



## Agenda

Subject: January TORL Board of Directors Meeting  
Meeting Date: January 16, 2024  
Time: 7:00 pm  
Location: Zoom

### ATTENDANCE:

Call to order at 7:03pm

<b>President</b>	Carmen Larsen	<b>President, GVRA</b>	Wayne Roberts
<b>Vice President</b>	Rosemary Manton	<b>President, KRA</b>	Tessa Russell
<b>Past President</b>	Not in attendance	<b>President, SRA</b>	Tammy Packer
<b>Treasurer</b>	Tammy Packer	<b>President, WRA</b>	Nathan Kurjata
<b>Secretary</b>	Cathy Lipsett	<b>Past President (non-voting)</b>	Bob MacDonald
<b>Director of Coaching</b>	Richard Toth	<b>Ice Scheduler</b>	John Hopkinson
<b>Director of Officials</b>		<b>TORL Webmaster</b>	Katelyn Toth
<b>Registrar</b>			

### 1.0 Approval of agenda

Motion: Nate

Second: Wayne

Motion Passed

### 2.0 Review of minutes from November 21, 2023

Motion to accept: John

Second: Cathy

Motion Passed

### 3.0 Old business

3.1 Signing authorities – Carmen signed last week. Tammy paid RAMP fees via SRA.

Tammy and Cathy has to go to a in person meeting to get etransfer, as of now we just do cheques.

Shuswap paid Ramp on behalf of TORL until we get the signing cleared.

3.2 TORL Cup- update from Richard

Having a U-10 Jamboree in Salmon Arm.

Shuswap want to make it a fun filled event with baskets, photo booth, cookie decorating etc.

Fund were set aside for TORL Cup. Associations will pay ice cost. TORL has allotted \$500.00 for expenses. Some kind of swag for the athletes. Tammy will get a budget done.

### 3.3 Cancellation Policy

Katelyn and committee have made up a Policy as of Feb 1,2024

Motion by: John That the Cancellation Policy be circulated by Katelyn be followed as of Feb 1,2024

2<sup>nd</sup> by Tammy

Motion: Passed

3.4 Player pick up policy: definition of 'work through' roster for same age-division supplying teams. Team rosters Tessa wrote up a Player pick up Policy,

A good discussion was held by all , Carmen will draft a letter to address the stresss RBC put on a club team attending the Richmond Tournament. Carmen will send out to all of us to approve.

### 4.0 Financial Update

We haven't used the bank account so no change.

Can everyone send association numbers so Tammy can send invoices.

Scholarship \$250.00 per association for the 2023-2024 season

### 5.0 New business

5.1 FUN scheduling – Wayne/Richard? Resolved

5.2 Cost to WRA of unused ice times for U12CI WRA – Nate

2 U12CI ice times unused due to conflicts in ice scheduling, WRA would like TORL to pay the \$191.70. Tammy will look into the budget to see if funds are available. Answer will be given next meeting

5.3 Meeting with League Presidents, Ringette BC Executive Director Matt Doherty and Board President Lesley Driscoll. Presidents of LMRL, NRL, Victoria. Themes of the meeting:

**Evaluation:** Some evaluators rate based on matrix and some based on comparison of players on the ice  
- Ringette BC plans to reassess skills matrix to simplify, will be lead by Rebecca Tamil-Selvin  
May include training modules, video.

**Communication:** RBC's goal for August to November was to stabilize the office and personal  
Trying to 'right size' service delivery model  
Changes in portfolios and changes in personnel.

**Burnout of volunteers:** Lack of officials and administrative volunteers (worse than on-ice volunteers)  
RBC role in training volunteers?

**Policy Review:** Policies are contradictory/unclear, some outdated one may be on website  
RBC initiating policy review process to ensure consistency and alignment with Ringette Canada

**Development program concerns:** Deferred to meeting with Rebecca Tamil-Selvin

\*\*December 13: I met with Rebecca to discuss concerns brought to me regarding U14 Train to Excel/Team BC selection, and Canada Winter Games and Team BC feedback.

