

Start Time: 7 pm Central Time

Duration: 3 hours

Method: Zoom

Present:

WSO representatives - Amanda Whiting (AW), Brittany Rucker (BR), Bobby Sirkis (BS), David Griffin (DG), Ray Harkness (RH), Daniel West (DW)

Athlete representatives – Jodi Vaughn (JV), Layne Palm (LP), Chris Lofland (CL)

DG opens meeting

Voting Practices (beginning at 0:00 of recording)

- Discussion of how this group will conduct business and how and when voting on items can occur
- DG expresses preference for all voting to take place via regular meetings rather than by email, however
 - DG proposes if a vote needs to occur ASAP that we could call a “Special Meeting” (for immediate decisions or to spend money) for the next immediate/nearest weekend in order to have the highest likelihood of having all WSO members present.
 - If member is unable to attend (out of the country, running a meet, etc), then they could vote by email ahead of time to be tabulated with others at the meeting, while other members present could still debate ahead of the vote.
 - This procedure is for decisions needed immediately while all others can wait for next scheduled meeting time.
 - LP clarifies that votes by email should be sent to entire group as a whole rather than just DG as president
 - RS proposes instead using seven available members as threshold/quorum for holding a vote, including at least one OK member and one athlete representative. If seven are not available, then default to email for items needing immediate vote and action.
- DG reiterates preference for all voting to take place in person rather than by email chain or proxy. DG proposes having a minimum time period between calling a Special Meeting and having that meeting happen such as 48 or 72 hours (Friday or Thursday night for a Sunday night meeting time).
 - BR confirms availability on weekends in general with 2-3 days notice.
 - RH also confirms availability in that time frame.
 - AW is in agreement.
- DG summarizes: to conduct business at a meeting where action items will be voted on we will need a “super 2/3 majority” of 7/9 WSO Board members present.
 - LP reiterates requirement to have at least one OK member and one athlete representative in those seven.
 - BS notes that to reach seven members there will have to be at least one athlete rep present, therefore we just need to make sure to include an OK member and not vote without one present.
- DG summarizes discussion of notice given for Special Meetings – 48 or 72 hours?
 - BR agrees with 72 hours/3 days notice being reasonable
 - BS proposes 72 business hours/3 business days, for anyone out of town and not checking emails
 - DG clarifies that to mean calling a Special Meeting by Tuesday evening for a Sunday evening meeting time and pointing out that if not called then, that the item in question wouldn't be dealt with until the following Sunday (10 days later).
 - BR notes that would be an issue for urgent items.
 - RH proposes 5 pm (end of business day) on Thursdays as the cut-off for calling a Sunday night Special Meeting

