2008 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes
Waller Texas
November 15, 2008

In Attendance

QT   John Godfrey
927   Garret Willat
UH   Hank Nixon
BB   John Cochrane
KM   Ken Sorenson
X   John Good (volunteer)

Election of Officers and Committee Appointments

RC Chair	UH
Secretary	927
Rules Writer	X
Rules Change Summary	QT
Pilots' Opinion Poll writer	BB
Pilots' Opinion Poll publisher	Aland Adams
Pilot Ranking List	John Leibacher

Future Schedule

Date	Action	Assignee
11/24	2008 Meeting Minutes to committee	KM/927
12/1	2009 Draft rule changes to committee	X
12/8	Rules Change Summary to committee	QT
12/15	Committee responses back to Chair	ALL
12/16	Publish minutes on SSA/SRA websites	UH
12/22	Publish Rules Change Summary on SSA/SRA websites	UH
12/22	Proposed Changes to Guy Byars	X
1/07	Blue book cutoff date - documents transmitted to Hobbs	KM
1/25	Approved changes to Aland & GFB	KM
2/16	2009 Rules from Aland	AA
2/16	Publish draft rules	KM
2/23	Review of draft rules for completeness and accuracy	QT
3/1	Final rules published	KM
May, July	2009 RC Election announcement	UH
June	Poll Topics request to pilots	UH
Aug.,Sept.	2009 Pilot Poll announcement	UH
9/7	2009 Pilot Poll questions to writer	ALL
9/17	Draft poll to committee	BB
9/21	Poll to Aland for publication	KM
10.5-10.17	Poll closed	

11/15	2009 RC Meeting	

meeting began 8:00 a.m

Notes:
Unless otherwise noted, all decisions are by consensus.
There are a number of agenda items with the source identified as Seaborn/organizers, referring to John Seaborn (A8). These are not necessarily John Seaborn's personal suggestions/requests. In many cases, he is relaying input he received from past contest organizers.

Administration

1. Sanction Fee Review. Seaborn 7/9 email, CDBN 7/9
Sanction fee surplus- KM report

KM reported the recent SSA Board decision to assign spending authority for a portion of the contest sanction fee revenue to the control of the Contest Committee (the chairs of the Rules Committee, US Team Committee, Site Selection Committee, Handicapping Committee, and the Contest Committee Chairman).The SSA Board passed the following motion:

"Beginning in 2008, any excess funds collected from the Basic Sanction Fee revenue portion of the Contest Sanction Fees will be determined and made available for discretionary spending on contest-related equipment or activities as directed by the Contest Committee. "Excess funds" will be computed as the annual Basic Sanction Fee revenue minus the annual SSA "hard" costs related to contests and minus $3500 for SSA staff time. "

The Rules Committee will have input into how the funds are spent. High on the list will be the purchase of one or more sets of scales for contest glider weighing. An industrial style box for shipping, would make it very economical.

The current sanction fee charges seem about right. We will monitor the size and use of the surplus sanction fee funds and recommend a reduction in the sanction fees later if appropriate.

No change in sanction fees.

2. Entry Fees/tow costs

Current allowable tow charge is 48$. Some sites need more and this has been done by waiver. Expect increase in fuel costs to slow down. For future waiver requests for increased tow charges, KM to ask whether the increased cost should be an increased fixed cost rather than a tow charge increase. Ferry costs would be better treated as fixed costs, since number of tows may very depending on weather. We continue to try to balance the costs to entrants with the ability of an organizer to make some profit on a contest, and to certainly not lose money. In 2008, most contests made a modest profit.

No change in entry fees & tow costs.

3. Towing/insurance- review KM 2/4

Towplane insurance: Following an SSA Board directive, 1m$ liability insurance for commercial towing was required in 2008. Imposition of this did not seem to cause any major problems in 2008. We did loose access to some towplanes. Our understanding is that it is possible for club towplanes to tow at contests if all contest entrants become temporary club members. This has been done before. Costello has specifically said that this is OK (per X).

No rules change.

4. Remove TP list from contest kit- KS 7/20

KS request to remove. A8 request to keep.

Few pilots look at the paper TP list. Easy to print an electronic list from Leibacher. Rules 5.7.1.5 lists what is required to be provided: control points, closed airspace, landout bonus airports. Rule 10.4.6 requires providing the turnpoint list in paper form. We don't really need to print this out in paper form since few, if any, pilots use the paper – everyone is downloading the information electronically. But we need to have an unambiguous identification of what the official data is.