5.4 Ringette BC Membership Fees 2024-2025: Impact on TORL?

RBC did not give a audited budget or any budget at the AGM, TORL would send a request to RBC give us an audited statement before we pay the \$40.00 increase per player. Carmen will draft a letter.

### 5.5 Male Athletes

Nate has concerns on Player Safety. Playing against a Bigger, stronger, faster males, hurting female players, is a big issue. There is also a big worry of losing female athletes. Discussion held.

Nate will take his concern to RBC

Motion by Nate : That TORL lobby RBC to address the Burnaby Stinger u19 club team concerns, regarding their male athletes, because allowing this team to continue as it is, will be detrimental to Ringette BC in both short and long term.

2<sup>nd</sup> Richard

Motion: AMENDED

By Nate: That TORL lobby RBC to address the Burnaby Stinger u19 Club Team Safety concerns, regarding their male athletes, because allowing this team to continue as it is will be detrimental to Ringette BC in both short and long term.

2<sup>nd</sup> Katelyn

Motion: 5 for Nate Katelyn, Wayne Richard, Rosemary, Tammy

Against 2 John and Tessa

Abstained Cathy

Motion: Passed

### 5.6 U19 Zone Player Policy

Too many of Male players as per RBC Policy. RBC are not taking a leadership on their Policies.

Motion by Wayne: That TORL get clarification on Rosters being 80% female, 20% male this includes AP's. Reason being so that we do not run into another team that exceeds the 20% males on the Roster.

2<sup>nd</sup>: Tammy

Motion: Passed

### 6.1 Reports from Associations

WRA - Nate

U16 - U19 game they request that these games are an exhibition game. Request that U19 not play U16 zone

SRA- Tammy

U10 Jamboree

Love the fact that the schedule is posted to the end of the year. But SRA are complaining that they are getting 7:15 am games in Kelowna

WRA- Wayne

Autumn Blast committee working with the city so next year tournament will run smoother.

City of Vernon working on a 2 tier pricing.

GVRA created a subcommittee to keep ringette alive

Training for Boards due burn out of volunteers

KRA- Tessa

KRA Board organizing Sweetheart, a big undertaking for the Board.

### 6.0 Next meeting:

Feb 20<sup>th</sup>, 7:00PM

Meeting Adjournment 9:41 pm

**2024-01-22**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Good evening Everyone,

I have been thinking about the following TORL board motion from our meeting on January 16.

*By Nate: That TORL lobby RBC to address the Burnaby Stinger u19 Club Team Safety concerns, regarding their male athletes, because allowing this team to continue as it is will be detrimental to Ringette BC in both short and long term.*

*2<sup>nd</sup> Katelyn*

*Motion: 5 for Nate Katelyn, Wayne Richard, Rosemary, Tammy*

*Against 2 John and Tessa*

*Abstained Cathy*

*Motion: Passed*

I recognize wholeheartedly the passion, frustration, fear and concern that each member of this Board feels to provide a safe environment for ringette players. It is real and important and should be shared with Ringette BC, our Provincial Sport Organization (PSO). This motion is reflective of a much broader concern that many of you are hearing from parents and players in your association about ensuring a safe playing environment.

I have not yet composed the response letter to Ringette BC per the direction of the Board because I am concerned, from a governance issue, that this motion can be considered *Discrimination* and violates the British Columbia Universal Code of Conduct (BC UCC) that we all signed. This motion clearly targets a specific group of athletes asking for a team to be altered or changed because of their gender.

As the Chair, I am asking you, the TORL Board, to bring this back to our next meeting to reconsider the motion. I feel very strongly that our League should be able to bring this important issue to the PSO in a manner that does not violate the BC UCC.

Please respond to this request to re-consider the motion with a Yes (reconsider) or a No (do not reconsider).

Thank you for all the time you give to this sport and these young athletes.