- DG hears concerns over short notice and notes that this procedure should only be used for extraordinary and urgent items that likely need to be dealt with in less than 10 days.
- BS acknowledges urgency with that timeline.
- DW proposes Thursday mid-day as compromise time to note availability with a 5 pm decision on holding the Special Meeting “in person” or move to email discussion.
- BS notes that for very important issues, with 7/9 members available we can continue to operate. And that we do not need to wait until 7 pm Sunday to hold a meeting and can call for this earlier in the week in extraordinary circumstances
 - DG notes difficulty in getting super majority any other time of the week with existing job and life responsibilities
- BS proposes setting official meeting time as 7 pm Sundays (highest availability) with Special Meetings needing to be called for by mid-day on the previous Thursday. Board member response expected by 5 pm CT (close of business) with 7/9 making the meeting a go.
 - Proposal is agreed to by BS, BR, DG, DW, CL and is adopted.
- DG brings up next topic of how often to hold “regularly scheduled” meetings.
 - BS suggests quarterly meetings with nine different WSO committees/working groups reporting back.
 - DG states opinion is that the objective of the Board is to help guide people and bring them into weightlifting governance via the working groups. The majority of the groundwork will be done in the working groups outside of Board meetings while the Board will discuss what’s working or not in those areas, provide guidance and/or leadership for major events (legacy State meets and the new WSO championship) and provide updates on WSO financials and abiding by/progress towards metrics set by USAW.
 - DG proposes meeting more regularly as the WSO starts up and less often afterwards.
 - BS suggests proactively scheduling every quarter to ensure that Board members are aware in advance and not double booked, with a decision 30 days prior to decide if there is enough business to hold a meeting or not.
 - DW agrees with quarterly for general business with the mechanism to call Special Meetings as needed for urgent business. Notes that we can evaluate how often “urgent” business comes up to revise regular meeting schedule as needed.
 - AW asks if regular meetings should be used for decision making only or for updates from working groups as well.
 - DG answers yes to both as primary objectives of regular meetings. Currently, we working though initial one-time action items as to how we conduct business and what is going to happen with former South Texas, North Texas and Oklahoma LWC programs and financials. But in general, regular meetings should discuss ongoing identified initiatives in the WSO working groups. DG envisions working groups as think tanks (without voting power) that generate ideas to present to the Board with the Board making the final decisions including allocation of resources if any.
 - AW proposes regular meetings every two months to allow for regular five minute updates from each of the working groups to allow them to get work done in a timely manner. This would require advance notice to get that group’s issue onto the agenda for that meeting with details distributed.
 - BR also agrees that meetings should be more than quarterly to ensure that work gets done and progress is made. JV agrees with meetings every 6-8 weeks for now.
 - Prior to deciding meeting frequency, BS suggests deciding how many working groups/committees we will operate to have reporting in, give them directives, let them meet and then come back to a regular meeting when updates are available to discuss.
 - DG states we should agree to meet quarterly at minimum, and then update to more frequently depending on next discussion of working group objectives.
 - There are no objections to stating that the Board will meet at least once each quarter.

Discussion of new WSO Championships and legacy Texas & Oklahoma State Meets (beginning at 15:47 in recording)

- DG opens discussion of committees with updates from Alex Love at National USAW Office.
 - The WSO has the go ahead to host our own Texas State and Oklahoma State Championships despite earlier confusion over this, however USAW does want to see a WSO Championship held as our primary event.
 - DG references prior meeting discussion about making the WSO Championship team-oriented to differentiate it from the Texas State Meet with its own look, feel and reputation.
 - Current timing of events from 2021 is Texas State in January and Oklahoma State in November.
 - RH states that the 2022 Oklahoma State Meet will instead be held in July to better fit with the schedule of their growing youth athlete population (out of school).
 - BS indicates that the 2023 Texas State Meet is also expected to be held at its usual time prior to the MLK weekend in January (Jan 13-15, 2023).
 - DG states that USAW acknowledges that a WSO Championship may not happen in 2022 due to timing and scheduling reasons. He also states that we do not want to put on a second-rate event by rushing to hold one in 2022 with available venues, weekends or lead time.
 - LP asks about opening up the Texas State Meet to become the WSO Championship by inviting OK athletes to participate since it is a big enough event to accommodate that.
 - DG notes that this would limit the participation of Texas athletes at their own State meet as indicated by the 100 person waitlist from 2022. RH questions the willingness of the current OK athlete population to make the trip to (South) Texas in order to compete at an out-of-state event.
 - LP then questions whether the WSO Championship in general would have a lot of OK athlete participation or would be more like a second version of the Texas State Meet in terms of participating athletes.

- DG proposes the following for the WSO Championship:
 - Be primarily held in the North Texas area to be accessible to more of the WSO region (vs. Texas State that moves through four main cities in Texas).
 - Be targeted to teams, athletes and clubs that do not make it into the Texas State Meet each year to move the community forward with more engagement from a larger group/percentage of our membership.
 - Such as those that did not compete the year before, or do not make the threshold or tiers currently used for priority in registration (90%, 80% of National total).
 - Use a five member, possibly mixed gender team format (similar to AO Series) rather than 10 members, or have the option to submit smaller and/or larger teams to encourage participate from smaller or newer clubs that do not have huge existing rosters.

