Business)
  - a. [World Arena Rugby](#)
6. Adjourn

Alan: Motion to adjourn?

Ron: Motion to adjourn...

Alan: Thanks all.

---

### **Agenda & Minutes - Wednesday, June 5, 2013**

1. Call to order and Roll Call (Alan Sharpley)
  1. Alan Sharpley
  2. Steve Daniels <bloobastard@gmail.com>,
  3. Ron Watson <transcohi@aol.com>,
  4. Wendy Young <wendy@scrumhalfconnection.com>,
  5. kyle <kmlubbers@gmail.com>,
  6. Phil Camm <[phil\\_c@griffinsrugby.com](mailto:phil_c@griffinsrugby.com)>; joined at 7:32pm
  7. Kirk <hunscoach@yahoo.com>,
  8. Jerry Gallion <jerry.gallion@kirbycorp.com>,
  9. Doug Corrigan <rainyday\_15@yahoo.com>,
  10. Greg Varnell <gvarell@q2ebanking.com>,
  11. Travis Hughes <thughes@utpa.edu>
2. Competition Structure Discussions. Following is a proposed structure assembled by Ron Watson.
  1. Division 1
    1. Single conference league of 9 teams (New Orleans, Blacks, Harlequins, Dallas, Huns, HARC, Ft. Worth, Woodlands, Griffins)

2. Home and Away schedule for 16 league matches
3. Request by New Orleans RFC for option to double-up away matches (Saturday/Sunday)
4. Kirk Tate submitted another structure:  
3 brackets:  
North - Quins, Griffins, Dallas  
Central - Huns, Austin, Ft. Worth  
South - HARC, Woodlands, New Orleans

Each team plays home AND away in their bracket - 4 games

Each team plays home OR away against the other brackets - 6 games

Top four into championship semifinals, final, 3rd place - 2 games

Total of 12 games to meet USA requirements.

Eases travel burden

Allows more room in the calendar for fall rep side rugby, and for clubs to seek high level competition from outside the region.

If this proposal were accepted, I would also propose a bottom four into a relegation playoff with the team finishing last being relegated to Division 2 at season's end.

5. **General discussion notes:**

1. Kirk Tate: Generally teams should be looking to move up, Ft Worth and Woodlands could have been relegated due to losses and forfeits but this relegation is not being enforced.
2. Bloo: Instead of forced relegation/promotion, could there be challenge matches instead? Alan: Our conference has 2 more teams in our structure than any other conferences in the USAR. This is not because of competition but rather than teams "wanting" to be D1.
3. Ron: Do we want to keep our D1/D2 teams traveling together?  
Kirk: If possible this should try and be accomplished, but is not always feasible. If teams can travel with their B sides, great, if not then it wasn't feasible.  
Doug: Since the disappearance of A/B sides, it seems that competition has gone down for TX teams & with our National Competition.  
Alan: Again, TX is the only region to have D1 & D1b, no value judgement, but just a general statement.  
Jerry: Cost is a HUGE concern for their team, but he generally agrees with Kirk's proposal.  
Kirk: Doesn't necessarily believe that our competition at the National level is a reflection of our current structure (D1/D1b traveling together). There are bigger issues at play that affect our level of competition & performance at the National Level.  
Doug: Likes Kirk's proposal, but is concerned about long term longevity. He would also like to keep D1/D1b together as well.  
Phil: Doesn't feel strongly about D1/D1b HAVING to travel together, but it won't be perfect. It always seems that someone has an "unfair" or "unbalanced" schedule.

Vote? (not sure who called for the vote...) Alan: There doesn't have to be a vote at this time, but perhaps more discussion.

Kyle: Playing Sat/Sun at the college level has been happening for the last few years. So players that are coming up to Club teams shouldn't be too phased by this.

Alan: Teams have generally not loved the Sat/Sun; even at the National Level. USAR Playoffs this year will be highly likely scheduled as a Friday/Sunday.

