



PACIFIC HANDICAP RACING FLEET OF THE NORTHWEST

P.O. Box 489, Gig Harbor, Washington 98335

Phone: (253) 857-8858 Fax: (425) 962-8729

visit our web site at <http://www.phrf-nw.org>

**Minutes
Handicappers Council Meeting
January 24, 2010**

A handicappers council meeting was held on Sunday January 24 2010 at the Tacoma Yacht Club, Tacoma WA.

Attendance:

Alan Grim, MIL – CH

Neil Bennett, BL

Nate Crietz, ST

Matthew Wood, CN

Kirk Utter, ST

Joe Poire, SH

Pat Nelson, CNT

Pat Waters, TT

Charles Tolman, SID, SSI

Rafe Beswick, SSSS

Mike Stainsby, PYC

Terry Waters, NYC

David Hickman, RC, PYC, SYS

John Wolfe, CE

Mark Lindeman, TA

Mike Milburn, SE

Robert Miles, WINSA

Ron Jewula, RVC

Dan Wierman, CNW

Eric Rimkus, None-2

GENERAL HANDICAPPER COUNCIL BUSINESS

Call to Order/Agenda Changes/Adoption of Previous Minutes

The meeting was called to order by the Chief Handicapper (CH), Alan Grim, at 0910 hours.

The CH provided an opportunity for handicappers to revise the posted agenda. The following motions to revise the agenda were made and passed:

Motion: reinstate appeal of HOT27-1 Blackfoot and Egress rudder modifications – passed

Motion: Add item to discuss Chapter II, paragraph C.12 with regard to the inclusion of cushions and door boards as part of a standard boat – passed

Motion: Add item to discuss the ODR process and set specific ODR ratings – passed

The CH called for any changes to the meeting minutes from the September 27 2009 meeting. A correction was noted regarding the discussion of the SIER26/XSIER26.

A motion was made to accept the September 27, 2009 minutes as amended above. The motion carried.

Administrative Business

Handicappers Training Guide

Pat Waters has developed a training guide and is looking for feedback. The intent is that the guide be a living document, under constant change.

Action: All handicappers to review training guide and provide feedback for review and inclusion in the guide.

Progress Converting to Current Protocol/Correcting Roster Errors

The CH noted the slow progress being made in converting the remainder of the fleet to the current rating protocol. It has been nearly three years since the council committed to the current protocol. The CH is committed to driving the final boats into the current protocol by the end of 2010, but requires the help of all handicappers. The effort is difficult due to the number of boats missing dimensions in the database and certificates. Handicappers needs to identify the boats for which they are responsible, and act to support the conversion.

The handicappers discussed the issues at length resulting in the following motion:

Motion: Handicappers are to work with their members that have missing dimensional data. A letter is to be sent to each member with data missing requesting that member provide the data by the end of 2010. The handicappers are to focus on very active boats that require conversion to the current protocol. – Passed.

Motion: The handicappers request to be provided with a copy of each rating certificate for the boats which they are responsible from the Business Office (hard copy or electronic). The handicappers will have 6 months to work with their members to collect any missing data. After 6 months, the handicappers request that the certificate data be made public via the PHRF-NW website for all members to access. After 2010, the handicappers recommend that no certificates be issues with missing data. The handicappers request that any time a new or revised certificate is issued that a copy of that certificate be also provided to the responsible handicapper. – passed. The Board is requested to take the necessary actions to provide the certificates to the handicappers.

Action: The CH is to write a letter to the handicappers providing direction to drive out errors, ensure complete certificates, and complete conversion of the remaining boat standards to the current protocol.

Base/As-Sailed Rating Shift to Multiple of 3

The CH requested approval of the previously provided spreadsheet that changes all base ratings and as-sailed ratings to a multiple of 3. Of the ~ 980 members

from 2009, 386 as-sailed ratings change by 1 second up or down. Of the ~ 780 standards, a similar number of base ratings change by 1 second up or down.

Motion: Approve the change of base ratings and as-sailed ratings as proposed – passed.

Action: The CH is to write a letter to the membership to be included with each new certificate explaining the change.

Mainsail Measurement Loophole (elevated tack)

The CH provided proposed language to remove the loophole that allows sails that can be hoisted to full hoist or pulled to full outhaul to report measurements less than MP and/or ME.