- DG indicates we would need to decide how to open up, invite or select athletes to participate in the WSO Championship in a way that is not redundant with the Texas State meet (i.e. Texas State 2.0).
 - BS and RH suggest having individual athletes register to be a part of a team competition and then use random selection to generate the actual 3 to 5 member teams. Using a scoring system based on NRS or Sinclair or Robi, etc to determine the highest scoring team to win a small prize, etc. BS sees this as a way to introduce athletes to each other and extend the community.
 - JV suggests using team prize money or existing legacy incentive programs (like payouts) to drive participation to the WSO Championship over the Texas State meet. Both events could be used to set Texas State Records while only medals would be awarded at the Texas State meet and prize money would be given to teams the WSO event. That way, whole teams could earn money for the club rather than be awarded to individual athletes.
 - CL suggests both a small and large team category (but not entering both).
 - DG acknowledges that existing team competition scoring format based on final placement is not the best since it favors smallest/largest/oldest athletes or those in low population categories as point getters, rather than representative of who is the best. Alternative could be aggregate of Sinclair total, for example. We also do not know how well attended WSO championship will be to use a traditional point system based on category placement.
 - RH indicates that the OK State Meet no longer has a team competition for this reason (low attendance/small meet making the team scoring meaningless).

- BS suggest using the five Olympic weight categories instead to remove super low and super high bodyweights
 - RH also suggest NRS, though DG states is skewed as well in similar manner to traditional team points.
 - DG is open to all but the “normal” method at the WSO event.
- AW asks if WSO Championship is meant to be an event as “prestigious” as the existing State meets (where the best of the state/top ranked athletes compete) or is the Board aiming to make it more of a community event with an emphasis on member participation (using lower entry totals, or a unique method of qualifying or being eligible to compete there)?
 - DG reiterates that the function of the Board is as a grassroots organization to grow the sport of weightlifting rather than support high level athletes. That could be best served by getting creative with the WSO event to specifically target those not qualified for Texas State and create more opportunities.
 - RH asks could the WSO event be equally as prestigious at Texas State but more fun? i.e. experimenting with things not likely to be done at Texas State, such as borrow elements of atmosphere from Crossfit, crowds, noise, etc to attract athletes to the sport.
 - BS clarifies that Texas State is only as prestigious as it is perceived due to the effort that goes in to it. There is no reason that the WSO event cannot become its own independently well known event and capitalize on the existing State meet infrastructure (scoring system, pipe & drape, technical knowledge, officiating population, etc), and not to minimize the WSO event.
 - BR has concerns about targeting the WSO event to attract Crossfit athletes due to observations about poor retention of athletes who are not invested in becoming weightlifters, and whether this would actually grow the sport or support smaller clubs trying to survive.
 - DG reiterates that grassroots creativity would come where the WSO has leeway (such as how team events are planned with specific emphasis on accessibility of newer or smaller clubs) and that the same level of execution and scoring as Texas State would be expected.
 - AW suggest a team/club invitational format as a possibility – each club is invited to send up to 5 athletes of each gender to compete at the WSO Championships.
 - DG agrees with the idea of the WSO event as the larger goal for teams/clubs all working towards the same event. He would also like to find out why individual clubs do or do not choose to participate more in the community, such as lack of representation at Texas State despite having eligible athletes.
 - AW comments that this is similar to Canada, in that provinces select teams for Nationals and there is an inherent “Team” component, rather than athletes qualifying individually to Nationals as is currently done by USAW and to Texas State. Notes that this aspect could increase the “prestige” of the WSO event as being selected to represent your home club regardless of total.
 - JV suggests forming teams across age groups to include clubs that may not be able to field a full team of a single age class (such as Vaughn Weightlifting). Alternative, across age groups could be the requirement such as a “generational” team. The question would be how to score that for teams.
 - DG asks BS if Sinclair or SMF totals are meant to match up to elite Open athletes?
 - BS – in short yes, since totals adjusted via coefficient based on current World records of that weight class. SMF includes coefficient based on age as well.
 - DG suggests generational scoring based on aggregate Sinclair or SMF total to allow Open and Masters athletes to compete on a relatively equal field. However, does not account for Youth athletes. BS notes that NRS could be used for youth but does not apply to Masters.
 - BS asks if DG has any math majors on team who could look at Masters SMF and create a similar coefficient curve for youth athletes as a potential solution?

