

A PHRF-NW Handicappers Council meeting was convened on Sunday, January 20th, 2002, at the Seattle Yacht Club, Seattle, WA.

Handicappers in Attendance:

Arden Newbrook, Chief Handicapper	David Hickman, CGYC, RCYC
Bill Nelson, NONE-1, KH, PA, PT, OR	Bryce Smith, NONE-2
Matt Wood, CN-3	Jack Stacey, CF
Hamp Phillips, CN-2	Mike Benjamin, TA
Bill Brennan, PYC, SYS	Betsy Wareham, OI
Frederick Perez, FH	Rocky Goodhope, BL
Larry Clark, SH	Larry Calhoun, WINSA
Vaughn Ploeger, ST-1	John Martens, SS
Tim Lott, SID	Gay Morris, CE
Louis Eagle, CNP	

1.00: GENERAL HANDICAPPER COUNCIL BUSINESS

1.01: The meeting was called to order at 10:05 A.M. by Bill Nelson, at the request of the Chief Handicapper, Arden Newbrook, who was delayed in arrival. A call for additions and/or corrections to the previous January 21st, 2001 Handicappers Council Meeting Minutes elicited no response. The previous Minutes were accordingly approved as submitted.

1.02: Dave Hickman, Chair of the Portland RSC, began the meeting with a discussion of overdue corrections that need to be made to the text of Chapter II of the Handicappers Manual. These corrections include:

Under Section C, Paragraph 14, all of the text of this Paragraph, (Subparagraphs a through d) is regarded as being outdated and should be deleted, with new text inserted in lieu thereof to read as follows:

“Hiking Aids and Lifelines: The PHRF-NW “standard” definition includes the adoption of ISAF and PIYA rules and prescriptions for hiking aids and life lines.”

Under Section F, definitions for standard and Code “Zero” spinnakers should be added to read as follows:

““Spinnaker” Any sail which, carried in normal position, is set forward of a boat’s foretriangle with a mid-girth equal to or greater than 75% of its foot girth,

including such sails tacked to a stemhead fitting or sails provided with a stemhead tackline.”

“Code “Zero” Spinnaker” A spinnaker with a mid-girth less than 75% of its foot girth.”

- # The designation for actual “**Spinnaker Area**” under Section G, Paragraph 2, should be changed to read “**Symmetric Spinnaker Area**” and a new designation and formula for asymmetric spinnakers should be added to read as:

“**Asymmetric Spinnaker Area =**
[DH+DF+4(D1+D3)+2(D2)](Luff+Leach)/24”

- # Under the same Section and Paragraph the actual mainsail area formula should be corrected to read:

“**Mainsail Area = [3(E)+4(MGM+MGU)+HB](P)/12”** (Note location of brackets)

- # Under Section H, Paragraph 1 is regarded as being unnecessary and should be deleted, and the remaining Paragraphs consecutively re-numbered.

- # Under Section H, Paragraph 5, the Rating Adjustment Table for Non-Standard Jib-SAFJ should be corrected (as previously changed) to read:

NOMINAL	SAFJ	RATING	RATING
SAFJ	RANGE	ADJUSTMENT	CODE
1.19	1.17+ - UP	-15	L
1.15	1.13+ - 1.17	-12	9
1.11	1.09+ - 1.13	-9	8
1.07	1.05+ - 1.09	-6	7
1.03	1.01+ - 1.05	-3	6
1.00 STD	0.97+ - 1.01	0	5
0.96	0.94+ - 0.97	+3	4

0.92	0.90+ - 0.94	+6	3
0.88	0.86+ - 0.90	+9	2
0.84	0.82+ - 0.86	+9	1
0.80	0.00+ - 0.82	+9	S

Under the same Section and Paragraph the phrase “**Boats with One Design Ratings and SAFJ less than .90 use Code (0)**” should be deleted. One-Design ratings were previously abandoned by the Handicappers Council and the Adjustment Table changed to show Code 2, 1 and S adjustments all as +9 seconds, but with the Code designations retained to show actual jib size.

Under Section I, Paragraph 2, the word “**proposed**” in the last sentence should be changed to read “**adopted**” as previously enacted by the Handicappers Council.

Under the same Section and Paragraph, Subparagraph c is regarded as being unnecessary and should be deleted, and the remaining Subparagraphs consecutively re-lettered.

Under the same Section and Paragraph, the time penalties listed under Subparagraph e for boats rating less than 119 or more than 120 should be changed to read “**-12 sec/mile**” and “**-6 sec/mile**” respectively. This change was previously enacted by the Handicappers Council.

