

Present: Christine Chittock (Chair), Ian McLaughlin, Maurice Chittock, John Hunt, Olwen Smith, Lyn Holmes, Richard Morgan, Maureen Phillips, Bryan Webb

1, Apologies None

2. Returning to The Pavilion from sep21

CC referred to her 'Report from the Chair 20210614' for this meeting, and the latest government announcement, and noted that East Devon covid cases had risen to 18 – a large increase in a short time. She had spoken to the Pavilion Duty Manager James Westmacott who was currently updating the jun20 Pavilion Risk Assessment. It was very likely that numbers in the hall would continue to be limited to 110 using a 'cabaret' layout with a maximum of 6 at any one table. The plan was for attendees to enter via the main entrance but exit from doors in the main hall. If we wanted to use any covid-safety system of our own in addition to the Pavilion's, then that would be acceptable.

CC had been in contact with two other local u3as, one of whom had replied to her request for information. Totton South were intending to return to Face to Face meetings. They planned to have Stewards wearing u3a sashes for identification. Our situation was different from some in that we didn't have to put out chairs etc. for our meeting and The Pavilion (**TP**) was responsible for sanitising furniture and contact locations like door handles.

The position with our members is that recent members may not even have attended any Pavilion meetings. CC added that nationally some have joined for one year and then left. If we accepted TP risk Assessment and their efforts to use this to protect attendees (and of course themselves), it was felt necessary for us also to be able to check on which of our members attended our events in TP.

OS and MC had compiled ideas about how to proceed, particularly on the subject of recording attendee's details in order to be able to trace them subsequently if required.

2.1 Compiling a list of attendees

It was recognised that it was necessary to avoid pinch points and members bunching together, especially when recording members entering TP. OS had investigated Beacon and found that we can attach membership cards to Beacon emails. There was thus the option of being able to collect membership cards in a box on entry. There would then be a need to collate these and compile a list. OS suggested that the outside hall doors could be kept open for ventilation. CC thanked OS for her ideas and very useful contribution.

CC noted that TP currently recorded attendees using a QR code system. This would have to take precedence. A discussion then took place about the possibility of us using QR codes too. JH mentioned that a majority of members are unlikely to have QR software on their phone, may not have a phone with them, or may not even possess one. IM noted that waiting at reception to register one's presence could itself create a queue.

BW could foresee possible difficulties arising from limiting numbers to 110. If more than 110 turned up, that may create some discussion and resistance from those excluded and also a bunching of attendees when that was the opposite of what we wanted. CC said that TP would

keep their QR code records for 21 days. Perhaps we could simply take advantage of TP registrations. There was a concern that the data may not be readily available to us and also may not be in the form that we would require.

RM was concerned about the possibility of limiting attendees to 110, but also the general implications of limiting numbers and the implications for our Charitable status. He wondered whether we need to record anyone at all. He felt that we can't stop members coming in.

MC then outlined his own thoughts, referring to his own report, dated 15Jun21, 'How to check members into The Pavilion'. He had looked at the ORCA barcode scanner app and was concerned about the cost and also whose phone we would use. He pointed out his view that any system of ours must:

1. Satisfy our own risk assessment as well as that of TP
2. Reassure members
3. Be quick and easy at the point of entry
4. Minimise the number of volunteers required to operate it

He envisaged a system which read a barcode from a membership card at the point of entry and used this to record that person's details on a spreadsheet. If necessary, details of all attendees can be quickly used to send alerts. He recommended that we should put in place a system which addresses the requirements and which he detailed in his report.

The question of printing such membership cards was discussed. MC thought that we couldn't leave it up to members who may not have a printer and most home printers weren't capable of reproducing the required detail.

The normal number of attendees was then discussed. CC thought that the most we have had was for the Red Arrows speaker, which was around 200. OS added that the show we put on had about 300. CC felt that if we did have to restrict numbers, members should understand that it was for their own benefit and safety. When she has had heard from members, there was a general wish to return to meetings in TP. So there was a need to decide on how we should respond. There were two scenarios

1. Under covid restrictions and
2. After government restrictions no longer apply (post-covid)

RM repeated that he doesn't think we should be limiting numbers but he liked MC's barcode idea. He made the point that if we were to adopt that route, and it's likely that we would be using that approach for quite a while, we shouldn't economise on the quality of any barcode reader we purchase.