**2022-01-22**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

No

**2022-01-22**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

A motion was forwarded, seconded, discussed, voted on, and passed.

I'm disappointed and concerned on a number of levels by this email.

For the record.

**2024-01-22**

**From Cathy Lipsett**

Yes

**2024-01-22**

**From Tessa Russell**

I vote yes to the request. Following Robert's Rules of Order this is an option that a board can take.

**2024-01-23**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

For the record, the motion "requests RBC to address" the team, it does not ask RBC "for a team to be altered or changed".

This follow up email to a motion passing nearly a week after the fact is incredibly inappropriate (that's as mildly as I can put it right now) and a disservice to every board member, and every member of TORL that we represent.

**2024-01-23**

**From Richard Toth**

I vote no.

I don't see any issue with expressing our members concerns over a team that has been brought up as a safety concern.

**2024-01-23**

**From Katelyn Toth**

My vote is no.

I agree with Richard and Nathan and feel we owe it to our players and the sport as a whole, to bring forward concerns regarding safety.

**2024-01-23**

**From John Hopkinson**

I vote yes. I think we should adhere to the True Sport Principles we were recently reminded of in the Jan. 19 meeting. I do not feel that there is a safety issue with the u19 Burnaby Stingers team, and as an assistant coach on the KRA u19 club team feel that while they are a talented team, they are not a rough team, and are only being singled out because they are talented, have more than 18 on the roster, and have a number of boys of varying levels. A large number of boys at u19 club is to be expected when boys are not allowed to play competitively at u14 and u16 and encouraged to play up a division. In the Langley tournament our team played against CPRMA and we had several of our players coming off crying after being injured, and a similarly rough game against ACE Bowview and no issues with BNWRA.

**2024-01-23**

**From Wayne Robert**

Good morning,

I wanted to respond and let you know I am not ignoring this email or question. I want to give this the proper thought and today is NOT that day with my workload (starting at 6:30 and going straight through to 9 pm).

*My two asks...*

do we have the exact write wording request of the motion? For me 'lobby RBC' vs 'requests RBC to address' have different implications when we speak policy like True Sport Principles and British Columbia Universal Code of Conduct (BC UCC) and I have heard Human Rights.

If we do table the topic for further discussion, we should organize a separate TORL Board meeting not part of the regular board meeting. We need to be able to act on items in a timely manner.

This is obviously an important topic as we have a lot of members who have taken the time to reach out and express their opinions.

Once I get this clarification I will give it more thought and reply tomorrow.

**2024-01-23**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Good afternoon,

Thank you, Wayne, for your thoughts. I am mindful of everyone's time and appreciate all of our busy schedules and that you took the time to send this.

Ask #1: It is the wording of the motion that is at the core of my request to reconsider the motion. I am tasked as President to speak to on behalf of TORL to the motion as passed, and it is the current wording that I believe is problematic. If the motion is to be amended, to 'have the exact right wording', that is up to the Board to decide.

Ask #2: I agree that a separate TORL board meeting could be called to discuss this motion, if the Board wishes.

As I stated in my email, I believe TORL can bring this important issue to Ringette BC in a manner that does not violate True Sport Principles and the BC UCC.

**2024-01-24**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

I don't know where we're at with this, but I found this online regarding Robert's Rules of Order ...

<http://www.rulesonline.com/rror-06.htm>

**36. Reconsider.**<sup>1</sup> This motion is peculiar in that the making of the motion has a higher rank than its consideration, and for a certain time prevents anything being done as the result of the vote it is proposed to reconsider. It can be made only on the day the vote to be reconsidered was taken, or on the next succeeding day, a legal holiday or a recess not being counted as a day. It must be made by one who voted with the prevailing side. Any member may second it. It can be made while any other question is pending, even if another member has the floor, or after it has been voted to adjourn, provided the chair has not declared the assembly adjourned. It may be made after the previous question has been ordered, in which case it and the motion to be reconsidered are undebatable.