Motion: Require MP = P, ME = E for all boats. Motion failed.

The CH proposed language was amended as follows (red text is new, strikethrough is old deleted):

- “P” ~~Measured luff length of mainsail from tack to head measuring points. This term shall be used for actual mainsail area computation in lieu of the rig “P” which is used for standard mainsail area computation.~~ **Actual rig dimension taken from the horizontal surface of the boom as it intersects the aft face of the mast to the point of maximum hoist of the mainsail.**
- “E” ~~Measured foot length of mainsail from tack to clew measuring points. This term shall be used for actual mainsail area computation in lieu of the rig “E” which is used for standard mainsail area computation.~~ **Actual rig dimension taken from the aft face of the mast along the boom to the maximum point at which the mainsail may be outhauled.**
- “MP” **Measured luff length from tack to head measuring points. The tack measuring point shall be the intersection of the projected curve of the foot with the projected curve of the luff. Where MP is declared to be other than P, the responsible handicapper shall apply MP = P or require the mast be marked with a contrasting band to limit mainsail hoist to measured MP.**
- “ME” **Measured mainsail foot length from tack to clew measurement points. Where the declared ME is declared to be other than E, the responsible handicapper shall apply ME = E or require the boom be marked with a contrasting band to limit outhaul of the foot to measured ME.**
- “HB” **Measured headboard length from head measuring point to after top edge of headboard. For “square top” mainsails or any sail with extreme roach resulting in a nearly horizontal top of the mainsail, the headboard dimension shall be taken from the Head Point to the aft end of the upper batten(s) supporting the top of the mainsail.**

Motion: revise the rating protocol to adopt the above language. – passed.

Action: All handicappers are to evaluate each boat in their fleet, replace MP with P and ME with E. Where the code of the mainsail changes, the handicapper shall contact the member and inform them that they may add black bands to their mast at the MP and ME dimensions provided retaining their current rating, or accept the new rating with MP = P and ME = E.

Spinnaker Protocol Loophole

The CH informed the council that the current spinnaker protocol is not clear. Where boats are using both symmetric and asymmetric spinnakers, some members have been reported to be taking advantage of the larger asymmetrical spinnaker midgirth to lengthen the mast-mounted spinnaker pole to SGM/1.8, and then using that spinnaker pole to fly either symmetrical or asymmetrical spinnakers.

Action: The CH will consider further and propose revised wording. Members should be aware that the council considers this a loophole to be closed. Where members are increasing the length of the pole to SGM/1.8 for their Asymmetric Spinnaker, handicappers are to apply that pole length when calculating the rating for the symmetrical spinnaker as well. This will result in an increase in symmetrical spinnaker calculated area.

Chapter II, paragraph C.12 regarding equipment intended by manufacturer

Motion: Revise C.12 to delete “tables” and add text to allow removal of cushions and tables. Passed.

ODR Protocol and ODR Ratings

Motion: Revise Chapter II, Paragraph V, second paragraph to read “For those recognized national or international one-design boats, owners may request a one-design rating by submitting a valid and current class certificate, or provide a signed statement that the boat meets the one-design requirements of the class, in place of the required PHRF-NW dimensions.”

The CH noted that the Board of Directors may have an objection to the proposed change. The CH agrees that the change is needed to allow the ODR fleet to grow. The change will facilitate increased membership.

Action: The handicappers request the board of directors review the above change for compliance to the bylaws.

In the standard database, each ODR boat will have a unique base rating that equals the as-sailed rating. Each ODR standard in the standard database will be the boat type appended with a “-ODR”.

Motion: Create the following ODR standards and base ratings:

MART242-ODR base 168 - passed
ETCH22-ODR base 123 - passed
MELG24-ODR base 99 – postponed to MELG24 review
JBOA24-ODR base 186 – postponed for further review

Lunch Break (1200 – 1300 hours)

Sub-Region Council Reports

Seattle RC: Report submitted to CH prior to meeting.

South Sound RC: The SSRC has prepared a review of the rating of the MELG24 to be heard during the rating reviews and appeals.

British Columbia RC: Report provided separately.

West Sound RC: No report.

North Sound RC: No report.