Under Section I, Paragraph 5, the formula for actual asymmetric spinnaker area should be corrected to read:

“**Spinnaker Area = [DH+DF+4(D1+D3)+2(D2)](Luff+Leach)/24**” (Note location of brackets)

Under the same Section and Paragraph, the text for the spinnaker head dimension should be changed to read:

DH = Head dimension, the girth as measured 6" below the head along each edge”

Under the same Section and Paragraph, the remaining text starting with “**The formula on the following page...**” is regarded as being unnecessary and should be deleted to the end of Paragraph 5.

Under Section I, Paragraph 6, all text in this Paragraph is regarded as being unnecessary and should be deleted, with the following new text added in lieu thereof to read:

“Code “Zero” Spinnakers:

Calculate the area of code “zero” spinnakers with the applicable formula for actual symmetric or asymmetric spinnaker area and rate as a headsail using the sail area adjustment factor formula and adjustment table for jibs. A boat shall be rated on the basis of its largest jib or code “zero” spinnaker.

Boats using only code “zero” spinnakers are not eligible for NSF (No Flying Sail) rating credits and a “5” shall be entered as the second digit of their rating Code.”

Following general discussion of the proposed corrections a motion was made and seconded to adopt the corrections. The motion carried. The changes are to be made prior to publishing the next Handicappers Manual for distribution to the PHRF-NW membership.

In addition to the above changes, Arden Newbrook indicated that the PHRF-NW recommendations for crew weight limits and “cruising class” adjustments, as previously adopted by the Council, need to be inserted in the Manual. See the attached text for these limits and adjustments.

1.03 Jack Stacy introduced discussion of the C&C 24S (Hinterhoeller Shark) and presented two options for dealing with errors on the boats he is rating. The Council adopted option no. 2 and authorized Jack to proceed with correction of the errors as indicated.

1.04 The Handicappers Council generally discussed the need to establish an Appeal Review Board for the preliminary assessment of rating Appeals prior to their presentation to the Council. Arden Newbrook noted that a previous attempt to form an ad-hoc Appeal Screening Committee for this purpose did not result in any Committee activity. As an alternative, Arden suggested that pre-screening of Appeals could be a function performed by the PHRF-NW Regional Sub-Councils (RSC’s) which would be best able to address the appeal issues of local boats. Question was raised as to whether the Appeal Form should be included in the Handicappers Manual. It was noted the form is available as a PDF file on the PHRF-NW web site.

1.05 Arden Newbrook reported that the PHRF-NW Regional Sub-Councils appear to becoming more active. Vancouver Island has recently organized its Sub-Council and Arden noted that both the Oregon and Seattle RSC’s are fully engaged in PHRF-NW business. Active RSC’s for the south and west sound areas need yet to be organized.

1.06 The Portland Regional Sub-Council (Dave Hickman) reported its activities and made the following recommendations to the Council:

The instructions for sail measurement as currently posted on the web site need to be upgraded with clearer text and better graphics.

Policing of rated sail areas needs to be improved. Boats with sail areas reported as “standard class sails” need to have their sails measured and reported as required by standard PHRF-NW measurement protocol and “class” sail areas should not be accepted by Handicappers.

With respect to sail area measurement, it was noted that the ISAF “**Guide to Sail Measurement**” would be a useful resource for developing clearer instruction and graphics. There was consensus that the Portland RSC should be charged with the responsibility of preparing an upgraded measurement protocol for installation on the web. Both Mike Benjamin and Dave Garman volunteered to provide assistance in the way of graphics and text to be associated with the protocol.

1.07 The Seattle Regional Sub-Council (Larry Clark) reported its activities and indicated it had base rating change recommendations and process questions for the Council's consideration as follows:

Proposed base rating changes:

J-30	Change from 145 to 151
SC 27	Change from 158 to 145
X99	Change from 115 to 105
Tripp 33	Change from 86 to 89
J24 (ODR)	Change from 189 to 186
J105	Change from 78 to 87
Thom850	Change from 55 to 48T

How are regional actions and ratings implemented between the Sub-Regional Councils?

With respect to the proposed base rating changes Arden Newbrook indicated he was reluctant to endorse them because, although he was aware of the proposal, its information had not been made known previously to the Handicappers at large, and they have accordingly not had an opportunity to react to them. Nevertheless, the Council agreed to change the base rating of the Tripp 33 to a "T" rating to enable local rating adjustment, and the Thompson 850 to a 48T rating. It was further agreed to address the base rating of the J-105 on an rating review basis at the next Council meeting.

