

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

In Attendance

9B Andy Blackburn
H7 Bif Huss
UH Hank Nixon
DT David Coggins
X John Good

Election of Officers and Committee Appointments

RC Chair	UH
Secretary	9B
Rules Writer	X
Rules Change Summary	DT
Pilots' Opinion Poll writer	H7
Pilots' Opinion Poll publisher	UH
Pilot Ranking List	John Leibacher
Handicap Sub-Committee Chair	Barry Jaeger
Winscore Liason	UH
SSA Website Liason	9B, UH
Scoring Adviser	John Godfrey
WinScore Development	Guy Byars

Future Schedule

Date	Action	Assignee
11/21	Meeting Minutes to committee	9B
11/28	Minutes comment period ends	All
12/6	Publish minutes on SSA website, Publish Poll results	9B, UH
12/6	Completed draft of all rules and appendix changes to committee, cross reference links vetted.	X
12/7-20	Rules change review period	All
12/29	Publish Rules Change Summary on SSA website	DT
1/7	Proposed handicap changes published for comments	BJ, X
1/10	Pilot comment period closes	-
1/17	Final rules changes agreed	All
1/24	Draft rule change document published to committee for review	UH
1/24-2/1	National FAI and Sports rule vetting – incl. links, conflicts	9B
1/24-2/1	Regional FAI and Sports rule vetting – incl. links, conflicts	H7
2/1	Handicap comment period ends	-
2/1	Final rule documents vetted	All
2/21	Handicap committee complete with 2018 updates	BJ, X
2/7	Blue book cutoff date - documents transmitted to Hobbs	UH, X
3/1	Publish Rules on SSA website	UH, 9B
8/15	Poll topics to poll writer	All
9/20	Poll to Aland for publication	H7

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

9/1	Call for nominations to committee (to SSA Directors, to Pilots)	X
10/1	2019 Pilot Poll and Election announcement	UH
10/1	Poll Opens	UH
10/20	Poll Closes	UH
Nov	2019 RC Meeting and Agenda	UH

Administration

1. Contest Fees-Regionals- Remove all rules regarding fee amounts for regionals (but encourage a best practice of a fee structure where to the greatest extent possible you only pay for tows you use). Godfrey 10/8.

Some contests have tow pilots and staff brought in – especially in the west. Contest organizers get caught between needing to provide guarantees to tow pilots regardless of number of tows flown and variable tow fees paid by pilots. Fixed fee for all tows is upsetting to pilots in washout or short contests.

RC recognizes this tension and the need to allow for flexibility in fee structures. When contests get rained out no one should get left holding the bag.

5.2.1.1 Organizers may set fees as appropriate to meet their particular financial circumstances. Fee in excess of the published structure must be approved by SSA Contest Board – which approval will not be unreasonably denied.

2. RC Election Process- confirm this is approved and put on web site.

Process moved to ranked voting and multiple rounds of vote tallying which is in accordance with requirements of SSA by-laws. Prior RC election voting process was in violation of SSA bylaws. Approved by SSA Board

Discussion: Directors may now nominate multiple candidates within their region.

Action: UH will publish new process on SSA website.

3. Poll participation. 152 people responded, up from 136 last year. No election this year due to only one nomination. About half of the national pilots responded. Multiple announcements were made on RAS and an e- mail blast to all on the ranking list was done twice. Only a very few of the total of about 560 came back as bad addresses, or Spam filtering. Comments were numerous (over 1000) and thoughtful by those that participated. It is not clear how many on the list are not getting the messages. This needs to be studied and possible solution identified.
 - a. Need better dissemination – Don't know how many people don't receive poll reminders. Current method beyond email and r.a.s. Spam filters may be problem or otherwise getting lost in avalanche of emails
 - b. Email addresses come from online registrations. Most registrations are online

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

- c. Actions:
 - i. Test email robustness
 - ii. Add postcard reminder
 - iii. Include opt-out link to get maximum verification
 - iv. Email reminder prior to poll publishing asking for response
 - 1. Would like to participate in poll
 - 2. Don't want to participate in poll – and reason
 - 3. Suggestions for poll questions – other input
 - v. Postcard (and text messaging or phone call)
- 4. RC Election. David Coggins now is serving a 4 year term.
 - a. Congratulations to David
- 5. Make a strategic decision to integrate with Soaring Spot and the FAI ranking list by 2 years from now. Assign responsible individual to be trail boss. Godfrey 10/8
 - a. Two issues – Soaring Spot integration (is there an API that we can access?)
 - b. Costs money (~\$1200/yr - ~\$4 surcharge per US contest entry) to get onto list.
 - c. FAI ranking is a selector for admission to some non-US contests, though there are work-arounds.
 - d. There is some value associated with being on the list. Is it worth the additional cost per pilot?
 - e. X to look into issues and costs associated with ranking list
 - f. Suggest QT look into Soaring Spot integration.
- 6. Change US competition to use FAI rules - Various communications and poll.