Portland RC: The Portland RC attempted to submit a complaint of the actions of the CH in lieu of the required report. An extensive list of complaints was handed out to the handicappers without warning or advance publication, and had been discussed with the board of directors earlier in the day. The CH stated that the discussion was out of order and gave the Portland RC an opportunity to add the item to the agenda. Before the item could be added to the agenda, a motion was made to table the subject to a later meeting.

Motion: Table the discussion to the next meeting. Per RRO, a motion to table is immediately voted on. The motion passed. The topic will be included in the next meeting.

Multihull RC: No report. No multi-hull handicappers were present.

Handicapper Rating Reviews

The handicappers discussed the difference between handicapper rating reviews and member appeals. There was some question whether handicapper rating reviews were allowed by the bylaws. There are some that believe that there is a conflict between Chapter I, paragraph T and Chapter II paragraph Q. Regarding paragraph Q, all boats have by definition "probable error" regardless of the length of time a boat has had the same rating.

Action: The Board of directors is requested to review the handicapper rating review process for compliance to the bylaws.

After further discussion regarding rating reviews the following motion was made:

Motion: Rating changes due to handicapper review will not take affect for 90 days in which affected members may submit an appeal. If appealed, the rating will not be changed until the appeal can be heard by the Handicappers Council.

The motion was amended to 30 days from 90.

The motion passed.

In a previous meeting, council had given the authority to the regional councils to make changes to boat ratings for the entire region when that boat type resides

entirely within the responsibility of that region, with the oversight and approval of the CH. The CH stated that this decision may be in conflict with bylaws.

Action: The handicappers council requests the Board of Directors consider and allow regional councils be allowed to manage base ratings for boats entirely within that region, under the supervision and approval of the CH.

MELG24-1: The SSRC provided a detailed review. There was no motion made to change the base rating.

EXPR37-2: The CH provided data and analysis comparing the -1 and the -2. In September, the base rating of the -1 was changed to 72. The -2 has the same base rating (per the earlier motion regarding multiple of 3 ratings). The CH requested the council consider whether the -2 should have a different rating. The -2 has a taller mast and shallower draft.

Motion: revise the EXPR37-2 base rating from 72 to 75. Passed.

Note: Due to the motion above to freeze rating changes until affected members have a chance to appeal, this rating change is subject to appeal and will not be changed until affected members have an opportunity to do so.

SIER26/XSIER26: Due to a lack of time, this discussion was not heard.

Motion: extend the T rating status of these boats another 2 years and refer back to the responsible handicapper for action. Passed.

Member Appeals

HOTF27-1 Blackfoot/Egress:

The CH noted that the council had already reviewed the rudder change in September and determined that the change did not warrant a rating adjustment. A motion would be required to repeat that review.

Motion: review rudder change again. Passed.

Member Ian Sloan reviewed the appeal of the rudder change with the council. Egress owner Steve Trunkey provided detail of the change. HOTF27 rudders are not available. Most HOTF27s have changed the rudders, some significantly. In the case of Blackfoot and Egress, the rudder is of similar construction and area to the original rudder but moved forward 2-3 inches to balance the excessive helm experienced in heavy air. The CH noted that moving the rudder forward would not relieve the tendency of the boat to round up (weather helm) but only relieve the load on the helm.

Motion: No change to the ratings of Blackfoot or Egress due to the rudder change. – passed.

JBOA109 Appeal

Owners of Tantivy and Shada presented a case that the J109 with the code 4 headsail (145%) and code W spinnaker (120 sq m) should rate 72.

**Motion: Revise as-sailed rating of the J109s coded 4W55 from 69 to 72.
Failed.**

Joint Directors/Handicappers Session (1530 hours)

WIRW race organizer Gary Stuntz addressed the joint session of the Directors and Handicappers. Gary explained his rationale for the few rating changes, stating that his motivation is only to ensure fair sailing. Both PHRF President David Lynch and CH Alan Grim stated their support for this important event and commitment to more proactive rating changes to ensure fair sailing.

President David Lynch thanked the handicappers for their continued efforts.

The directors requested the handicappers better define the process for managing T ratings.

Action: The CH to define T Rating process.

The meeting adjourned at 1600 hours.

Meeting minutes as recorded by Alan Grim.

AG/ag