With respect to regional ratings, Arden responded that, due to anticipated changes to the current spinnaker rating protocol, the data management program used by PHRF-NW (Microsoft Access) will need to be changed. At that time an additional rating column (digit) could be inserted in a boat's rating Code to deal with local rating adjustments. This adjustment could be either adopted by other regions or further adjusted at their discretion, or ignored to have the base rating applied as would be expected at inter-regional racing events. Arden further indicated he is in support of the concept for regional rating adjustments and will be working towards making their implementation realistically possible within the Access program.

1.08 Arden Newbrook introduced proposed changes he is considering for the PHRF-NW spinnaker rating protocol and distributed copies (see attached) for Handicapper consideration. By way of explanation, Arden stated that a change to the current protocol is necessary to correct the discrepancy of calculated spinnaker areas between symmetric and asymmetric spinnakers as returned by current formulas and to more fairly address the issue of sprit boats which necessarily carry (by virtue of tack location) sprit-tacked chutes which are much larger than comparable boats with pole-tacked chutes. The principal elements of the proposal include the following:

A single, “universal” area formula would be applied to both symmetric and asymmetric spinnakers. Adoption of such a formula would eliminate the need to distinguish between symmetric and asymmetric spinnakers; they would all be treated the same. A universal formula would also permit a more reasonable basis for the comparison of dissimilar (sprit vs. non-sprit) boats employing downwind sail area to displacement (DW S/D) ratios, as the sail areas would be computed uniformly. As they currently exist, PHRF-NW’s symmetric and asymmetric formulas return an error of ±11% when applied to the same chute.

Two new spinnaker definitions would need to be established; one for pole-tacked spinnakers, and another for sprit-tacked spinnakers. Boats with pole-tacked spinnakers would be permitted to use either symmetric or asymmetric chutes without penalty; similarly, boats with sprit-tacked chutes would be unpenalized for carrying either symmetric or asymmetric chutes.

Two new formula definitions for standard spinnaker area would be established; one for pole-tacked spinnakers, and another for sprit-tacked spinnakers. The formula definition for pole-tacked spinnakers would remain as currently used, $1.566(l)(J)$. The formula definition for sprit-tacked spinnakers, in recognition of their intrinsically larger sail plan geometry, would be $2.215(l)(J)$. By adopting the current standard area formula for pole-tacked chutes, the current as-sailed rating for all non-sprit boats would remain unchanged. By adopting a new standard area formula for sprit-tacked chutes, the as-sailed rating for all sprit boats would more closely approximate their base ratings. (Good buy X, Y & Z rating Codes!)

Two new definitions for standard spinnaker poles and bowsprits would be established. The standard spinnaker pole length (for pole-tacked chutes) would remain unchanged at (J). The standard bowsprit length (for sprit-tacked chutes) would be set at $1.414(J)$.

All the miscellaneous rating caveats currently used to accommodate boats equipped with asymmetric spinnakers would be eliminated, as they would no longer be necessary. Sprit boats with over-sized bowsprits would be penalized in the same fashion as boats with over-sized poles. Similarly, sprit and non-sprit boats with oversized hoists (greater than l) would be penalized identically.

The “universal” spinnaker area formula would be established as:

$$\text{USA} = [\text{SGF} + 2(\text{SGM}) + 4(\text{SGM} + \text{SGL})](\text{SLU} + \text{SLE})/22$$

Where this formula is derived from the application of “Simpson’s Rule” for quarter girth measurements and as empirically modified (the 22 divisor) to closely approximate PHRF-NW’s current formula for symmetric spinnaker area, $0.87(\text{LLS})(G)$.

Arden noted that the above “universal” formula was proposed to impact the fewest number of member boats in PHRF-NW, as only the as-sailed ratings of sprit boats would be affected. The formula was derived and empirically modified to agree with spreadsheet data compiled by Alan Grimm, using spinnaker dimensions previously requested from the Handicappers. However, this formula would return calculated areas greater than the area calculated by the IACC spinnaker formula, $(\text{SLU} + \text{SLE})(\text{SF})/4 + (\text{SMG} - \text{SF}/2)(\text{SLU} + \text{SLE})/3$, for the same chute; effectively penalizing Code 5 spinnakers as measured under PHRF-NW as contrasted with “standard” spinnakers as measured under IACC. Although the proposed “universal” formula could be further modified to approximate the IACC formula, it would

impact the as-sailed ratings of all boats in PHRF-NW. Several other PHRF regions have adopted the IACC spinnaker formula.

Upon discussion, it was pointed out that the proposed "universal" formula requires several more measurements than the current symmetric formula. Arden responded that the proposed formula actually requires fewer measurements than the current asymmetric formula and that, for proper and accurate measurement of the maximum girth as provided by the current symmetric formula, multiple trial-and-error measurements are required to establish the location of the maximum girth.