- DG proposes two team competitions such as 17U and generational (or 18+) with existing metrics for scoring. Will look into scoring options for youth athletes moving forward for the possibility of one inclusive team competition.

Further general discussion of formation of committees/working groups (beginning at 43:28)

- DG opens discussion of committees/working groups and how they could work:
 - Identified to work on areas of interest to the WSO
 - Ideally 3-5 members per committee. DG notes there were 28+ people not elected to the TX/OK WSO board who are invested in governance and could be interested in being on committees, plus others from the membership.
 - Have at least one person on each committee from the WSO Board that operates as lead or chair.
 - DG proposes the following committees:
 - Competition (5 members)
 - Finance & Marketing/Business Development (including social media) (5)
 - Youth Development (Middle & High Schools) (3)
 - Collegiate (3)
 - Masters (3)
 - Records & History (?)
 - Initiative/Incentive Programs (3)
 - Technical Officials (3)
 - Coach Engagement & Mentorship (5)
 - Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (3)
- BS comments that what each committee is responsible for and how that work is going to get done should be clearly defined
- No objections raised to using the above as initial committees
- DG calls for Board member interest in terms of defining and serving on particular committees
 - **Competition:** three major yearly events – WSO, TX State and OK State
 - BS proposes himself and RH to represent each state meet on competition committee, with a third member to represent the WSO Championship. Alternatively, committee could be made of member(s) at large interested in being mentored in running such events.
 - RH states that primary focus of committee should be to assist people wanting to run their own events with the three major events as “visual aids” for best practices and a learning experience for new meet directors.
 - DG agrees that focus should be on sharing the load of running major events, by extending the opportunity and knowledge to the membership at large (as with all committees)
 - BS asks to include AW and BR in the discussion of competitions given their significant help in planning/executing Texas State in recent years
 - BR declines due to wanting to focus on other committees presented
 - DG agrees that the Board should not spread itself out too thin, and that it is given that most Board members will be volunteering at these events anyway even if not involved in planning
 - AW asks if the Competition committee is supposed to run & plan each of these events or if individual representatives for each event would be responsible for creating their own teams to plan and execute?
 - DG states that Committee as a whole should be responsible for the event including non-Board members if present having made a commitment to assist.
 - BS proposes a 3-member committee with each responsible for planning & presenting one of the three major events while working to support each other’s events. Event planners could then reach out to the membership/outside people with specific skill sets to assist with the needs of each event.

- DG agrees with that idea of spreading the load via the three point people on the committee acting as project managers.
 - BS proposes starting with three members and expanding if needed.
- Competition Committee will initially be formed by DG, BS and RH.
- **Finance & Marketing**
 - In addition to Board members such as BR, DG proposes seeking out members with financial backgrounds or skill sets.
 - DG proposes BR as Board liaison of this committee. DG will also reach out to membership for interest in serving starting with those who unsuccessfully ran for the WSO.
 - Finance Committee will initially be led by BR.
- **Youth Development**
 - DG suggest beyond the macro goal of weightlifting in middle/high schools on a state level, this comes down to access to specific local schools with proximity to local coaches. DG will talk to JP Nicoletta at USAW about making inroads with school athletic directors as a way to gain access to schools.
 - DG notes that youth development is under-populated with only 2400 youth weightlifting athletes nationwide.
 - BR volunteers herself and one or two of her current youth coaches. JV notes that she and CL were working on this in late 2021, and could also help.
 - BS notes this committee could be larger given many different ideas of how to grow youth lifting. He also asks how we should define success in this area – youth athletes being coached in the Olympic lifts or youth athletes who sign up for USAW memberships?
 - BR suggests a pipeline of teaching first and then having meets available to get kids to need USAW memberships.
 - BS has previously used youth developmental meet registration fees to pay for the first annual membership of a new youth athletes participating in the event.
 - DG asks where the majority of youth athletes comes from, such as sons/daughters of existing athletes or...?
 - DW suggests getting in with high school strength coaches to access a youth population in the off-season of their respective sports (such as okay football/volleyball players but strong athletes).
 - DG notes that a focus should be on retaining high school strength coaches using weightlifting rather than just passing through the courses and never having competing athletes (example – re-engaging with them via developmental meets)
 - Youth Committee will initially be formed by DW, BR (possibly CL).
- **Collegiate**
 - BS asks if the WSO Championship could be combined with the Collegiate/State University Championships initially in order to maximize existing structures?
 - DG notes that USAW wants to pilot two sub-national regional championships this year (southeast and southwest) which will be done by USAW in the fall, making a Texas Collegiate event redundant.
 - BS suggests advertising school teams at the WSO Championships (and Texas Collegiate event) if done with generational teams who are bringing in more school-aged athletes.
 - BS asks how many university clubs currently exists? DG lists Texas, Texas State, Texas A&M, Texas A&M Galveston, Tarleton State, possibly Baylor, UMHB. Interest in Oklahoma at OU possibly.
 - BS suggests adding some heads of those clubs to this committee (such as DJ Bray).
 - Collegiate Committee will be initially led by DG.
- **Masters**