Discussion: Data suggests significant interest in seriously considering a move to FAI rules. There is wide divergence between the most active quintile (top 20%) of pilots and the second most active quintile (second 20%) of pilots. An anonymized tabulation correlating responses with racing activity and performance was done. This yielded a segmented view of responses across pilot cohorts that could be sorted by various pilot participation and performance measures. Mostly the RC looked at results broken down by overall contest and Nationals participation rates. This breakdown of responses also allowed the RC to normalize poll results for the 4:1 variation in poll response rate across pilot cohorts so as to estimate the likely views across the entire US racing pilot community. It was noted that the top 3 contest participation quintiles of pilots had high enough response rates to have reasonable confidence that they represented the views of the cohort, while the bottom two quintiles had lower response rates that may not be fully representative of the cohort. Lastly, these bottom two cohorts represent only 13% of all US contest entries.

The strongest support for FAI rules is found among the top 20% most active pilots who fly 49% of all contests and 61% of all Nationals. Strong opposition to FAI rules was found among pilots who are the second most active contest flying cohort – but fly

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

Regionals about 4 times as frequently as Nationals. This second group represents 23% of all Nationals entries and 23% of all Regionals entries.

A summary of poll responses appears below (Note: “Favor FAI” includes respondents who answered ‘yes’ to favoring a fast switch to FAI rules OR a gradual switch to FAI rules (14 pilots answered ‘yes’ to both questions – this was interpreted as favoring a fast switchover):

Quintile Rank by # Contests Flown	Favor			Response Rate (% all PRL pilots)	% Favor FAI	% Fast Switch	Avg PRL	# Cont/ Yr/ Pilot	% Total Nats/ Yr	% Total Cont/ Yr
	Favor FAI	Switch to FAI	Total Resp							
1	40	24	59	64%	68%	41%	89	2.24	61%	49%
2	12	7	33	36%	36%	21%	84	1.05	23%	23%
3	17	6	30	33%	57%	20%	67	0.68	10%	15%
4	7	5	14	15%	50%	36%	76	0.33	5%	7%
5	10	2	13	16%	77%	15%	29	0.30	1%	6%
TOTAL RESP	86	44	149	33%	58%	30%	69	0.92	100%	100%

The RC discussed how much particular details and implications of FAI rules are broadly or deeply understood since there were broadly unfavorable responses in the poll about specific rule changes in the direction of the FAI approach. Questions were raised as to whether unpopular changes in specific rules could have implications for participation.

- a. Energy control at starts
- b. Team flying
- c. Tasking / landouts
- d. Finishes
- e. Penalties (e.g. FAI rules have less use of graduated penalties, greater use of contest disqualification for multiple offenses).
- f. Permissible for pilots to receive tactical support from ground crews
- g. Elimination of the MAT
- h. Scoring formulas and associated incentives. (Note that these may will be under consideration for changes to FAI rules in 2018).

In addition, questions in the poll about specific rules changes that are part of the FAI system generated lower support than the overall support for a move to FAI at the high level (e.g. support for distance credit inside AT turnpoint cylinders, start out the top, etc.). This led to discussion about how much US pilots may like the idea of FAI rules but dislike many of the specific details. This led to a further discussion about the potential to use local procedures to reduce the impact of some of the more significant changes that FAI rules require that have less support among US pilots. For instance, should a US shift to FAI rules mandate use of meters and kilometers and allow team flying at all contests, or should there be adjustments to accommodate the desires of a broader group of US contest pilots?