Jerry: The desire by New Orleans to double up is a response to a 16 game league season that will be quite expensive & tough on the team to travel that often.

Kirk: If we moved to the 12 game proposal that I proposed, would New Orleans still request doubling up?

Jerry: I am speculating at this point, but at this point I would say no. If money wasn't an object we would play as often as we could, but our recent travel to USAR events cost close to \$50,000.

Kirk: There isn't a perfect solution, but I feel that this proposal gets us "most" of the things that these teams want.

Ron: I can take the format you have proposed & change it into a proposed schedule for review.

Alan: The proposed schedule you sent out didn't start until Jan 4, those dates have not been approved yet.

Ron: That was just a proposed schedule, nothing official yet.

Alan: Speaking of the schedule, do we want a fall/spring, when do we want to start?

Kirk: Doesn't feel that a preference can be discussed until the length of the season is determined (12 vs 16).

Phil: It also needs to be considered if our D1 calendar is one way, are the D2/D3 calendars the same? Other divisions may consider other time frames for their season.

Alan: Doesn't see an issue with divisions having different seasons.

Kirk: Fielding three teams last season that started at different times didn't seem to cause any issues...

Bloo: Would the Round of 8 be on May 17?

Alan: There is not a Round of 16, but there is a Round of 4 & Round of 8 (Rd of 8 & 4: May 17, Finals, Jun 7).

Kyle: I've spoken with the D2 North teams & they have requested a Spring only schedule.

Alan: seems to be a consensus to go with Kirk's D1 proposal. Any objections?

Phil: objects. (reason: home OR away)

Doug: opposed (reason: because A and B not playing together each week) - Alan: that's extraneous,

Ron: no objection.

Alan: any Objections? Taking a vote right now - we can take another one later (in response to Doug wanting more time).

Net: Phil only objection.

Alan: future objections must propose alternative.

Phil: will work on that.



- 4.
2. Division 2
  1. Three sub-conference leagues
    1. D2-North - 4 teams (Shreveport, Tulsa, OKC, Little Rock)
    2. D2-South – 4 teams (Alamo City, Bay Area, HURT, Katy)
    3. North/South – Home and Away within conference, Home or Away cross-conference for 10 league games
    4. D1b – 7 teams (All D1 clubs except New Orleans & Griffins) 12 league matches
    5. ACR4 D2 playoff structure tbd
    6. Discussion notes are under D3 (these discussions were mostly lumped together).
3. Division 3
  1. D3-North - 6 teams (Ft.Sill, DARC, Denton, Grand Prairie, Griffins-B, Tyler & Diablos (social)) Home and Away schedule for 10 league games
  2. D3-South – 4 teams (Galveston, Corpus Christi, McAllen, SFA)
  3. D3-Central – 4 teams (San Antonio, San Marcos, Austin-c, Huns-c)
  4. Central/South – Home and Away within conference, Home or Away cross-conference for 10 league games
  5. ACR4 D3 playoff structure tbd
  6. General discussion notes for D2/D3:
    1. Kirk: I don't have an issue with the proposals for D2/D3.  
 Phil: I am very opposed to the home OR away format  
 Bloo: Where does SFA belong?  
 Ron: D3  
 ? who's talking? : home OR away is tough, but usually it works to a teams advantage eventually because they will see them at home eventually.  
 Alan:  
 Various: who's got the answer?  
 Ron: this seems the best way to get the games required with the least travel.  
 Jerry: this is as balanced as you can get  
 Alan: tradeoffs to make. cost vs. level of competition. don't have the resources to do home AND away for all. We're pushing the envelope at lower divisions of what they can afford and what they can actually do in terms of player availability (real world stuff).  
 Travis; past d3 south had 12 game season until UT Grads bailed out. It was a stretch to go further isn't going to happen. 10-12 max is realistic.  
 Ron: example: 10 game season then playoff games. Gets minimum games for all. IS that too much?  
 Travis: no that's good. If you don't break up into conferences, too many games - forces Home OR Away for some.  
 Kirk: ultimately, the solution to these things is more clubs. Can divide into more

brackets. Addresses travel, balance of games. We have to grow existing clubs and support marginal/weak clubs. One of the things that kills sides is the travel costs or the scheduling issues that pile too many games on and they don't have the depth to carry on. Our only way out of this is enough teams concentrated in enough geographic areas so we don't have these problems.