Change: Remove the requirement for paper publication control points, airspace, and bonus airport. Instead, 1) electronic data must be available locally for download and 2) 10.4.6.2 will be reworded to follow the new thought of: current revisions must be identified in the pilots kit. Identify but not provide. 3) 10.4.6.1 remove 'in both printed and'. Harmonize this change with the appendix. X to do.

5. Magazine Article optional- Review   KS 7/20

KS drop article. A8 keep article.

Rules (13.0 Reporting Requirements) no longer require a contest report/article for either Nationals or Regionals. The contest sanction application forms for both Nationals and Regionals do not require submission of a contest story, but recommend it.

We would like to encourage writing of articles, but not require it. One way to do this is to include in the contest organizer's kits/info some guidelines for how to write a contest article for the magazine. X has written some guidelines for how to write article and will resurrect this and send this to A8 for inclusion in the on-line contest resources. X to do.

Change: Remove from sanction application form.

6. Medallions – relevancy/cost /quality of medals/ administration- various/ Seaborn 8/27

Medallions are useful prizes and are worth continuing.

John and Linda Murray have offered to take over from the SSA office all aspects of the medallions starting with the 2009 contest season. This should solve the quality, cost, and administration problems. Current SSA cost is $15 per medallion. Garret has source for roughly $11. We suspect that too many medallions have been sent out (to lower placings than specified by the rules). The plan is that any stockpile of medallions as the SSA office will be sent to Murrays in early 2009. They will take over the administration, purchase of additional medallions as needed, engraving, and shipping. Their costs will be reimbursed by the SSA and charged against sanction fee revenue as "hard costs".

KM to connect Murrays with Garret. Garret will talk to Linda about interfacing this with the on-line system. Might it be possible to somehow make this process easier by use of A8's new online contest system?

Discussed John Murray's suggestion of allowing lower place finishers (2nd and 3rd) who didn't qualify for medallions per the rules to buy medallions. Concern is that this would "cheapen" the meaning of the medallions for those who had actually earned them per the rules.

No rules change.

7. Contest scheduling conflicts- Glick 3/24, L Murray 3/24

Complaints received about schedule conflicts between contests that prevent pilot from attending two contests when they might otherwise attend both.

Linda Murray is now working with the Nationals sites to resolve this as best as possible. Due to the few number of active nationals sites, we continue to be largely at the mercy of the Nationals contest organizers regarding scheduling. The new on-line system will help Regionals to self schedule and avoid conflicts by allowing them to see early on what the schedule is for other contests in their area. Scheduling conflicts with Regionals doesn't seem to have been much of a problem. The various contests work it out among themselves.

No change.

8. SSA Membership to run contests? KM, Linda M, 3/26, Tylers 4/12 , Cornay ?

The suggestion was made that we require that contest managers and contest directors be SSA members.

We're not aware of this ever having been an operational problem at a contest. It's not uncommon for contest managers to not be SSA members, sometimes this person is the contest-experiences wife of a contest pilot, whose help running a contest is gratefully accepted. We couldn't think of any instances where the CD was not an SSA member. Contest insurance does not require the contest officials to be SSA members.

No change.

9. Mixed Regional/ Nats Entry priority process document

KM developed procedure/document *Combined Nationals-Regionals Entry Acceptance Criteria* dated 04/09/08 and this has been approved and adopted by the Rules Committee as a correct interpretation of the intent of the entry priority requirements of the rules. We discussed how to incorporate this document in the official paperwork. It doesn't really fit in the Rules. Decision was to include this in the Contest organizers "kit" as an additional document.

KM to work with A8 to put the document *Combined Nationals-Regionals Entry Acceptance Criteria* on the website.

No rules change.

10. Allow larger maximum number of entries BB

This issue was actually raised by KM and discussed some with BB at Uvalde. The issue came up as a result of intense lobbying from Andy McQuigg at the 2008 Cordele combined Std Nats and Region 5S contest. He desperately wanted the limit raised to allow more pilots into the contest. It has come up recently at other contests (Perry). Do we want to reconsider the 65 limit? This limit was established long ago, prior to GPS, cylinder starts, multiple start cylinders, and multiple classes at a single venue. The historical 65 limit is based on other considerations besides just the starts, such as congestion pre-start near the airport in poor weather (a major consideration), single task, logistics on the ground, overload of contest volunteers, towplane considerations (getting enough, launch operations), and fun factor for the contestants (it seems like the pilots generally prefer contest with 50 or so contestants, assuming of course that they are one of the 50 who get into the contest). There are actually very few contests that are affected by this. On balance the 65 limit has worked well historically and there is no need for a change.

No change.