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

Some expressed the view that a change to FAI rules should be “all or nothing” as diluting the rules to accommodate US pilot preferences (to not allow team flying or ground crew assistance at contests, for instance) would negate the whole purpose of moving to FAI rules which is to prepare pilots to fly at the WGC. It was noted that many countries have elaborate local procedures and some countries don’t use FAI rules at all (e.g. Canada, UK and Australia) so the “all or nothing” view varies around the world. It was agreed that it will be critical to craft specific proposals (pure FAI, vs FAI rules that accommodate some US practices vs current US rules) in order to obtain clear guidance from the US racing pilot community on a rules transition. It was also agreed that all of this will take significant effort which will need to begin quickly.

Actions:

- Create a description of each major area of FAI rules that is different from US rules, without description of potential implications.
 - Articulate two versions of each area of FAI rules – one without any local procedures, one with local procedures to address some of the significant differences as much as practical within the FAI framework (e.g. may not include adding back MAT task, could include minimum finish height like was used at Uvalde).
 - Recruit knowledgeable proponent(s) of FAI rules and proponent(s) of US rules to opine on pros/cons of each approach.
 - Craft specific proposal(s) for polling of pilot group.
7. Make practice period constraints/included tows etc the same between regional and national (this is all about co-location of a regional and a national and not making the CM nuts) Godfrey 10/8
 - a. Action: Make practice day tows no longer included in contest fee – like regionals.
 8. Identify and eliminate as many differences between regional and national rules as possible. Use tables in the rules text for display where differences must exist (eg. SMTD, SMTT). Godfrey 10/8
 - a. Action: Review and ID differences. Determine appropriate action.
 9. Reduce to one rule text for regional and national- Godfrey 10/8
 - a. Action: Assess practicality of implementation depending on outcome from #8.
 10. Use of excess sanction fee funds. KS 7/23. “For the agenda, or whatever venue is useful, I'd like to see a publicized accounting of the amount of the SSA contest sanction fees collected and returned to the contest board each year, and where it was spent (if it was).

Discussion - Accounting as follows:

1. \$20 of the \$60 per entrant National sanction fee goes to the US Team
2. \$10 of the \$45 per entrant Regional sanction fee goes to the US Team

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

3. The remainder of the Sanction Fee goes to SSA operations (but see #8 below).
4. Note: The US Team pays 30% of the approximately \$11K/year NAA Annual Fee
5. The “Excess Sanction Fees” (sanction fees collected in excess of estimated SSA costs up until 2014) have been held by the SSA Foundation in a distinct fund: (http://www.ssa.org/files/member/SSAF_Funds_Tracker_2017-06-30.pdf).
6. At June 30 the Rules Committee Foundation Fund balance was \$65,391.09
7. Each year, this income from this fund is used to subsidize the Jr. Contest Rebates (90% of entry fees and contest tows). This has been 4.5% of the principal
8. The remaining expense of Junior Contest Rebates comes from SSA operations (even if not completely covered by sanction fees)
9. By agreement reached in 2015, no additions are made by the SSA to the Foundations fund from 2015 forward, in exchange for the SSA funding the Junior Contest Rebates beyond the 4.5% contribution
10. In 2017, Junior Contest Rebates totaled:

Year	No.	Amount
2013	5	2,303
2014	5	3,286
2015	6	4,118
2016	12	4,240
2017	9+23*	4,181+3,680*

* Harris Hill Jr. Camp (pending final reconciliation)

Participation

11. Contest participation – UH study -Total entries in 2017 were 423 compared to 455 for 2016. Regionals down slightly. Nationals down slightly at 136 compared to 145 in 2016. Two regional contests were replaced by nationals. 3 contests were rained out. Full report appended.
12. Barriers to participation – Poll comments.
13. Growing participation – Blackburn 10/8. Andy is to take the lead on this topic. All should bring thoughts and ideas.

Discussion: Losing ~12 pilots per year and ~15 contest entries per year. There is significant aging of the contest pilot population. Neither is a good trend. Part of RC charter is to advocate policies that positively influence participation and encourage development of new racing pilots.