In closing statements, Arden asked all Handicappers to examine the proposed changes to the spinnaker rating protocol in detail, and to provide him with feedback. The proposal is not unlike comparable procedures adopted by southern California PHRF to deal with sprit boats. Arden indicated that, upon further analysis, the coefficients used both for standard sprit-tacked spinnaker area and bowsprit length may be subject to adjustment.

2.00: RATING REVIEWS & APPEALS

2.01: The Standard (Base) Ratings for the J-24 and Melges 24 were reviewed at the request of the Oregon RSC. In both instances it was noted that the current Base Ratings were adopted on the basis of faulty and inconsistent sail area data used to determine as-sailed "class" ratings. Additionally, it was shown that there are a large number of Melges 24's which are racing under the same "class" as-sailed rating with different rating Codes. After discussion, the Council adopted the following changes:

JBOA24-1: Change Standard Rating from 189 to **186**. (-3 Seconds)

MELG24-1: Change Standard Rating from 138 to **129(T)**. (-9 Seconds, "T" Added)

Given these changes, it was further pointed out that the as-sailed rating of these boats, in their

"class" sail configurations, should be **180** and **99(T)** for the J-24 and Melges 24 respectively. These as-sailed ratings exclude other adjustments (such as removal of outboard motor from transom).

2.02: The Standard (Base) Ratings for the Tripp 33 and Thompson 850 were reviewed at the request of the Seattle RSC. After discussion, the Council adopted the following changes:

TRIP33-1: Change Standard Rating from 86 to **86(T)**. ("T" Added)

THOM850: Change Standard Rating from 55 to **48(T)**. (-7Seconds, "T" Added)

In both instances tentative, "T", ratings were added to permit local RSC adjustment within PHRF-NW guidelines (± 6 Seconds).

2.03: A Rating Appeal was heard from the Owner of "**Kiwi Boat**" (SN 69331), a Young 8.8, contesting Arden Newbrook's denial of a Base Rating change, as proposed by Mike Benjamin, prior to last summer's Whidbey Island Race Week. This denial was based on the Council's previous removal of the boat's "T" rating and further discussion of the boat's speed potential with both Bill Nelson and Mike Benjamin with respect to other Whidbey Race

competitors, including J-29's and "**Midsummer**". Upon Appeal presentation and further discussion by Mike and Bill, the Council acted to restore the **(T)** rating for the **YOUN8.8** and authorized Mike Benjamin to locally adjust "**Kiwi Boat's**" as-sailed rating by +3 seconds.

2.04 A Rating Appeal was presented by Hamp Phillips in behalf of the Owner of "**Irene**" (SN 35),

a Kettenburg 32PC. Hamp explained that the Base Rating for this boat was determined on the basis of faulty original sail area data and that a "T" rating needs to be restored to permit him latitude in establishing an equitable as-sailed rating. The Council acted to restore the **(T)** rating for the **KETT32PC** as requested and directed Hamp to provide it with accurate and sufficient data for determining a new Base Rating at its next meeting.

2.05 A pending Appeal in behalf of "**Jaded**" (SN 299), a J-105, was discussed. The as-sailed rating of "**Jaded**" is **72**, based on a double over-sized chute. The Base Rating for a **JBOA105** is **78**. It was agreed this appeal should be deferred until the J-105's Base Rating is reviewed by the Council. At issue is how the Base Rating was established. Arden noted that J-Boats reports spinnaker areas (and rating recommendations) on the basis of the IACC formula which results in "standard" spinnakers that are significantly larger than PHRF-NW Code "5" asymmetric chutes and that the current J-105 Base Rating, as well as other J-sprit boats, appears not to incorporate this distinction. Larry Clark indicated the Seattle RSC is currently examining the spinnaker area question and will report back to the Council with its recommendations.

2.06 The **63(T)** as-sailed rating of "**Snake Eyes**" (SN 69696), a Beneteau 40.7, was discussed. This rating was originally prepared by Arden Newbrook from an assigned Base Rating of **57(T)** (for a new boat type) and the reported rig dimensions in US Sailing's dimensional database. It was mentioned the reported "E" dimension appears to be too large (by 2 feet) and the as-sailed rating should be made 12 seconds faster. The Council acted to authorize the boat's local Handicapper to adjust the as-sailed rating from 63(T) to **51(T)** and to report the correct "E" for insertion into the Table III database.

2.07 There being no further business, the Handicappers Council Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Arden M. Newbrook,

Chief Handicapper, PHRF-NW

AMN:cbw