Neither of the foregoing conditions I've underlined apply here.

Unless we're all okay with making up rules on the fly, I maintain my position that this entire email string is out of line.

**2024-01-24**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Thank you for your attention to this, Nathan. I did not make a motion to reconsider as I am aware of the restriction of that motion. As a non-voting Chair, I do not have the authority to make that motion, and certainly not after the meeting. I am simply asking to reconsider in the sense of a sober second thought about the wording as it stands.

I apologize if there was confusion about this use of the work 'reconsider'. It was not my intention for you to read it as a motion.

**2024-01-24**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

We need another meeting.

**2024-01-26**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Good morning,

Further to the email that I sent asking if the Board would be willing to re-open discussion about the motion:

*By Nate: That TORL lobby RBC to address the Burnaby Stinger u19 Club Team Safety concerns, regarding their male athletes, because allowing this team to continue as it is will be detrimental to Ringette BC in both short and long term.*

*2<sup>nd</sup> Katelyn*

*Motion: 5 for Nate Katelyn, Wayne Richard, Rosemary, Tammy*

*Against 2 John and Tessa*

*Abstained Cathy*

*Motion: Passed*

I have received the following responses:

Nathan: no

Rosemary: yes

Tessa: yes

Richard: no

Katelyn: no

John: yes

Cathy: yes. Email was sent only to Nate that he then forwarded to me.

Tammy: no response

Wayne: no response.



For the record, it was clarified by Nathan that a motion to reconsider can only be brought by someone who voted with the prevailing side and only during the same meeting. I agree with this per Roberts Rules of Order. I mean only to ask if the Board will put more thought to the wording of the motion.

I would also like to move forward on a decision about whether the Board will entertain my request to discuss the wording of the motion. I do not feel that a decision has been made until the 2 remaining board members who voted at the meeting respond.

**2024-01-26**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

Where in Robert's Rules of Order is this an option? I can't find it. Reference to where it is would be appreciated.

**2024-01-26**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

What Jan 19 meeting is John referring to? I'm confused.

**2024-01-26**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

Where we at with this?

**2024-01-26**

**From John Hopkinson**

Hi Nathan,

Sorry, that was a typo. I was referring to the email from the Chair of Ringette BC that was sent on Jan. 19.

**2024-01-27**

**From Wayne Robert**

Sorry I have been MIA. Was an insane week. I have gone back and forth on this topic.

I will vote yes to rewording the motion. Not to debate it.

What I am struggling with ... are we not allowed to mention a gender when we have safety concerns? When that is the root of members concerns.

I agree with Nathan. Let's make time and meet on this before the next meeting.

Have a great weekend

**2024-01-29**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

This motion was made nearly 2 weeks ago.

When are we meeting on this?

I feel it's being unnecessarily delayed at this point, but I have no idea what the rules are around timelines etc related to such.

**2024-01-29**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Good morning,

Does tomorrow evening work for most to discuss? I can set up a Zoom link for tomorrow if we can set a time.

**2024-01-29**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

Anytime tomorrow evening works for me.

**2024-01-29**

**From Wayne Robert**

I can make that work.

**2024-01-29**

**From Tessa Russell**

This is Sweetheart week and I have a meeting at 7. Sorry, it's really a busy time for KRA

**2024-01-29**

**From Richard Toth**

Tuesday 730 is good for me.

**2024-01-29**

**From Cathy Lipsett**

I will be travelling home but could try and see I  
Can get connection while travelling.

**2024-01-29**

**From Tessa Russell**

My apologies

I should have said that with Sweetheart pending this week, KRA does not have the capacity to meet until next week. I appreciate that this is not the most timely response, however, it's the best I can do under the constraints.

**2024-01-29**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Hi Everyone,

Does Monday Feb 5 in the evening work? Then all associations can be there?

**2024-01-29**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

Do we not have quorum for tomorrow?