11. Crash procedures   BB

This agenda item was submitted by BB and subsequently withdrawn.

12. Entry dating- consider in light of electronic entry- Also what is required to have a complete entry – Seaborn/organizers 8/27

At what point are you entered in a contest? What is the applicable date (application sent, received, deposit received)?

Rule 5.5.2 covers this. This lists the items required to be submitted and says that the "date of application" is the date on which those submissions are complete either electronically or by mail (this includes the entry fee deposit; using the postmark date if payed by check).

QT to work with A8 to make the on-line registration process only require those items in the rules. Specifically, remove the proof of ownership requirement, the intent is that only a declaration of ownership is required (that's what we actually do now). Requirements need to match the rules.

Distinguish between entry and registration.

Change 5.5.2.1.1 to require "current" SSA number, rather than one "valid through the last scheduled day of the competition". Reason is that membership might renew between date of registration and date of contest. This would also require that at time of registration pilot must present current SSA membership. X to do.

Change 5.5.3.1.3 from proof of ownership to declaration of ownership. X to do.

13. Eliminate team donations on entry form   Seaborn/ org 8/27

We don't think this is ever used. Suggestion is to remove it.

Change: Remove team donation box from entry form pending approval from US Team Committee. KM to discuss with US Team committee.

14. Scale administration Seaborn/ org 8/27

Not really a Rules issue. Complaints from organizers regarding high costs associated with having scales delivered and manned by Charlie Minner. Additional scales will probably be purchased with the surplus sanction fee funds and located regionally. Probably 2 sets of scales. We need additional volunteers to manage the scales. Need good shipping cases. (KM note -- Linda Murray has offered to help with management of one set of scales on the east coast and thought that Rex Mayes might do the same on the west coast). Garret also volunteered as needed.

No rules change.

15. Increase deposit Seaborn/ org 8/27

The problem is that some pilots take up positions and then drop out, possibly with little real commitment to attend the contest. If we raise the deposit amount and extend the period within which it becomes non-refundable, this should help to discourage casual entries.

Change: Raise the deposit to $150 in 5.4.2.3.

Change: Deadline for deposit refund increased from 2 weeks to 30 days in 5.4.4..

This will be effective for 2009, but we will grandfather all deposits received prior to publication of the 2009 Rules. X to do

16. Make preferential entry date flexible Seaborn/ org 8/27

People plan on the existing 60 day preferential entry deadline, which has been in place for a long time. Making it flexible will add unnecessary complication and cause confusion.

No change.

17. Application fee administration Seaborn/ org 8/27

The comment received was:
Application Fees - I think that the $150 sent in to apply for a contest application, should be applied to SSA administrative rules, web site administration, and contest administration staffing. I don't think it should be subtracted from the sanction fees. I think it should be a separate charge, but I also believe that it should be stated UP FRONT, exactly WHAT the money is going towards. A $150 fee for "contest administration" or "application fee"

The $150 sanction application fee is simply a deposit against the total contest sanction fee, which isn't known until after the contest is actually underway. The questioner does not seem to understand that this is simply a deposit.

No change.

18. Revisit roles of contest manager and CD   Seaborn/ org 8/27

The comment received was:
"Also, it states in the rules that the Contest Manager supervises the day to day of the Contest Director. I have YET to meet a CD that will agree to that. Most CD's believe that they are running the contest and the Contest Manager is an administrative assistant. Perhaps there need to be more definition of the roles."

The roles of the CM (3.1.1) and CD (3.1.2 and 3.1.3) are well defined in the rules. The relationship between the CM and CD varies from contest to contest. We're not aware of a general problem with the current system.

No change.

19. Post contest reporting – review – streamline   Seaborn/ org 8/27

The comment received was:
Post contest reporting. Revisit, stream line and harmonize what the SSA needs to see from contest organizers with regard to reporting after the contest under 13.2. Here are some suggestions
 - The 14 day cut off is referred to twice in 13.2.2 and in 13.3 as well.
 - Should it be the CD or the Contest Manager who does the end of contest reporting to the SSA? Right now its the CD within the 14 day window (13.2.2). The admin reporting could/should be done by the CM.
 - 13.3.1 Financial reporting is a good idea but can it be done via an email attachment? How about allowing a financial report posting to the contest web site?
 - 13.3.2 After the contest do organizers REALLY need to send the SSA paper copies of each entry when they already have electronic copies? How about having the organizers keep the original entry forms plus all paperwork for a minimum of six months and skip sending in the paper copies of the entries to the SSA closet. From the organizer, *"If applications are going to be electronic, there is no need to send hard copies to the SSA (redundant and wasteful)."*
 - Lets expand the official summary report format to include who gets medals making this easy for the SSA staff to fill the order so to speak, plus a financial worksheet summary of fees, funds and such

What used to be the Competition report is now the Contest Summary Report and is now filled out by the CM. X will update the rules to reflect this.