Alan: this is the first time in USA there have been any minimum requirements for any division below D1, and previously, the D1 minimum was 6 competitive matches. As a result, SoCal sells a seed to New Mexico for \$5,000.

?: Opponent at Westerns in the past played 4 games to get there.

Alan: trading off advantages: more games vs. opportunity for injury?

Kirk: would Texas have fared better in the past if played as few games as the Northern teams.

Alan: everybody will be on the same requirements now.

Alan: D3N draft assumes Tyler will be accepted in to competition. D3 Central and D3 South paired (Home OR away across). Any objections? None heard.

Alan: Any objections to this?

Kyle: Can the North/South Home OR Away be against a D1b side?

Alan: No. opposition wouldn't be consistent. Needs to be North and South.

Kyle: is it consistent to have D1Bs in D2 playoffs?

Alan: they already have a sub conference, they already have 12 home and away games.

Kirk: still going to play 12 Home And Away, difference: few weekends - about 3 - where A and B sides will not be together because Griffins and New Orleans.

Alan: we need to see that specifically what that schedule will look like.

Kirk: with D1 proposed structure, you can guarantee that every club will have their A & B sides together for 7 or 8 games. Of the 4 or 5 games that they still have to make up, some of those could be scheduled where A & B sides are together at home just not playing the same clubs. E.g, hosting Griffins with A side and (insert other club here?) B sides.

(Going to summarize this as Math Discussion to be seen in a draft schedule)

Various: they still play 12 games (no arguments)

Doug: remember your second side does not have to play 12 games, only 10.

Not a fan of having to play (something?).

Alan: minimum satisfies USA, doesn't mean we can't have 12 because of fairness.

Doug: Ron said he would put together a schedule.

Kirk: can't cut 7 teams into less than 12 games fairly.

Alan: agrees. Doesn't appear we can agree on this for D2 at this point.

Alan: will require greater collaboration offline.

### 3. Referee discussion (Greg Varnell)

#### 1. General discussion notes:

Greg: Had a meeting earlier. No presentation ready about that yet.

At Sweet 16 event, TRU refs were told by McPhail that there is interest to combine TRRA into the TRU. Wants committee opinions on that.

Greg: reached out to various organizations that TRRA represents. No one has responded favorably. Operational efficiencies are clearly there. Question I have is from a TRRA stance, what are the advantages to the TRRA if they report under the TRU structure. Concerns: TRRA (having trouble following) where does their ability to serve other (non-TRU) competitions come from, would TRRA be beholden to TRU's interest (presumably over other interests).

Kirk: Doesn't TRRA already have a seat on TRU exec cmt?

Greg: yes.

Kirk: confused. How is TRRA not a part of the TRU structure already?

Greg: my understanding is that the TRRA is a separate org, 501c3, own banking accounts and org structure. Have a seat/representative (and there's a TRU rep on the TRRA), but that's different from being (integrated?)

Ron: what is referee consensus?

Greg: don't have one. Assume there are those that agree with operational efficiencies and it would be positive. Majority that have reached out to him have concerns. Everyone will remember a similar effort in recent past, having the refs be run by the Competitions, which isn't done anywhere else in the world.

Alan: There would probably be concern through the rugby playing world with the referees being part of the competition. Typically seen as independent. We know in competitions there is always politics. Wasn't this tried before and result in miserable failure.

Greg: the difference is that we had the STRR then and a group of members who thought being part of the TRU was a better plan (Republic of Texas Referees?), fewer referees with many refs locked out of participating. They're trying to convert the existing organization over (rather than setting up rival/competing org).

Doug: Came up at Winter AGM?

