

June 2011 Meeting Notes

Log Books

No report

Federation Tour

To this point we have had one volunteer to replace Bill & Joy – if you are interested or would like to know more please contact either Steve Henderson or Arthur Clisby.

Web Site

Club Details and up-coming events up to date.

Bay to Birdwood Classic

Thanks for those people who have volunteered their vehicles and time for the promotional launch in the Rundle Mall.

A risk analysis of the current route has commenced.

(Shirley Tonkin) At this point there are 687 entries, of which 152 are “new” entries. All clubs are urged to remind members to get the entries in – the number is capped at 1750 so don’t be late and miss out. Update – 20/7/11 – 1250 entries received.

And just a reminder Clubs are again requested to stress to all their members (even put it in the Club Magazine)

“If they are not an entrant please do not to drive their vehicles along the route, park safely and watch”.

Please help us to ensure that the traffic congestion is not compounded.

Cruising Classics

Entries are starting to come in and are on a par with the ’09 event

CHVR Variations

Currently one vehicle on CHVR has been queried by DTEI and is currently under investigation.

(Alan Pickering) During the month I had a call from a gentlemen querying why LPG was not permitted, during the conversation it transpired that a Club Authorisation Officer had inspected the vehicle, and only when he went to drive out and the vehicle stopped and had to be switched from LPG to petrol did the Authorisation Officer realize it was on LPG! This would pose the question did he open the bonnet to check the Engine No OR copied it of the rego papers – Authorisation Officers please check all the details before you sign off!

GENERAL BUSINESS:

Proposed Changes to CHVR, Clarification of Changes and DTEI Letter.

The proposed changes to the scheme generated a great deal of discussion the following are summaries of the points raised and answers.

“Letter from DTEI” A: Letter was sent by DTEI to 13 clubs (Sample Cross Section?), we were informed of it “when it was in the mail”. Of the 13 clubs ask to respond, 6 did so (plus one other club not on the list); - half the responses where favourable.

“Time Frame Given” Some clubs felt that the required time frame for response set by DTEI was insufficient for some clubs to reply.

“This is the first time they have heard of this” (proposed changes). A: Following a meeting with the then new Registrar Martin Small, it was reported (Jun 09) that it was likely there would be a cap on CHVR, compulsory vehicle inspections and other points that have not eventuated. Clubs were asked “If any club has any points that they feel should apply to THIS SCHEME please put them in writing and forward to the committee.” None have been received.

“No prior consultation/warning of changes” A: June 09 meeting with DTEI was a general discussion on the current scheme. At that meeting we were not giving any specifics as to the future direction of CHVR, rather hints of things to come based on DTEI’s perception of the “oldest fleet” still in daily use on the road, or conversely, while DTEI expressed no dissatisfaction with the current scheme, or anything specific, there were hints of too many vehicles not complying.

At the February 11 General Meeting a summary of a February meeting with DTEI was given to the Clubs. At that meeting the FHMC were expressly asked not to pass on specific dates etc., however these dates were “released to the public” by Gordon Cowley. Subsequently in the April Minutes, with DTEI approval we outlined the details of the proposed changes.

It has been repeatedly stated through FHMC meetings to delegates, that we would not deal in rumours and would provide as much factual information available and authorised. And we will continue to do so.

“30 Year Rolling Cut Off” *The DTEI proposed cut-off date is 31 December and is to include LHD vehicles.* Arguments against this change were generally based on the argument that - Changes to this will be detrimental to growth of the movement, not encourage younger members into the movement etc. No facts have been/were provided to back up these arguments.

“Annual Inspections” *The DTEI proposed mandatory annual inspection for all CHVRS vehicles. This inspection is not intended to be a comprehensive one, rather verification that the vehicle remains unmodified from its original state when the MR334 was raised. It should be noted this also includes rejecting a vehicle that did not originally meet the eligibility requirements, but was admitted to the scheme anyway.* The main argument against this was that these are seen as a major problem for Clubs with far flung membership (How was the vehicle inspected initially?), and/or this is going to add additional burden on clubs to administer.

Again, no facts have been/were provided to back up these arguments, particularly when at that meeting, details of another non-compliant vehicle was presented to the FHMC by DTEI.

CURRENT POSITION

A further meeting has been held with DTEI (15 Jun) – Currently as it stands, we have no direct rights with DTEI other than we are a lobby group representing the Historic Car Movement in this state. Although it was acknowledged that we do provide a small level of administration and are the only authorised source of CHVRS Logbooks. From this meeting we can report

Cut Off Date: The current proposed changes still stand.

If we go back to the start of CHVR many of the “30 year old” vehicles did not fit in with modern traffic flow i.e. braking etc., now a 30 year vehicle is more than capable of handling today’s traffic conditions i.e. disc brakes etc. and a large percentage of these vehicles are still in daily use.

The prime driving force behind this proposed cut-off is “financially driven” that perceives a loss of revenue from a continued rolling 30 year date. We can debate this point for a very long period but until the changes are implemented and the figures analysed, we have no valid and indisputable argument.

The proposed cut-off date will be reviewed at some point in the future. Compliant 1 Jan 1979 to 31 Dec 1981 vehicles that have currently made it onto CHVR will remain eligible to remain on the scheme, until such time as the cut-off date advances to encompass them.

Annual Inspections: *We have had a win!*

An owner will have the choice of either presenting his vehicle for verification check OR supply the Club with a Statutory Declaration that the “Vehicle is as initially inspected”. This will ease the perceived burden of Clubs with “far flung members” annual verification process or large numbers of vehicle registered through the club.

Comment was made by one speaker “A STAT DEC is a piece of paper”. A representative present a meeting has since passed on the following warning (He is a JP!)

A Statutory Declaration falls under the Oaths Act of 1936

Penalties for a false declaration is up to 4 years imprisonment plus substantial fines

i.e. it is not just a piece of paper.

NOTE We stress that these are proposals and are yet be drafted in to a format for submission to Parliament and the ensuring due process – they are proposed changes to the scheme.

“Number Plate Plate Petition”

Copy not received with minutes. A: Copy was sent to each Club secretary, action is up to the clubs.

Bay to Birdwood History

“Commercial Announcement”

The awaited release of the “History of the Bay to Birdwood” has arrived and is available for purchase. See Bill Watson 8264 6355 email bijo431@bigpond.com.

CONSTITUTION CHANGES

Under the current constitution an Executive Member can only serve two (2) consecutive two-year terms. In the past (and future) this has posed problems where an Executive member has to stand down and there are no candidates for the position, although the incumbent is willing to serve another term.

Motion was put to the meeting by Graham Dean, seconded by Neil Murrie
“The Constitution be amended to rectify this problem.”

A Special General Meeting was set for 8:00pm Saturday 20 August to discuss and vote on the proposal.

Secretary will prepare the proposed amendment (see below) and distribute to all Clubs and Delegates.

The proposed changes are

Current Clause

5.4 Re-election

Any President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer who has held office for one (1) full term must retire and, if desirous of re-election will be subject to re-election by a simple majority of the Member Clubs represented and voting at the Annual General Meeting. Provided however that a President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer is not to hold office for more than two (2) consecutive terms.

Proposed Clause

5.4 Re-election

Any President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer who has held office for one (1) full term must retire and, if desirous of re-election will be subject to re-election by a simple majority of the Member Clubs represented and voting at the Annual General Meeting. Provided however that a President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer is not to hold office for more than Five (5) consecutive terms.