

National Squib Owners Association
Minutes of Special General Meeting held on 3 October 2014 at Rutland Sailing Club at 18.00

1. Attendance and Apologies

35 Members present. Apologies were received from Ricky East, Paul Withers, Peter Wyllie and Neil Orum

2. Introduction by Chairman:

Steve Warren-Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that it had proved impossible to get rule changes connected to the new build sorted in time for Rutland.

3. Amendment to the Rules of the National Squib Owners Association as set out in the Squib Handbook

Add new rule 14k

Full member ballots may be conducted for significant changes to either the NSOA Rules or the National Squib Class Rules. These shall be conducted electronically or via postal vote. The results of the ballot will be auditable. Such a ballot will be the equivalent of a poll at a General Meeting and the same majority rules shall apply. The Class Committee shall have authority to decide whether such a ballot shall be conducted.

The chairman explained that there are only 2 opportunities a year where any rule changes can be tabled for decision – the AGM and the Inland Championships. Consequently the Committee had debated the matter and come to the conclusion that the NSOA rules needed to be updated to enable a more efficient method of dealing with potential rule changes.

4. Debate on the amendment

Major points raised:

How will the system work

All members would be able to vote rather than just those who attend the meetings or organise proxy votes. The existing rules on majorities would apply (2/3rds majority). The rules specify that a minimum of 28 days notice be given for a SGM and the all member ballots would comply with this. The poll would be auditable and each member would only be able to vote once.

What about the debate that has happened at physical meetings

With the minimum 28 days notice there is the opportunity to use the website Forum for debate as well as dissemination of information via the fleets.

Why do we need to do this

The NSOA has gradually been moving towards a more electronic form of communication with members with extensive work being undertaken on the membership database (including updating addresses) and expansion of the amount of information on the website. In addition there is also the Forum on the website and Facebook for general chat. The inability to bring rule changes to the SGM had the effect of focussing attention on how decisions are made – with the solution being to add a rule permitting full member ballots either by email or post. Concern was expressed that this was a preview of what Rondar are suggesting but it was reiterated that the proposed rule change was nothing to do with the builder. The meeting was reminded that any technical rules changes have to be approved by the RYA.

David Wines formally proposed the motion and Tony Saltonstall seconded it. The motion was then put to the vote.

5. A poll by personal and proxy voting slips

The result of the poll was 46 in favour, 1 against. The motion was therefore carried.

5a. The Chairman presented the outgoing Secretary with a bouquet of flowers in recognition of all her hard work on behalf of the association. Tony Saltonstall proposed and Jenny Riley seconded that Chris Stonehouse be made an Honorary Member of the NSOA. Carried nem con.

5b The Chairman reported that two overseas events had been suggested. Rondar have suggested that the Squibs might like to join their biannual event on Lake Garda and there has been a proposal that the Southern Championships be held in Bordeaux in 2016.

6. Consultation session on the potential changes to the Squib build

The Chairman welcomed Paul Young of Rondar Boats to the meeting.

Paul Young said that he had been looking very hard at the Squib and talking to both Squibbers and non-Squibbers. The main reason given for not getting a Squib appears to be the level of maintenance required – with incomers looking for boats with little or no maintenance.

Specific issues raised by Squibbers are:

- The lip on the cockpit edge
- Rotten floors
- Baling system
- Main-sheet system
- Woodwork maintenance

So far as the Recreational Crafts Directive is concerned there is currently an opt out. Most of the RCD is irrelevant but if clubs were to buy new boats they would find it difficult to obtain insurance without the RCD compliance regarding buoyancy.

The build up until now has been high labour, low material with a large number of variables in the build which result in inconsistency.

Specifics

The Lip

To remove it would mean a new deck mould – expensive but a moulding that fits over the lip would be possible and would be retrofitable.

Basic Construction

Current: single skin moulding with wooden bulkheads. There are maintenance issues associated with this. What about a moulded foam sandwich construction which would be lower maintenance?

Self Draining Cockpit

Would be possible if the floor level was raised approximately 8" – could be boom clearance issues. There could be self bailers above the waterline on both sides. *Considerable views that the floor should be left in the existing position.*

Double bottom – with internal liner (floor) sold as a spare which would probably be able to be self installed. Possibly a few wooden bulkheads. *Would it be stiffer below the waterline – probably no difference.*

Keel: currently they are variable – need to make sure they are the same every time.

If the Squib was first built today it wouldn't be single skin construction.

PY concluded his remarks by saying that whatever happens the purpose is to protect the class future and to be successful the price needs to be kept to the £18,000 level. The build needs to be repeatable – same boat each time. He compared the Squibs to the Firefly which Rondar took on a few years ago and have managed to revitalise from practically no boats being built to several hundred. It would be nice to see Squib production growing.

Comments:

If the "new" Squib does sail differently what about Lamboley measurement?

A good bond between the floor and the skin is essential.
Possible to use foam for the deck was mentioned.

At Abersoch the debate on the future made it clear that reducing maintenance was a major need.

Comparison with the Dragons where the floor level had to be raised to increase buoyancy. The hull and keel are the same and performance is very similar but there is a reduced risk of sinking.

Tony Saltonstall commented that the NSOA should let the builder move forward within reason with the Technical Committee and Class charged with making the right decision. All changes have to be approved by both the Class and the RYA.

Malcolm Hutchings commented that the only way to see whether raising the floor would be an issue was to test.

PY stated that he is intending to get things done by Christmas so that decisions can be taken in early 2015 with the target of getting the first boat at the Dinghy Show. The licence can't be issued until the first boat is built. By using modern materials it should be possible to maintain accurate weights. Work is currently underway on the keel scans to get the mould. Variations in the keel could be dealt with by having a void at the top which could be filled with lead. The possibility of making the keel slightly undersize and then epoxying over the whole keel with the weight being dealt with by adding lead is being explored.

SWS reminded the meeting that the decisions will be made by the membership and looked forward to welcoming new members to the class. He already has a meeting booked with the RYA.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 19.00