



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
August 19, 2007**

A handicappers council meeting was held on Sunday August 19, 2007 at the Royal Victoria yacht Club, Victoria BC.

Attendance:

Alan Grim, MIL – CH

Jack Stacey, CF

Andy Robinson, NWMA-3

David Lynch, PM

Roger Lawton, MP

Charles Tolman, SID

Peter Jacobson, SC

Stuart Farrell, ST

Ron Jewula, RVC

1.00 GENERAL HANDICAPPER COUNCIL BUSINESS

1.01 Call to Order/Adoption of Previous Minutes

The meeting was called to order by the Chief Handicapper (CH), Alan Grim, at 1115 hours.

A motion was made to accept the April 29, 2007 minutes. The motion carried.

1.02 Administrative Business

Spinnaker Rule

The CH asked for feedback regarding the application of the spinnaker rule instituted at the April meeting. Only a few had attempted to apply the new rule. Of those few, the rule and rating calculator seem to be working properly. The new rule significantly affects those boats with $ISP > I$ and/or $JC > J$. The majority of the fleet has $ISP = I$ and $JC = J$. The handicappers gave the CH the following action:

Action: CH to develop a plan to address yachts impacted by the change in the spinnaker rule, including steps and target completion dates.

SCD

A question was raised regarding the new Standard Class Database. Boat types that were not current members when the SCD was created were not transferred over from Table III to the SCD. When bringing boat types back into the SCD that had previously existed in Table III, start with Table III and use resources available to check the data. One resource is the USSailing Rig database. Web searches at manufacturer or class websites are other sources of data. A last resort is actual measurement of the yacht in question. When all else fails, Table III may be assumed correct.

Action: The CH will post the last revision of Table III to the Yahoo discussion board as a reference only, to be used to generate SCD maintenance forms.

A/R Form

The CH presented a proposed A/R form for comment. Some minor but important changes were identified and will be incorporated by the CH.

Action: CH to update the proposed A/R form and post to the Yahoo site and the PHRF-NW Officials_Only page for immediate use.

The CH asked the handicappers if PHRF-NW should require all measurements to be reported before a certificate can be produced. The general consensus was yes, but not immediately. The CH and the Business Manager are working on the new member database. This should be completed first before any missing data issues are addressed.

Roster and Certificate Data

The handicappers recommended that the roster be published with the certificate measurement data included.

Action: The CH will work with the Business Manager to create a report from the member database to an excel and/or pdf file that includes the certificate data, and post the file(s) to the website.

USSailing Positions on One-Design, Rule 49, Rule 51

The CH presented for discussion several recent USSailing positions regarding PHRF. Regarding Rule 49, Crew Position, the handicappers took no action. The race organizers are expected to monitor compliance to the RRS. A rating provided by PHRF-NW does not imply that a yacht is sailed in compliance with the RRS. The same applies to Rule 51, Movable Ballast. PHRF-NW will continue to provide ratings for yachts in the configuration reported by the

member. Race organizers are responsible for compliance and/or changes to the RRS.

IRC Spreadsheet

The CH informed the handicappers of the IRC spreadsheet provided on the Yahoo website. The IRC spreadsheet reports Time-on-Time factors for all current IRC rated boats in the US. The CH created a conversion to Time-on-Distance based on the scratch boat (J33 closest to IRC of 1.00) and back calculated the B factor based on A = 650. The ToD ratings are in the highlighted column. The spreadsheet is intended as an additional tool to rate new boats to PHRF-NW, and can be used as data in support of rating appeals. In no way should any rating appeal be based only on the IRC conversion.

Copyright of PHRF-NW Protocol

Copyright of the PHRF-NW handicapping protocol was discussed briefly. The handicappers request that the Board of Directors consider removing the copyright from the handicapping protocol. Of late, PHRF-NW has benefited from "borrowing" methods from other PHRF regions. Sharing of methods is for the betterment of the sport.

Lunch Break (1245 – 1400)

During the lunch break, the handicappers reviewed the results from Whidbey Island Race Week. No boats were identified as requiring immediate action.

1.03 Sub-Region Council Reports

Seattle Region: No report.

South Sound: The SSRC is working to develop a methodology for management of Miscellaneous Rating Codes. No progress to report at this time.

British Columbia: The BCRC has been working on a proposal for managing Mainsail Ratings. The proposal is presented below.

Portland: No members present, no report provided.

West Sound: No members present, no report provided.

1.04 Protocol Discussions

Mainsail Protocol

The BCRC proposed changes to the mainsail protocol. Ron Jewula provided a CAD drawing of a mainsail with the original PHRF-NW measurements, current PHRF-NW measurements, and ISAF measurements. Currently, most organizations use the ISAF measurements, including IMS, IRC, most one-design classes, and many PHRF regions. Also, sailmaker design programs use ISAF measurements. Many boats coming in to PHRF have measurements to the ISAF rule. Owners are providing ISAF numbers in place of PHRF-NW, resulting in code 4 mainsails. Using the leach as the starting point of the measurement process increases accuracy as the leach tends to have minimal or no stretch. The luff rope is commonly stretchable resulting in decreased accuracy locating the measurement points.