- JV volunteers.
 - DG asks what direction this particular committee should think about going? Masters are 50% of membership and should be catered to but how?
 - BS acknowledges difficulties for Masters at all levels (being left out) but notes Masters in Texas are relatively happy. BS suggests for all committees to solicit feedback from their member areas as well as at an annual membership meeting.
 - DG suggests following USAW's lead with an advertised Zoom meeting rather than at a particular meet.
 - BS suggests sending a preemptive message to membership before annual meeting to find out topics of main interest to be discussed by the Board.
 - AW volunteers. JV also suggests Tom Witherspoon as a potential member.
 - Masters Committee will initially be formed by JV and AW.
- **Records and History**
 - DG proposes a smaller committee to maintain existing records.
 - JV volunteers and notes that at least one member must be able to access back end of BARS and thus be a Board member. Also that there are current difficulties to be solved in BARS with accessing reports meet results for the whole WSO to easily find new records (unlike what was possible under previous LWCs).
 - DG will follow up with Avery at USAW with BARS issues.
 - RH volunteers as second member, specifically for Oklahoma records.
 - BS suggests inclusion of Tom Witherspoon as local Texas weightlifting historian.
 - Side note: DG indicates that rebates from USAW to WSOs will remain the same
 - \$25 for sanction, \$1 of youth membership, \$5 of Jr/Sr/Master membership, \$20 of club membership. Monthly memberships will only generate rebates if held for 12 consecutive months.
 - Records Committee will initially be formed by JV and RH.
 - **Technical Official**
 - AW volunteers.
 - DG suggests an opportunity for challenges/incentive programs in this area (like for increasing LWC refs at each club) with a low barrier of entry. AW notes that USAW has incentives to proceed to National ref that can help with the higher barrier if only people were aware of them.
 - BS suggests talking to Erica Talbot as interested member.
 - Technical Official Committee with initially be led by AW.
 - **Coach Engagement & Mentorship**
 - DG envisions this as resources to help guide new coaches from the completion of their Level 1 courses through to taking their athletes to their first meet(s) such as reaching out to new coaches (coaches round table, symposium, Zoom or in-person, etc).
 - JV suggests CL for committee.
 - LP suggest TX/OK WSO Coaches Facebook group as point of contact.
 - Side note: Both South Texas and North Texas have existing FB groups that could be utilized for marketing and contact along with WSO Instagram account.
 - DG proposes a larger group since mentorship does take time and could be spread out among more experienced coaches. DG also volunteers as a course instructor himself.
 - BR also volunteers.
 - Coach Engagement Committee will initially be formed by CL, DG and BR.
 - **Diversity, Equity & Inclusion**
 - BS suggests going to the membership for representation here given the current Board makeup.
 - BR volunteers as initial liaison.
 - RH also suggests looking to the community for members with vested interests in broadening weightlifting/athletics into their communities.