Wendy: yes, at San Antonio.

Doug: TRRA chairman votes on TRU board, don't understand what's trying to be done? I'm a member of both. Concerned as TRRA member.

Wendy: two meetings to talk about bylaw changes and issues TRRA in August, TRU.

Ron: it needs to be brought up the way the bylaws are stated right now - significant lead time.

Doug: August would be the discussion. No bylaws set for a vote in August.

Wendy: confirms

Alan: what is broken that these changes are going to fix?

Wendy: not because broken. Explained to me that operational things depositing checks, cutting checks, etc. Same people doing everything on two different boards.

Doug: on checks and monetary affairs: there is a much simpler, easier, and cheaper way to transfer funds. An overhaul on the banking side may be in order. on same people: that can be scary, rogue person runs amuck, separation of powers is good.

Alan: are we using a saber when we only need a scalpel. Does it require a bylaw change?

Doug, Ron: Agree.

Wendy: other angle is that with Texas becoming a GU and this committee, it's not doing much - just club rugby. Merging TRRA and TRU gives TRU a function again.

Doug: defer to McPhail on that. Has a presentation on Pros and Cons. More discussion needs to be set for that.

Phil: What does TRRA use 501c3 status for? TRU does not have. Is there an advantage to losing 501c3 status?

Alan: TRU won't be able to just transfer TRRA in.

Greg: there wasn't any resolution to that, but it sounds similar to what Doug said about San Antonio meeting. This was brought up late on Saturday evening after full day of rugby (implying not complete presentation or well discussed or understood at the time).

Alan: not sure what ACR4 cmte - a National subcommittee. It's not in our decision pathway. Effects us, but the TRU has to get that worked out and tell us how it effects us.

Doug: We're a competition committee, my understanding that better referee pool we have, that will help our competitive side, help our teams be better.

Alan: (Agrees) But we don't have any say. We have multiple GUs in ACR4.

Doug: If the cmte could have something to help Wendy and Greg take back to TRRA, that would help. (Not sure I got that right).

Alan: I don't think we have the authority to send a direct statement to the TRU about this, but we have representatives.

Greg: We're looking for a comment, not a decision.

Alan: Greg, Wendy, do have have the pulse of this cmte on that?

Wendy: I think so. ACR4 not the right place, AGM is.

Alan: Agrees.

Greg: Discussion or plan in August AGM?

Wendy: believes it was for discussion

Traci (happened to be in the room with Wendy): TRRA voting to tell TRU what decision is. Then presented to TRU board (believed to be Board decision).

Alan: does that require bylaw change?

Kirk: i don't think a 501c3 can agree to merge with a non-501c3 entity without changing their bylaw and due diligence.

Wendy: It was late at night and so I don't remember all of the discussion, but Dave did mention that someone may be brought in to help with a merger or a join acquisition.

Traci: There will be more details on this at the AGM this August.

#### 4. Name Change for ACR4 conference (Alan Sharpley)

##### 1. **General discussion notes:**

Southland, Red River Rugby Conference, Old Southwest, Armadillo etc...

Alan: is favoring Red River, likes how it includes all states.

Kyle: Vote for Red River

Phil: There is a Red River Athletic Conference, we need to make sure we use a very specific name. Red River Rugby Conference. We should probably spend a couple of days checking for domain names & making sure we don't have any trademark issues.

Alan: I think we would be OK, but I agree that we should take a few days.

Bloo: I don't think there are any serious trademark concerns. If we do, a cease and desist letter would fix the issue,

Travis: Likes Red River, thinks it is the most appropriate name.

Alan: Can we agree to put this forward to USA Rugby Marketing? Red River Rugby Conference.

5. Any other business

1. **General discussion notes:**

Alan: Any other business?

Phil: Had sent an email earlier asking about marketing with USAR etc.

Alan: Will send the new conference name to USAR & will use that as an opportunity to ask what USAR can do for us in terms of marketing.

6. Adjourn – by 9:00pm at the latest.