

Brooklyn Mooring Cooperative Ltd

Annual General Meeting Brooklyn Community Centre 26 November 2017 10.30am

FINAL Minutes

1. Meeting open by Chair at 10.30am

Quentin Strauli:

- Welcomed all
- Sought adoption of agenda
- Appointed Bob Brownrigg as Returning Officer for the day Bob Brownrigg

2. Directors in attendance

Quentin Strauli (Chair)
Steve Bruggeman (Treasurer)
Anne Conway (Secretary)
Felicity Brownrigg (Maintenance)
Jenny Rowe (Membership)
Pat Woolley (Communications)
Vanessa O'Keefe

3. Apologies

Hopkins, Pakes, Burns, Sykes, Johnson, Jacqui McDougall, Mullin, Wilson & Ryder, Mead, Jaggs.

4. Adoption of the Minutes of 2016 AGM

Derek Leslie indicated he was the 'question mark' (motion seconder) in item 13.

*Subject to amendment above Jill Leslie moved Minutes be adopted, David Myles seconded.
Motion carried.*

5. Business arising from minutes of 2016 AGM

To be covered in subsequent items

6. Chair's report

Quentin Strauli:

- Spoke of the acrimony on the Board this year

- Thanked the Board, in particular Anne Conway, Steve Bruggeman and Vanessa O'Keefe for their work
- Spoke of the significant amount of work on the forward agenda for the BMC and its Board.
- Indicated that the website was now up and running, and provided significantly greater transparency for members
- Thanked members for their support of him as Chair.
- Indicated he would not be re-standing, but that he would be around to help if need be.

7. Treasurer's report and financial statements (see attached)

Treasurer (Steve Bruggeman) tabled financial statements and explained:

- Accounts were in fairly good shape, with approximately \$40K in the operating account
- Underspent during the 2016/17 financial year, as works had not progressed as quickly as anticipated
- There were 7 member debtors
- He was the account keeper, and independent auditor prepared statement of accounts, as well as filing the tax return and lodging necessary documentation with Fair Trading.

Tim Irwin questioned why accounts were reported in July - June financial year, when BMC rules specified November - October. Steve Bruggeman could not explain the discrepancy, indicating it had always been so. Discussion (Derek Leslie) regarding need to strictly align practice with rules. This was generally agreed, and the amendments to the rules proposed for the coming year would incorporate the change to standard July-June financial year.

Anne Conway moved Financial Statements be adopted, Jenny Rowe seconded. Motion carried.

8. Election of Auditors

Steve Bruggeman explained that BMC had Kes Moodley and Assoc as auditors for 28 years, they serviced us well and understood our Coop, facilities and operating practices. He recommended we keep them on.

Bronek Karcz expressed some concern about elements of the financial statements, and requested the Board bring quotes for alternative Auditors to next year's AGM. Not formally moved, but Board agreed to do this.

Bob Brownrigg expressed opinion that current auditors are doing a good job at reasonable rates, compared to other organisations he has been involved in.

Jenny Rowe moved Kes Moodley and Associates be retained as BMC auditors, Bob Brownrigg seconded. Motion carried.

9. Maintenance Report

Felicity Brownrigg reported (see attached)

Wally Bower reported that another light had been broken over the past day or so.

Vanessa O'Keefe explained the recent grant application made to the Commonwealth Safer Communities fund - for CCTV upgrade, lighting upgrade and a card access system to replace the current key system.

Liz Putt raised the issue of maintenance and safety - were there regular checks, or was it just a member reporting system. Example of proud nails. FB indicated that there was a compliance officer over at the Coop a couple of times a week who checked. Also that new maintenance contractor should assist with keeping these smaller issues under control.

Re CCTV:

- Discussion around current system and its failure to live up to original specifications.
- Brownriggs of the opinion that we needed to start again entirely.
- QS explained that cameras are fine (high quality), but the problems are with motion detection activation (we need full time/real time footage), and this requires greater storage (offsite and outside of camera cards), with remote accessibility. He also explained that criminals are generally fairly savvy, and don't show their faces.
- Tim Irwin highlighted the need for easy remote accessibility
- Jill Leslie asked if we had any come back with BTS.
- Michelle Armstrong asked if we could get Scott (BTS) to upgrade
- Stever Bruggeman explained that we had BTS come to a Board meeting, and subsequently propose an upgrade that would meet our needs at a cost of about \$8.5K.
- Wendy McMurdo explained that her boat had been taken in broad daylight, she reported to police, but by the time the CCTV footage was reviewed, the incident had been taped over. Two issues highlighted - remote access, and storage.

Jodi Theissen moved that the CCTV be upgraded as a matter of urgency, Felicity Brownrigg seconded. Motion carried.