- DG notes needing to get more information from USAW about current standing/participation of minority communities in this area in order to judge our ability to increase them.
 - BS suggests trying to find other non-profits that represent minority groups, incentivize them enter an event (such as membership re-imbursement) and ask about other groups/communities through those contacts.
 - DG notes by nature of Texas that contacts made in schools are likely to bring in minority communities, including at the collegiate level and through diversity clubs on campus.
 - DG volunteers as additional Board liaison, with the intention of the committee being led by a vocal member of the community.
 - DEI Committee will initially be formed by BR and DG.
- DG calls for any further discussion on committees as currently stated
 - LP volunteers for Marketing committee, without Finance
 - BS suggests separating out Finance to its own independent committee with members not otherwise involved in revenue related.
 - DG temporarily includes CL on Finance. JV suggest Deb Doran as member with finance background.

Legacy Initiatives from North Texas LWC/Texas Weightlifting LWC 501(c)(3) (beginning at 1:36:54)

- DG brings up three legacy initiatives to discuss and decide whether to continue or reconstruct under the WSO
 - Scholarship for high school seniors
 - International team incentives
 - State Meet payouts
- **International Team Incentives and State Meet Payouts**
 - BS notes recent changes to the International incentives by Texas Weightlifting LWC 501(c)(3) to reflect the growing number of international, self-funded competitions available to Texas athletes
 - Previously only awarded to World and Pan Am team members
 - New: Texas athletes selected for a self-funded international team are now eligible for \$500/event (max 2x/year), regardless of event.
 - Requirements: athlete must compete in a Texas event (local participation and engagement), must be self-funded to the international event, must compete/weigh-in. Athlete will be reimbursed after returning from the event.
 - DG asks about including/making payments to coaches going to international events in addition to athletes.
 - BS – the initial reason this program was set up was to help make sure that any Texas athlete selected for an international team could go. While it would be great to fund coaches as well, if a coach is unable to go USAW provides two team coaches to take care of the athletes competing.
 - BR would be in favor of helping coaches as well if funds were there (cites herself as having to travel for multiple international competitions), though acknowledges the self-interest in that opinion.
 - JV notes that having your personal coach present at international events is a big thing and meaningful/important for coach and athlete.
 - BS notes that funding for this has come from profit from the Texas State Meet (2022 - \$8000, 2021 - \$4400) which limits how much we can fund.
 - LP mentions also Texas State Meet payouts being used by athletes (such as himself) to fund trips.
 - BS notes that profit from Texas State is after payouts are made (\$9000 in payouts) leaving profit to International teams.
 - LP asks about shifting some of the payouts to other events to encourage athletes to go compete for funding.

- DG worries that cash incentives (like payouts) only incentivize doping, noting that 2 prior Texas State winners have subsequently tested positive at larger tested meets. The likelihood of being drug tested at a local meet (like State) is very low whereas having made an international team, the athletes have very likely been drug tested to meet those requirements.
 - AW notes that athletes who win at Texas State are only eligible for 1 international team incentive in the year to limit total payout per athlete.
 - BS notes that payouts at the State meet are used to attract top lifters in the state to that event, so close after American Open Finals in December.
 - DG notes that creating an incentive for coaches of international athletes would be helpful, however, given the makeup of the Board (and that half would likely be those traveling coaches) that it would be self-serving to create.
 - BS notes that it would be difficult to not have some conflicts of interest given the Board make up but that a) using an independent financial committee and b) using award procedures from USAW or other independent source (such as NRS, or USAW stipends for coaches/athletes) can alleviate any issues of conflict or self-dealing.
 - DG proposes further discussion on funding coaches at a later date.
- **Scholarship for high school seniors**
 - History: up to \$5000 awarded to weightlifters who are graduating high school seniors based on accumulated points from meets/volunteering to determine award tier level and submitted application/essay. Total funds for scholarship were \$5000, that could be split and won by multiple athletes depending on tier and ranking. Awards are more of a symbolic gesture to local athletes who have been involved in the sport over the years.
 - BS – no applications were received for 2021 (nothing awarded), and two applications have been received for 2022 (but have not been decided or announced with the switch to WSO). 2019 and 2020 had only one athlete apply for the award.
 - DG notes that in four years only four athletes have applied and there are certainly more high school seniors in weightlifting in Texas than that. Could the marketing committee do better to advertise this option? Alternatively, could this money be better spent?
 - BS agrees that less money could be spent on this award, or awarded to more people. But overall, not as successful a program as hoped.