**2024-01-29**

**From Cathy Lipsett**

I can do Feb 5th

**2024-01-29**

**From Wayne Robert**

It will have to be after 8:45 for me. I have practice.

**2024-01-29**

**From Tessa Russell**

I can do Monday evening

**2024-01-29**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

I can't. Curling from 7 to 10.

**2024-01-30**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Hi All,

How about Tuesday February 6?

**2024-01-30**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

Our WRA meeting is that evening, followed by our U12 Year End meeting. How many need to attend this meeting? Why isn't it happening tonight if we have enough for a quorum? I'm legitimately confused.

**2024-01-30**

**From Tessa Russell**

Hi Carmen,

If we can do 8 pm ish, that would be great.

We will have our Sweetheart wrapup meeting at 7.

Thanks so much

**2024-01-30**

**From Wayne Robert**

I am unable to make Tuesday Feb 6th.

**2024-02-02**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Hi Everyone,

I know we are all in tournament mode.

Monday February 5 doesn't work for Nathan.

Tuesday February 6 doesn't work for Wayne.

Wednesday February 7 I am not available.

How about Thursday February 8 in the evening?

**2024-02-02**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

Works for me

**2024-02-02**

**From Katelyn Toth**

Richard and I are unavailable Thursday as we have practice.

For those that have an issue with the wording, can we not just propose the change by email and vote that way?

**2024-02-02**

**From Wayne Robert**

I can move my Tuesday if that will work for everyone.

**2024-02-02**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

Tuesday I'm busy 4 to 6. Then have WRA meeting at 7 followed by U12 Year End Event planning meeting :(

I agree with Katelyn. Someone just propose something and let's get on with it. None of this is following Roberts Rules of Order anyway.

**2024-02-03**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Hi Everyone,

I have tried to draft a motion that addresses the concerns I heard and read in the submissions from WRA but does not target a specific group/team. This is a first draft. It also tries to offer opportunity for dialogue with RBC. I look forward to your feedback.

*By Nate: That TORL lobby RBC to address the Burnaby Stinger u19 Club Team Safety concerns, regarding their male athletes, because allowing this team to continue as it is will be detrimental to Ringette BC in both short and long term.*

*2<sup>nd</sup> Katelyn*

*Motion: 5 for Nate Katelyn, Wayne Richard, Rosemary, Tammy*

*Against 2 John and Tessa*

*Abstained Cathy*

*Motion: Passed*

That TORL relay to RBC the following concerns from our associations about on-ice player safety in age-group divisions where male athletes are physically bigger than female athletes:

Some ringette participants (players, coaches, spectators) perceive this size difference as dangerous in game play.

That teams with a higher percentage of male players are perceived as more dangerous than others.

Some coaches and players are anxious or play differently or want to avoid playing when competing against a team with a number of large, adolescent boys.

Because of these worries, some coaches consider withdrawing their teams from games against teams with a higher proportion of male players.

Because of these worries, some families consider withdrawing their female players from the sport.

Because of these safety concerns, some feel that Ringette BC is not fulfilling the objectives of its Constitution, namely that RBC “establish conditions conducive to the safety and enjoyment of its participants.”

TORL would like RBC to consider these legitimate concerns, review how risk assessments for individual players are completed and tracked, review how coaching plays a role in fair play and communicate to the membership of Ringette British Columbia how the safety of all players is addressed in situations like this. Associations are concerned about player injury as well as about the loss of athletes at higher age-groups and worry that safety concerns will contribute to reduced ringette registration in the short and long term.

**2024-02-05**

**From Nathan Kurjata**

Fellow board members,

The original motion (that has morphed into whatever this is since our last meeting) was simply intended to request that RBC address safety concerns related to certain players on a specific team (who happen to be their male players) because of their behavior in a game that had just been played. It left RBC many options, including something potentially as simple as a warning (FYI - warnings were handed out after that weekend that I was cc'd on – but nothing related to this team because my motion that passed was stonewalled by our president for being ‘clearly discriminatory’).