BW strongly supported buying a barcode reader and one suitable for long term use. Even if TP is collecting data it's likely to be mainly to satisfy their own requirements. Our members may still wish to sit apart even post-covid.

JH made four points.

1. He supported MC's paper and thinks a barcode reader was the way to go.
2. Limits to numbers may give rise to unforeseen problems
3. A limit on numbers may be solvable with concurrent streaming. CC pointed out that speakers wouldn't always allow this.

4. Should we think about prior lateral flow tests? He had decided against this as they were not reliable and added another administrative layer. Members might not be happy either.

LH agreed that using barcodes was a good idea but made the point that it was the responsibility of TP. However she did agree that we should check our own members in. MP thought that many members would be nervous about attending a large gathering even post-covid and that in itself would tend to limit numbers. She suggested that we could advertise in a Bulletin or Newsletter that we were looking for volunteers (eg. Meeters and Greeters).

2.2 Seeking the Committee's formal views

CC proceeded to canvass the committee's opinion on her proposals.

2.2.1. Are we happy to restrict the numbers of members attending meetings if we return to TP?

RM repeated that he would like to check 'Charity Law' on this before committing himself.

All generally agreed subject to RM's findings. **Action RM** to find out the 'Charity position'.

(RM left the meeting at this point.)

CC thought that we'd need another meeting to discuss this after the next expected government announcement around 19jul21. IM thought it was worth emphasising that if we do have to restrict numbers, we would be doing it for the benefit of our members.

CC would send TP's updated risk assessment to the committee as soon as possible. **Action CC.**

BW noted that the need to quarantine sometimes prevented people from submitting to 'test and trace'. He also added that even in a post-covid scenario it was likely that we would still have to protect our members. They shouldn't feel too hard done by as they have u3a FB, YouTube, Zoom, Bulletins and Newsletters.

CC agreed that we can request precautions in addition to those carried out by TP. She will make members aware that they must consider their own attitude to returning and, in effect, do their own risk assessment.

OS thought that we wouldn't be short of volunteers as members want to get back to TP asap. She also noted that the Park Run used scanners and found their system had gaps and was not infallible.

IM pointed out that we can't prevent covid infection, only do our best and everyone must decide for themselves the level of risk that they're prepared to tolerate. MP pointed out that if anyone is diagnosed with covid after a Pavilion meeting, there's no guarantee that it was caught in the Hall. CC will point out that anyone who wishes to wear masks or visors can do so.

Conclusion: Everyone was happy with the principle of restricting numbers to 110 if necessary.

2.2.2 Use of barcode reader to record members attending

JH reiterated that we would keep records only for 21 days then delete. They will only be used IF someone has a covid diagnosis and then only used for that purpose (GDPR policy). MC noted that we need to test a barcode system and its associated software and also decide how to print appropriate membership cards, noting that they would only be valid for 1 year. It was estimated that professional printing would cost about £1.50 per member.

Conclusion: Everyone agreed that we should adopt a barcode scanning method for registering attendees.

2.2.3 Volunteers for helping support the new measures at TP

CC pointed out that helpers had previously taken it in turns to turn up, but she thought that we could do with more. OS thought that we need to be clear who would be responsible for the team of volunteers. She also thought we should mention the requirement in the next Newsletter and agreed that we should announce that, as far as we were currently able to decide, we were proposing to return to TP in September.

BW wondered how TP use their data and whether we would have access to it. MP thought that it went straight to the NHS system.

(JH left the meeting at this point.)

CC made the general comment that she would like to know how other u3as were handling the return to face-to-face meetings as she didn't want to conflict with other's advice if it could be avoided. She would take up the question at Link Meetings. **Action CC.**

Conclusion: All agreed that it was necessary to supplement the numbers of and organise helpers prior to returning to TP.

3. A.O.B.

LH said that she had booked The Beacon hotel for the Christmas Dinner on 13jan22.

It was agreed that our next Committee meeting on 6jul21 should revert to the later time of 13:00.

4. Date of next meeting 6jul21 at 13:00, by Zoom.

Ian McLauchlin, Secretary

date 20jun21

Signed:



Date: 27jul21

pp. Christine Chittock, Chair