10. Website & Newsletter

Pat Woolley indicated she had had some personal issues over the year which limited her ability to deliver on the website. She also objected to the website finalisation being outsourced. Pat indicated she was now back on track and would like to continue with her Newsletter role, and work on development of a member database in the coming year.

Question asked from the floor about waiting list and why names were not included. Vanessa O'Keefe indicated that there were some privacy concerns, but would be happy to ask those waiting to 'opt in' to having their names on the website list.

11. 2018 Annual Levy

Steve Bruggeman explained that the calculation of the annual levy was fairly formulaic, that he was happy to show this to any interested members, and that the formula was on the website. Based on the formula, the levy for 2018 would be:

- \$350 for payment received on or before 31/3/2018, and
- \$380 for payment received after 31/3/2018

Discussion from the floor about late payments, and using this as a mechanism to weed out serial debtors and perhaps free up memberships. The general feeling was that this was unlikely to have that effect. It was also pointed out that Rule 99 limits the maximum late fee to \$100.

Jill Leslie moved that the annual levy be \$350 if payment is received on or before 31/3/2018, and \$450 if payment is received after 31/3/2018, Harry Recher seconded. Motion carried.

Tim Irwin asked whether the Board had a structured capital works program upon which to base levies. The answer was no, but that the levy was based on 5 year rolling average of actual costs.

Tim Irwin moved that the Board prepare a capital works plan, Michelle Armstrong seconded. Motion carried.

12. Election of Directors

There were initially 7 nominations for 3 positions: Michelle Armstrong, Marina Garvey, Tim Irwin, Derek Leslie, Martin Lloyd, Gerard Putt and Pat Woolley.

Michelle Armstrong and Pat Woolley withdrew their nominations.

Each nominee outlined the skills they could bring to the Board.

Election outcome: 3 new Board members: Marina Garvey, Martin Lloyd and Gerard Putt.

13. Director's Remuneration

Steve Bruggeman explained that currently by way of remuneration, Directors' had their annual levy waived.

Kathy Merrick moved that the current waiver of Directors' fees be maintained, seconded by Liz Putt. Motion carried.

Previously, in addition to this, non-office bearing members receive \$100/yr to cover incidental costs (phone, printing etc), and office bearers (Chair, Treasurer and Secretary) receive \$200/yr to cover incidental costs. This arrangement was over-turned by members at the 2016 AGM, with Directors required to submit receipts for reimbursables.

Felicity Brownrigg moved that the previous arrangements for incidentals (\$100/200) be reinstated, seconded by Wynn Webber.

Felicity Brownrigg and Anne Conway spoke for the motion, pointing out the difficulties/time consuming nature of calculating costs and getting receipt for fuel, paper, ink, phone calls, etc, and that the small allowance suggested would be unlikely to cover these in any event.

Liz Putt and Gerard Putt spoke against, indicating that the process of re-imburement was standard practice and should be supported. Derek Leslie cautioned that in the near future there could be increased scrutiny of the BMC as part of the Brooklyn Master Planning process, and that total transparency was a must.

The motion was defeated.

14. 2018 Key Change Day

Key change day was set down for 18 February 2018.

Harry Recher moved that as a trial the key exchange day for 2018 be postponed until 2019, or later in 2018 if required by circumstances, seconded by Kathy Merrick.

In support, Harry argued that key exchange day was a considerable inconvenience. It was originally agreed to as a short-term solution to the failure of some members to pay their annual dues and was not, to the best of his memory, intended as an annual event. With it now possible to pay the annual fee by direct debit or b-pay, all members should find it easy to pay on time. If during the trial, it is found that a significant number of members have not paid their fees then the key exchange day can be re-scheduled for later in 2018. If there is a need to inspect mooring ropes, this can be and should be done on a routine basis during the year while boats are moored at the co-op. Members with inadequate ropes can be notified and asked to fix their ropes according to BMOC guidelines.

Against the motion, Gerard Putt reminded members that the KCD was originally instigated to minimise the opportunities for members to give keys to non-members, to regularise use, as well as to collect annual levies. He pointed out that the random approach to rope compliance put the onus back on the Board rather than the members, who should indeed be responsible for their own compliance.

The motion was defeated.