Discussion of Previous LWC Assets and Entities (beginning at 1:58:18)

- Texas-Oklahoma WSO is formed by the combination of three LWCs – North Texas, South Texas and Oklahoma. Discussion turned to the entities used by each of those organizations, the assets currently held by each of them and what next steps might be.
- South Texas LWC – David Griffin
 - LWC taken over in 2016 from Tim Swords and LWC funds (from membership rebates) sent by check to external LLC account under David Griffin, Suzy Sanchez and Steve Galvan.
 - DG intention now to transfer entire external account (~ \$8,000) to USAW to hold with WSO funds.
 - External funds had been used very intermittently. Primary transactions were requested from account held by National Office with majority of LWC funds (~ \$30,000) from rebates.
 - Other assets: TVs and cables (to help put on meets).
- North Texas LWC – Bobby Sirkis
 - In 2011/2012 ish, LWC received \$2400 check from Mark Rippetoe without documentation on origin, etc as LWC funds. NT LWC used existing Spoon Barbell account to hold those funds until such time that the Texas Weightlifting LWC 501(c)3 non-profit was established in 2015 and the funds transferred.
 - Texas Weightlifting LWC 501(c)3 non-profit is an entity separate from USAW with its own bylaws that was used to operate the North Texas LWC (primarily the Texas State Meet).

- Similar to South Texas, LWC rebate checks were deposited in to the 501(c)3 until USAW's creation of LWC accounts within USAW. Exact amount of membership rebates before that time is not known and that information was unavailable when requested from USAW.
- Remaining funds held in the 501(c)3 are revenue from the annual Texas State Meet. These have been used to fund the State Meet payouts and the International Team Incentive program as well as the purchase of other physical assets for the State Meet.
- Other assets: two sets of black pipe & drape, a few television monitors and cables, computers and accessories to run the scoring system x2, wireless microphones and speakers. Also owns the website and domain of texasweightlifting.com.
- The existing 501(c)3 board consisting of BS, CL, JV, AW and Melissa Knourek (non-WSO board member) has voted to turn over the fate of the 501(c)3 and the funds held within to the majority decision of the nine member TX-OK WSO board.
- Pros and cons of keeping Texas Weightlifting LWC 501(c)3 non-profit as an entity separate from USAW/TX-OK WSO as it has been:
 - Pros (from BS):
 - It is an official Texas non-profit subject to appropriate oversight of finances and yearly state reporting.
 - For expenses related to the State Meet (such as hotel deposits), the 501(c)3 has the ability to quickly reimburse the personal transactions needed for the event vs. waiting on USAW to reimburse from the general WSO account.
 - The 501(c)3 can be used as the responsible entity in order to sign venue contracts rather than taking on individual personal liability (USAW will not be the financially responsible party for these contracts)
 - It is less costly to us to process registrations for the State Meet through Stripe alone on texasweightlifting.com than it would be to use BARS (2.6% + \$0.30 + 1% fee for Stripe + BARS fee of 4%). Cost saving of about \$1900. ** Note that this does not apply to the WSO Championship which is required by USAW to have its registration be processed through BARS.
 - Changing how the State Meet is run could cause unnecessary disruptions or changes to the current quality of the event.
 - BS proposes restructuring the board of the 501(c)3 to be made up of/include the three members of the TX-OK WSO Competition Committee in order to have the 501(c)3 belong to the WSO but remain outside of USAW as originally set up.
 - Cons and Counterarguments:
 - DG: all issues with not using a 501(c)3 to run an event will have to dealt with for the WSO Championship, such as waiting on USAW for deposit and payment reimbursement, and being personally liable when hosting large events.
 - BS: If the 501(c)3 exists, it could be used as a buffer between USAW and outside to ensure that those issues are not encountered or are minimized. The 501(c)3 could be quickly used by other events for payment or reimbursement and then registration funds collected by the WSO via BARS could be sent to the 501(c)3 to ensure that the registration fees are used as intended.
 - DG: If 501(c)3 is used in this manner by the Competition committee (DG, BS, RH), doesn't this co-mingle Texas and OK funds? (which was a point of keeping Texas funds to be used for Texas athletes?) Would OK have a say with how Texas spends its funds?
 - RH: OK is/was considering forming their own 501(c)3 to also have independent OK funds remain separate from Texas. Currently OK State is run out of a personally owned LLC.
 - RH: one concern could also be if USAW decides to deny reimbursement for a charge or purchase that the WSO has made?