Actions:

- a. Advice for organizers to get new pilots: Split weekend format, mentoring, 2-seater classes, task for lots of airports to ease retrieves.
- b. Social events most nights

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

- c. GTA-type local events
- d. Hybrid Regional/OLC events
- e. Rookie school
- f. Mentor team flying – especially at practice days.
- g. Target audiences:
 - Youth (low yield but high potential)
 - Mid-40s pilots with time, money and some independence, especially lapsed glider/racing pilots
 - OLC pilots
 - HG/PG pilots looking for less physically demanding ways to fly

Entries

14. Formalize the process for handling entries in oversubscribed multi class nationals. This has been handled by a process set up under a previous waiver that is not well understood or available to all. UH, Giltner e-mail 8/31

Action: X and UH to handle

Nationals Options

15. Consider whether the co- location of 3 classes, Open, 15M, Std, as has been done for the last 3 years, may have the effect of limiting participation due to class allocation. UH recommendation is to pair Std. with another class.

Action: Formalize our recommendation to the site selection committee.

- a. Avoid three-class nationals can create constraints on entries and limit participation
- b. Proposal – Group classes such that limits aren't reached.
- c. Pairings: 20M/Std, 15/Open, 18/Club, Sports

Sailplanes/ Equipment

16. FLARM- poll data and comments. Review current estimates of adoption. 88% of Poll responders flew with FLARM in 2017. No change from 2016.

Discussion: Poll comments strongly support FLARM use.

Consider if, or when FLARM may be mandated. Some comments support mandate in nationals, but not regionals due to concern about barriers to participation. Define criteria for consideration of mandate.

Action: No change for 2018. **Fair warning: The RC has a favorable inclination to mandate Flarm at Nationals in the next two years.**

17. Tracking- Are any actions required coming out of the Poll, section 3.2?

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

Discussion: Poll respondents supported allowing without restriction (65%). Numerous comments support use of time delay to minimize tactical issues.

Action: No change. Reminder that receiving assistance from the ground is prohibited including forwarding of internet-based tracing information

18. Cockpit data reception- weather information. 14% report using cell phone based weather.

Action: No action: Track usage.

19. Tracking information into cockpit. How do we handle this?
FLARM “radar”
Ground sources

Discussion: May be difficult to monitor or contain over time. Not a significant issue today due to technical limitations.

Action: Retain prohibition on receiving ground-based tracking information

Motor Gliders

20. Relaxed restrictions on MG relights - Any change in our position from last year?

Discussion: RC reviewed rules changes made in 2017. British allow one motor test – a second use ends the flight regardless. FAI apparently does not allow any MG relights. Reviewed changes in 2017 review. Nothing has changed since.

Action: No change.

21. Relaxed restrictions on MG airfield bonus eligibility- Any change in our position from last year?

Discussion: Allowing airport bonus to a glider that doesn't land at the airport is a courtesy. The current rule is designed for a reasonable worst-case scenario for a sustainer needing to make a windmill start. The RC will not enter into the complexity of making special rules for particular motorized glider configurations that can start lower (e.g. jets or FES).

Action: No change.

22. FES implications- Any change in our position from last year?

Discussion: FES presents unique capabilities and may result in more aggressive pilot behavior by virtue of its quick deployment and reliability. This is a difficult issue to legislate. RC will monitor use of FES.

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

Action: No change.

23. Motor glider engine operation prior to the start (Murray e-mail).

Murray suggested allowing a longer test run while requiring return to engine start altitude after test. Any change in our position from last year?

Discussion: Reasonable request so long as it doesn't create opportunity to avoid a relight by waiting out temporary weather issue or moving to a more distant favorable area of lift without risk of outlanding. Request of 4-minute engine test is too long in this regard.

Action: Additional rule in MG section. Motorgliders are allowed to test run engine at any altitude above 1000' above airport elevation and within 3 miles of the airport. Test must be less than 2 minutes and the pilot must return to the approximate location of the beginning of the test and no higher than the altitude that the test commenced promptly following completion of the test.

Starts

24. Starts out the top

Discussion: Poll supports retaining start out the top (64% or 2:1 in favor). Somewhat problematic for scoring – recent WinScore revisions have made improvements.

Action: No change. Contemplate elimination as part of FAI proposal.

25. Eliminate start out the top front half of cylinder rule

Discussion: Poll supports (50% to 39%) removing the restriction that only allows starts out the front half of the cylinder.

Action: Unnecessary complexity. Remove restriction.

26. Line start - Poll. 32% favored replacing the cylinder start with a line start while 61% did not favor.

27. Godfrey 10/8 - Convert to line start that works as follows:

- a. Establish a MSH
- b. After everyone is launched and had a chance to climb “ring the bell”
- c. Everyone must now get below MSH for 2 min before starting but can start from any altitude.
- d. I “think” this solves the problem of the guy who finds weak wave early and does not incentivize high speed dives. But needs thorough discussion.