The SAFM table needs codes for larger mainsails, up to –30 seconds.

The recently added MGT does not increase accuracy for fathead mainsails. For most mainsails measured thus far, the calculation with MGT results in a slightly smaller area. For fathead sails with deliberately small headboards and large battens just below, direction should be provided to measure the headboard as the extension of a horizontal line from the top of the luff to the intersection with the extension of the leach.

Ron is investigating the impact of increased area higher in the sail, given sails of the same area.

Proposal:

1. Adopt ISAF definitions of mainsail girths.
 - a. Revise mainsail standard area to 0.59(P)(E).
 - b. Revise SAFM table ranges downward by 0.001.
2. Add additional ranges to the SAFM table up to –30 seconds
3. Drop the use of MGT and associated formula
4. introduce adjustment to the calculated area of mainsails where the girths exceed IMS maximums

Motion: Adopt above proposal items 1, 2, 3 subject to confirmation at November Council meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Action: Ron Jewula to post proposal and supporting discussion to Yahoo discussion board.

Use of Mast-Mounted Poles and Bow Sprits

The CH presented the guidance for use of both mast-mounted poles and bow sprits previously posted to the Yahoo discussion board June 14, 2007. Since the decision in April to allow use of both symmetric and asymmetric spinnakers without adjustment, a few members have been asking to use symmetric

spinnakers on mast-mounted poles and sprit mounted asymmetric sails. Most yachts are not designed or intended to be sailed in this configuration (Rocket 22 is an exception). Use of both types will result in a significant increase in performance in the judgment of PHRF-NW. Therefore, the addition of either type of rig to the other is considered a significant change to the yacht and will be rated accordingly. For sprit boats wishing to use a pole-mounted spinnaker as well as the sprit a-sail, a new boat type will be created with a unique base rating to be proposed by the handicapper and approved by the CH (with T rating). The addition of a bow sprit to a yacht normally rigged with a mast mounted spinnaker pole will be managed by the commensurate increase in area associated with a sprit mounted a-sail.

Motion: The CH is directed to create the wording necessary to clearly state the requirement in Chapter II. Motion Carried.

Increased Hoist (H)

Chapter II, paragraph I.3 currently states

For boats where the "H" dimension is *greater than "ISP", use the greater of H or SLE in conjunction with the adjusted girth dimension to calculate the non-standard spinnaker area.

SLE was formerly LLS. The intent is to ensure that yachts do not raise H without commensurately increasing the luff/leach length of symmetric spinnakers. With the change to address both symmetric and asymmetric spinnakers by measuring luff and leach separately, the above is no longer as effective. SLE is clearly an error and should at least be SLU. But even replacing SLU with H will have only half the effect as previously. No solution was presented.

Motion: CH to propose solution. Motion Carried.

One-Design/Specified Configuration

The CH presented a proposed method of dealing with one-design boats as previously posted to the Yahoo discussion board June 23, 2007. The proposal would require measurement of sails from one-design fleets. This direction was not desirable to most of the handicappers present. The conversation focused on bylaw 9.4 which states:

Each sailboat shall be rated or handicapped individually irrespective of whether it is a member of a one design class. Sailboats are not required to comply with class rules when racing in events using PHRF-NW handicaps or ratings.

The consensus of the handicappers present is that one-design boats should not require measurement to receive a one-design rating from PHRF-NW. The handicappers in general want to return to the time when ODR ratings were supplied to one-design boats based on observation that the boat was in one-design configuration. It was the consensus of the handicappers present that this

does not violate bylaw 9.4. It was also suggested that bylaw 9.4 may be in direct conflict with bylaw 6.2.

Based on the above interpretation of bylaw 9.4, the CH will propose one-design specific language at a future council meeting.

Adjustments for Changes to Standard Boats that affect Performance

Guidance was requested regarding changes to standard boats that may or may not affect performance. In general, PHRF-NW assumes that a change to a yacht is made to improve its performance. Changes to consider include, but are not limited to, changes to appendages (hull, keel, rudder, propulsion, etc), rig, and weight. The handicapper needs to use his/her best judgment. If a change is obviously intended to improve performance, a rating adjustment is warranted. If the affect of the change is unclear or uncertain, the handicapper is encouraged to use the resources available: fellow regional handicappers, chief handicapper, handicappers council. If still uncertain, a rating adjustment toward a faster rating is warranted until the performance is understood by observation.

1.05 Appeals/Rating Adjustments

No ratings were presented for appeal.

The meeting adjourned at 16:30 hours.

Meeting minutes as recorded by Alan Grim.

AG/ag