Discrimination implies unjust treatment, by definition. This motion never would have been made if it wasn't justified by these players' actions, and it wouldn't have been passed by six intelligent, caring and diligent board members if it was ‘clearly discriminatory’. Calling this motion 'clearly discriminatory' implies that the member that made the motion acted in a discriminatory manner, which is a challenge to my character and I won't accept it.

What has happened since this motion passed is unbelievable and so far outside of Roberts Rules of Order (contrary to what one of the individuals on the board claimed) that it's actually hard for me to believe. I'm still stunned by this, but I've tried to take the high road and go along with this until now.

However, to ‘amend’ something is to make *minor* changes. The amendment proposed Saturday cannot be considered minor in nature and clearly demonstrates that we are hours and hours and hours away from getting anywhere near something our president will likely approve, on a somewhat simple motion, which brings me to my final point.

If we are forced to walk on proverbial eggshells while we discuss and debate important issues for fear of being accused of being discriminatory, and if we have to wait to see if our president will approve motions we debate on and pass before acting on them, we cannot function properly as a board and we're not honouring our fiduciary duty to our members by doing so.

Time is valuable, and we're all clearly wasting it at this point. I can only control what I can control and won't continue to participate in this particular motion amendment (or whatever this is) because doing so is only enabling this to continue and a clear waste of everyone's time.

This will be my last reply to this email string, and I expect (on behalf of WRA's members) that the motion that passed will be addressed in a timely manner by our president in its current form.

**2024-02-05**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Good morning,

Thank you Nathan. You are right, I lost focus on the original request to re-think the wording of the motion. I recognize you will not respond and that any alternative is not acceptable to you. I too would like very much to move on with this. I do not like being the one to re-word the motion without discussion among the group but it seems impossible to find a time to do so. I have revised the first draft, trying to explain the concerns that are listed in Nathan's letter and the discussion from our last meeting.

That TORL relay to RBC the following concerns from our associations about on-ice player safety by the male athletes on the Burnaby Stinger u19 Club team at the West Coast Classic tournament in January where male athletes were physically overwhelming female competitors:

1. Some ringette participants (players, coaches, spectators) perceive this size difference as dangerous in game play.
2. Some coaches and players are anxious or play differently or want to avoid playing when competing against this team because of the size difference between the male and female players.
3. Because of these worries, some coaches consider withdrawing their teams from games against this team.
4. Because of these worries, some families consider withdrawing their female players from the sport.
5. Because of these safety concerns, some feel that Ringette BC is not fulfilling the objectives of its Constitution, namely that RBC "establish conditions conducive to the safety and enjoyment of its participants."

TORL would like RBC to consider these legitimate concerns, relay them as needed to the team, and review how risk assessments for individual players are completed and tracked and communicate to the TORL board how the safety of all players is considered in situations like this. Our member Associations are concerned about player injury as well as about the loss of athletes at higher age-groups and worry that safety concerns will contribute to reduced ringette registration in the short and long term.

Having said all that, if you as a Board direct to me to send the original motion, I will of course do the will of the board. I stand by my decision to raise a concern to improve the wording, nevertheless.

Please, let's wrap this up by Wednesday February 7. Therefore, I ask that someone please ask for a vote to either a) direct me to send a letter to RBC based on the original motion or b) ask to replace the original motion with the one proposed above.

Thank you



**2024-02-05**

**From Tammy Packer**

I feel that worded in this manner the motion both addresses the concerns about the specific team as raised by WRA and the u19 club team and its members (players, coaches+ parents) and doesn't 'attack' male players in general which could be problematic. Understanding and Ensuring that there is a process, risk assessment process or policy that will be followed for ALL players should be paramount.

I like the reworded motion and will support presenting this to RBC from SRA.