Discussion: Line starts not favored majority of pilots. Line starts creates new ways for a pilot to have NVS. (N.B. This method could also apply to cylinder starts). The major

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

objection is that this would permit circling at or slightly above cloudbase prior to start, as happens at WGC on occasion.

Blackburn proposed an energy management rule to be added to this proposal and apply to all starts (line or cylinder). The rule would apply a penalty of 4 points per minute spent (in excess of 5 minutes) within 400' of the maximum height achieved during the last 10 minutes prior to starting. This creates a counter-balance to the competitive desire to loiter near the top of a thermal (or cloudbase) prior to starting. It still allows a best L/D glide across the diameter of a 10 mile start cylinder – or to reach a start line. The penalty could be waived by the CD if the pilot presented evidence that (s)he wasn't loitering (e.g. 3 or fewer turns at top of lift prior to starting glide to start line). Other RC members felt the rule was too complex compared to current 2-minute rule and a maximum start height.

Action: No change. May need to be part of proposal to move to FAI rules.

28. Sequenced start times - This option is being considered by the IGC where a pilot is scored from the beginning of the start time window he or she selects. This is intended to try to reduce gagging.

Discussion: Poll response showed 20% favoring trying at the regional level and 77% not favoring trying.

Action: No action.

29. "Roll and go" Start – Cochrane e-mail 10/8. Starts are still complex, witness the feedback leading to your poll. Why is our start still passing a specific point in space? How about just roll out and go? The start fix is the fix anywhere inside the start cylinder that yields the best score – period. Just like turn areas. We already have pilots starting out the top and flying through the cylinder, and it's not causing a problem. So roll out and go shouldn't cause a problem either. It's also easier to know if you really started, a bit of a problem with going out the top.

Discussion: Very creative. However, it creates ambiguity with pilots as to time on course and distance flown. Glide computers will likely never calculate this.

Action: No action.

Tasking/Flying

30. Turns- Revise standard turn radius. Godfrey e-mail 10/8.

Discussion: Poll. 51% favored retaining 1 mile radius on AT and MAT tasks. 45% favored reducing the radius.

Action: Make part of FAI proposal for 2018.

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

Finish

31. Finish - New rule for 2012 providing for distance points only when more than 200 feet below the bottom of the finish cylinder has had negative feedback. Review 2017 poll results and consider actions to refine this rule. 9B to take the lead on this topic.

Possible actions:

- a) Leave as is.
- b) Eliminate 200 foot cushion for simplification- Poll item 5.1, topic number 1.
- c) Revise penalty for low finish to a more gradual progressive penalty.

Discussion: Poll results strongly favor graduated penalty to no speed points at minimum safe altitude to reach airport. Discussion of various penalty formats including increasing pts/ft using quadratic or other power relationships. Some inconsistency in responses across various poll questions on particulars OF how to structure the penalty.

Action: Rule change to two-tier structure: 0.25 pts/ft up to 200 ft below MFH, 1.75 pts per foot for next 200ft. No speed points below 400' below MFH . No finish heights permitted lower 800' AGL at 1 mile cylinder, 1000' at 2 mile cylinder.

32. For MATs, require steering turn if a line is in use. Godfrey

Discussion: Turn cylinder moves congestion point out but does not eliminate it. Can lose the safety benefit of the finish call at congestion point. Does allow CD to steer pilots to prevent low flying over congested or otherwise other dangerous areas. Rules now permit CD to do this.

Action: No action.

33. Revisit finish height and required energy when using line finish. Sorenson 9/1 and Godfrey 10/8

Discussion: Finish line at Uvalde produced multiple of questionable patterns and pilots who described being quite concerned about their own or others' safety. Time penalty for rolling finishes can have the effect of encouraging low energy finishes to avoid the penalty. This effect was reported as happening in Uvalde.

Action: No action.

34. Create near miss minor penalty for electronic finish line edges. Godfrey 10/8

Discussion: Minor penalty already exists – for a miss finish time is extended to time at end of landing rollout.

Action: No change.

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

35. 10.9.1.2.1. Provide for CD to specify a finish call distance greater than 4 miles.