- AW suggests using the new WSO Championship as a test case for all of the above concerns with USAW and making a decision after that experience.
- DG: Registration for the WSO Championship is required to be hosted on BARS to ensure that funds raised from it are used by the WSO through USAW's accounts.
- DG has issue with currently the largest revenue generating event in Texas being held outside of the purview of most of the members of this committee/board by not also being board members of the 501(c)3. North Texas has held the Texas State meet for a number of years and South Texas has chosen not to run a competing "South Texas Championships". He has concerns over the WSO not having access to the funds raised by the Texas State Championship that are held by the 501(c)3, and that other WSO board members will not have a say in how they are spent. DG wants to ensure that there is oversight and transparency based on meeting minutes to show to USAW.
 - BS: is confident that with DG, RH and himself on the Competition committee that the 501(c)3 could be used appropriately and in the transparent manner expected by USAW.
 - BS: also has concerns over the "ring-fenced" funds held by USAW being subject to other USAW uses without our authorization (example being holds on payouts leading to Tokyo 2021 while all funds were diverted to that event). USAW would have no jurisdiction over funds held outside of their accounts.
 - AW points out that the WSO Finance committee should have access and oversight of all three potential accounts – the WSO account (rebates and WSO championship), the Texas 501(c)3 and whatever entity is set up by OK to handle their State meet.
 - JV is not confident that the WSO Finance committee could handle oversight of all three accounts and would recommend not having external accounts at all.
 - AW suggest using USAW's model of reporting and payment for all WSO accounts.
 - DG suggests having program payout such as Team Incentives come from the National account (vs. external ones) and limit the number of withdrawals that occur from external accounts to only those required to put on specific events. Incentive funds could be transferred from 501(c)3 to WSO account and voted on in order to have athletes paid (for example).
 - BS believes that the same policies and procedures required by USAW for the WSO account can be equally applied to any 501(c)3 account.
 - DG prefers the optics of having a "national" group sent money to athletes rather than from an external account given that members of the board have athletes that could be receiving those funds.
- Voting cannot occur on this because CL, LP and DW have dropped off the call and 7/9 members are not currently present.
- Oklahoma LWC – ran out of time and was not fully discussed at this meeting.

Meeting Wrap Up: (beginning at 2:32:19)

- Action items moving forward:

- DG to ask USAW how paying and reimbursement is supposed to work. USAW has offered to pay invoices directly but unsure how that would work with hotel deposits using credit cards.
 - DG will reach out to all people who ran unsuccessfully for WSO Board for interest in participating on various committees.
 - BS brings up needing to get moving on 2023 Texas State Meet ASAP since no contracts have currently been signed pending WSO funding decisions. He has proposals for Dallas and Houston on hold but needs a decision quickly to secure one.
 - Will hold a vote next meeting about incentive programs and whether they will be adopted by the WSO.
- Next meeting will be tentatively held on Sunday, April 3rd at 7 pm to specifically discuss and vote on the 501(c)3.

Adjourned at 9:54 pm.

(recording finished at 2:43)