**2024-02-05**

**From Cathy Lipsett**

I would 2nd it

**2024-02-05**

**From Tammy Packer**

For meeting dates or times, I will just make my schedule work for what works for others. I am used to juggling and in reality I don't have a very 'exciting' life at the moment. 🤪

**2024-02-05**

**From Tessa Russell**

Good afternoon,

I would like to ask if there are game sheets or game video to justify this line of inquiry? What is the evidence to support this motion being brought forward?

As members of the league, we should be wary of making motions that demonstrate unsubstantiated prejudices simply to please our membership. Especially if those motions are unsupported.

It is our role as presidents to lead our organizations, not to reinforce unsupported beliefs. Just because someone brings forward a complaint, this does not mean that it has merit. That is outlined in Ringette BC's Discipline and Complaints Policy. What is the specific complaint on which this motion is being brought and what parts of the Code of Conduct or which policy does the team violate? Simply being male players does not make them dangerous . There are many teams who have female players of size who can out skate, out check and power through a triangle. Are we to ask for Ringette BC to review every team that has been formed in the province.

That language or line of thinking is incredulous as there is nothing other than opinion to underpin that belief. To my understanding of the process, this motion would be dismissed as frivolous (Ringette BC language) should it be sent to Ringette BC. It is more troubling

that TORL as a league which has male players actively involved in their associations would target another association or team over which we have absolutely no jurisdiction.

This is a Point of Order

Further to that, one of the complaints which triggered this motion was brought by a parent who moved their below average U16 aged skater to U19 as an underaged player. They made the decision to play in a higher division due to a series of circumstances including WRA not allowing any of the KRA players from our oversized U16 roster to move to their club.

It seems to me that the basis of this motion is flawed at its start and the complete information was not presented to the board for full consideration before voting.

To that end, per Robert's Rules of Order, I am making a motion to Rescind based on new information which was not presented when the original motion was voted on. As I did not vote on the prevailing side in the original motion, I am unable to make a motion to reconsider.

The motion to rescind would need a second and is still debatable in a future meeting.

**2024-02-07**

**From Wayne Robert**

Good morning,

First, great job KRA on Sweet Heart!

In regards to the wording. I think it meets the original intent. I look forward to it being submitted and moving forward.

**2024-02-07**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Good afternoon,

Wayne, Cathy and Tammy have responded that they accept the re-worded motion. Nathan has said no (private email to me)

Awaiting:

John

Tessa

Katelyn

Richard

Rosemary

**2024-02-07**

**From John Hopkinson**

Hi Carmen,

I also vote no on the reworded motion. I have seen no evidence (e.g. game sheets with penalty minutes, suspensions, video of rough play, ...) to support the idea that the boys on the Burnaby u19 club pose a threat to other players. Several of the Burnaby boys played with our boys at the male development weekend, and while some of them are quite highly skilled and fast, they are smaller than our boys, and avoid contact. I think it's also relevant to note that they are not white, and may have joined ringette at a young age because their parents were worried about them getting hurt in hockey, while ringette is a non-contact sport.

**2024-02-07**

**From Tessa Russell**

I will remove my motion to rescind from the table in the best interests of moving forward.

Hi Carmen,

I would say it's a no from KRA for this motion. I would ask that if the re-worded motion is sent that the minutes reflect strong disapproval from KRA as it regards any motion directed specifically towards the Burnaby U19 Club team.

Thanks

**2024-02-11**

**From Carmen Laursen**

Good morning TORL Board members,

Final responses by Wednesday to the re-worded motion were:

No: Nathan, John, Tessa

Yes: Wayne, Cathy, Tammy.

No response: Katelyn, Richard, Rosemary,

The motion does not pass. I will draft a letter to RBC based on the original motion, "that TORL lobby RBC to address the Burnaby Stinger u19 Club Team Safety concerns, regarding their male athletes, because allowing this team to continue as it is will be detrimental to Ringette BC in both short and long term."

This was a spirited discussion. I appreciate the feedback from each of you. I will share any feedback I receive from RBC.

Respectfully,

Carmen