Discussion: Comments at Cordele favored and 5 mile was used there by waiver.

Action: Finish is four miles unless set otherwise by CD.

Scoring

36. Simplification topic- airspace- Airspace penalties would become effective with one fix in the airspace or buffer. (Currently, coming within a horizontal or vertical buffer generates a small graduated penalty.) The buffers are effectively a warning zone having a graduated penalty for entering them. For simplicity they can be removed. It is up to the pilot to establish his warning criteria in the flight computer. Kill minor airspace penalty- Godfrey 10/8.

Discussion: This is predominantly a western rule. In a strong area of lift pilots can face a tradeoff between significant airspace incursion and exceeding redline. A total score of minus 100pts for the day as the only (major) penalty only will require pilots to maintain a personal altitude buffer and will potentially increase the number of contest-ending penalties.

Action: Retain current rule.

37. Contest penalties

No additional discussion.

Class Issues

38. 20M, 2-seat class –Establish class rules for implementation in 2018.

20 meter class to incorporate limited handicapping, likely in the range of about 5% to encourage participation.

Consider and address questions about 20 meter class from Mifflin Soaring Association.

Action:

Define two type of entrants:

- Individual
- Multiplace team

If one pilot of a multiplace team elects not to continue for any reason, the entry reverts to Individual for the remaining pilot.

An Individual entry may carry passengers without restriction to the specific individuals.

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

39. Need to develop a handicap list in which aerodynamically equivalent gliders of differing empty weights have the same handicap and reference weight. RC needs to advise Handicap committee. UH and poll.

Discussion: Weight adjustment formula in handicap rules results in less favorable handicap than motorglider handicaps for the motorized version of identical aircraft models.

Action: Communicate intention to move to weight adjustment formula that is consistent across motorized and non-motorized versions of the same glider type. This may require adjusting the motorglider handicaps or the weight adjustment formula or both.

40. Invert handicap list so more rational discussion can be easily had on us vs euro handicaps – Godfrey

Discussion: Handicapping needs to be inverting and renormalized by a reference glider to be comparable. X is working on a comparison table. Not viewed as critical to invert US handicaps given the confusion it might create and changes to scoring infrastructure.

Action: No action

41. Handicaps-Revisit rule 11.4.1.5.1 equation that adjusts handicap based on wing span change. The divisor has been found by the former handicap subcommittee to be too low, based upon comparison of similar sailplanes with different wing spans. UH

Discussion: The divisor in the span adjustment formula is too small leading to an adjustment for span that is far too large. This was determined by studying several gliders with similar geometry, but differing spans, and assuming that the existing handicaps are "correct" for each. Examples are V2CX 15 and 18, and ASW-27 and ASG-29. Deriving the divisor from these guides to a new divisor of 5 vs. 2 in the equation now. Study done by UH and Mike Westbrook during 2016/17 handicap review.

Action: Revise equation.

42. Consider a "Self launch and Motor glider Class" for regional contests. Cochrane e-mail of 10/8.

Discussion: Idea is interesting and may help participation for MG-oriented casual pilots.

Action: Encourage local experimentation.

US Team Considerations

43. Not discussed

2017 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Reedsville PA - November 11, 2017

Other items not included in agenda

44. Safety finish.

Discussion: Western thunderstorms can be huge so there is no radius that will cover every potential situation. Too large a radius raises significant fairness issues between finishers who are versus are not subject to the safety finish.

Action: Add 15mi safety finish option (5, 10, 15 mile options)

45. Team flying.

Discussion: Potential to create significant dissatisfaction among pilots unable to find suitable compatible and competitive teammate.

Action: No change. Make part of FAI rules proposal where team flying is permitted.

46. Contest Pilot Package.

Action: Encourage contest organizations to provide electronic copies, but not mandated.

47. Nationals duration.

Discussion: Old version Tuesday-Thursday with 3 days on either end for driving works for nationally contests attended by pilots that must cross the country. This works less well for organizers as it requires 2 weeks off for volunteers so we have provided the organizers with flexibility to find the best balance of conflicting needs for their contest.

48. Incentive or CDs, CM, and Scorers.

Action: Extend preferential entry and refunded sanction fee previously offered to CDs to include CMs and Scorers (Rule 3.1.3.4).

Errata

49. None noted at draft time.

Safety Topics

50. Safety report generated by UH and X.

Adjourn