15. Other Business

a. Proposed update of rules

Vanessa O'Keefe explained that the rules needed to be updated to comply with new national cooperatives law. The update was scheduled for 2017, but has been delayed so that we could develop some policy decisions for inclusion in the new rules. A special meeting is proposed for May next year to consider the changes.

b. Proxy voting

Vanessa O'Keefe sought advice from members about proxy voting. Currently the rules preclude this. Generally, members were in support of the idea, and encouraged the board to take the idea forward, bearing in mind that the issue of concentration of votes needed to be addressed, with limiting the number of proxies held by a single member as a potential way of avoiding this. There was also some concern that the availability of proxy voting would discourage members from coming to the AGM.

c. Policy discussion - use of facility by members

Vanessa O'Keefe outlined the inconsistencies between the current rules, and current practice/behaviour of members. Specifically, members and assignees allowing others to use their boat occasionally, or for periods of time (eg by house minders or a builder doing work at their property), or 'sharing' their boat with another non-member. Options were discussed for dealing with these types of uses, which members, on the whole, saw as reasonable.

Gerard Putt suggested trying to codify in the new rules would be preferable to turning a blind eye, or seeking Board approval (discretionary). Kathy Merrick pointed out that while codifying may seem preferable, changing the rules is difficult, and if the new rules were having unintended consequences, adjusting may not be easy. She stated a preference for 'Board approval' with decision-making criteria being established in member agreed 'policy', which could be change without recourse to rule changes and the Fair Trading process associated with that.

To be progressed by the new Board for amendment of rules.

d. Policy discussion - rules upon death of a member

Vanessa O'Keefe explained that the current rules around treatment of membership upon the death of a member were confusing at best and perhaps conflicted. The main issue is around bequests. She then opened up to the floor for discussion.

There was a general feeling amongst members that membership would not revert back to the Cooperative if the 'family' that benefited from the membership were likely to be active members (as defined by the rules). The question of definition of 'family' was raised (Steve Bruggeman), and was something that needed to be nussed out.

To be progressed by the new Board for rule clarification.

e. Database development

Vanessa O'Keefe suggested to members that BMC records needed to be digitised, and that this would require some investment of time and effort this year. The proposal was generally supported by members.

16. Members Questions and Comments

a. *Harry Recher moved that loading areas be established on each of the pontoons immediately adjacent to the ramps from the gates. The loading areas to be established by either removal of the mooring arm closest to the gate on the western side of each pontoon or by engineering the mooring arm so it be lifted up and out of the way allowing a boat to dock parallel to the pontoon. Seconded Pat Woolley.*

For the motion, Harry explained that for some it has become dangerous to attempt to load goods across the boats, so being able to tie parallel to the pontoon is important for personal safety. Although there are loading areas on the pontoons these are a distance from the entry gates and many elderly members of the BMOC are finding it increasingly

difficult to carry heavy loads the length of the pontoon. A loading area near the gates would resolve the worst of these problems and does not necessarily mean the loss of space for mooring members' boats. The area created would be available for short-term mooring (< 10 minutes) or longer if all other mooring locations were occupied. Even if the mooring arms in the area proposed were removed, parallel mooring would be possible.

Sue Merricks supported the motion on the grounds of improved accessibility, and Michelle Armstrong suggested the option could be trialled, perhaps with a locked trolley as well.

Bronek Karcz suggested extending the facility to offset the potential loss of mooring spots, although the potential problems of our development consent was raised in response to this.

Gil Lobendahn spoke against the motion, pointing out that the existing loading/unloading spots should be sufficient.

Derek Leslie suggested that the loss of a spot or two was not significant, as by his assessment, there are on average 15 spots unused, and at peak times of the year (Easter) up to 8 spots remain vacant.

Motion defeated

Amended motion moved by Gerard Putt that the Board explore the provision of side-on mooring immediately adjacent to the ramps near the gates. Seconded Vanessa O'Keefe

Motion carried.

- b. *Harry Recher moved that boats less than 4 m in length, with an engine of 15 hp or less, be allowed to moor at the BMC using 10 mm diameter mooring silver rope. Anne Conway seconded.*

Harry argued that silver rope of this diameter has a breaking strain of 920 kg, which is more than adequate for boats of this size and weight. Based on experience the smaller diameter rope is easier to handle and adjust than the 12mm silver rope now required.

In support, Derek Leslie said that silver rope requirement was also unnecessary, and that other rope could meet the strength requirements.

Gerard Putt pointed out that the silver rope requirement was about the flex in that rope that minimised strain on the arms, but noted the arms had held up quite well.

Sue Merricks pointed out the 'ease of compliance' associated with a simple standard.

Motion defeated.

Note, however, that Board agreed to re-consider the standards as part of the rule update.

- c. Sue Merricks questioned the decision of the Board to withhold contact details of those on waiting list from a member who asked for the purpose of seeking support for the development of a new mooring facility.

Steve Bruggeman explained that the Board was reluctant to share waiting list information and contact details without the consent of those on the list. As a work-around, an email was sent to those on the waiting list explaining that the request had been made, and the reasons for the request. The contact details of the member seeking the information were provided to those on the waiting list, and they were urged to contact the member if they were interested in the proposal.

Meeting closed 1.30