Organizers are not completing the post-contest paperwork. This has been an ongoing problem for many years. SSA staff changes have caused additional problems in 2008. The procedures that were put in place a year ago were supposed to have initial follow up from SSA staff with organizers to collect paperwork and sanction fees and then by Linda Murray if the organizers didn't respond to the SSA staff. KM to follow up with the SSA staff and contest organizers for 2008.

QT to contact A8 about handling the reporting requirements on-line. This is a good idea. We want to move everything possible on-line and make this as easy for the organizers as possible.

No rules change. Possible procedural changes after QT talks to A8.

20. Rethink contest organization   Seaborn/ org 8/27

There have been suggestions that most or all of the contest management functions be transferred from the SSA to the SRA. There would be many complications associated with this: US Team considerations, tax exempt donations status, existing endowment funds, insurance, support functions presently performed by

the SSA staff, etc. And this would probably not be good for the SSA since contest pilots are often strong contributors to the overall SSA volunteer organization. One of the factors in these suggestions was discontent regarding the SSA's collection of use of contest sanction fees. We think that recent changes in how the sanction fee funds are handled (agenda item 1 above) have addressed these concerns. The current contest organization and support structure has been substantially improved by recent on-line system changes undertaken by John Seaborn and Doug Easton. Provided we don't have unexpected inappropriate interference by the non-contest SSA management in contest matters, the current arrangement should continue to work well.

No change.

21. Online sanction functionality - review   Seaborn/ org 8/27

Lots of activity going on here, spearheaded by John Seaborn. The new online system is moving in the right direction.

22. Support of new contest providers   Seaborn/ org 8/27

Comment received:
If someone wants to host a soaring contest and does not have a club affiliation then they need some guidance on how to set up a checking account, handle the finances and the TAX consequences of this. My suggestion is step 1. Ask the SSA to look into this from an accounting/tax viewpoint and 2. Establish some guidelines on the subject, then 3. Make it KNOWN AND EASY for contest managers to get this accomplished possibly even through existing SSA banking relationships.

We're not aware of the banking issue being a problem. Not sure this really falls to the Rules Committee. Perhaps A8 can help and follow up on this.

Continue to build a collection of support documents. A8 is well along on this already. QT will continue to work with A8.

23. Super Regional- Review- on target or off the mark?

There have been no Super Regional contest held yet. The first will be this year at Parowan. Too early to consider changes as there is no feedback from a contest.

No change.

24. Organizers insurance requirement- KM 9/27

Pat Costello was at the recent SSA Board meeting and had a discussion with KM regarding contest insurance. There has always been some concern about the liability exposure of CDs, CMs and other contest personnel, including the Rules Committee members.While it's unlikely someone could win a lawsuit on something like this, the sued person would still have to mount a defense, which can be costly, and liability insurance would cover the cost of the defense.

Costello offers two types of contest insurance: #1 Air Meet Premises Liability Insurance (about $375/event) and #2 Air Meet Non-Ownership Insurance (about $125/event). Pat Costello said most organizers get both. #1 covers on-ground mishaps (slip & fall, Tonopah glider-pedestrian collision). #2 would cover a crash in the air or on landing out on course. A CD, or even the Rules Committee members, could be sued for an allegedly unsafe task call or unsafe rule and without #2 we're not fully covered.

Currently the Rules don't say anything at all about the organizer's insurance, just gliders and towplanes. The sanction application includes an insurance requirement, but isn't specific about what. Traditionally #1 has been required. There was no requirement for #2. In the interest of providing appropriate protection for contest organizers, #2 should be required also.

Change. Requirements will be changed to require organizer to purchase both types of insurance: Air Meet Premises Liability Insurance and Air Meet Non-Ownership Insurance. This will be changed on the sanction application and in the rules. X to write language for the Rules and the Sanction application reflecting this requirement.

Entries

25. USAFA participation/ entry priority - KM 1/30,2/11, 2/17, KS 7/4

Problem developed at Parowan where USAFA pilots took entry slots and then didn't participate seriously in the contest. Since the contest was oversubscribed, this bumped out some entrants who would probably have made better use of the contest resources. While the SSA is very supportive of USAFA participation in SSA contests, the expectation is that they attend the contest as serious competitors and are not simply using an oversubscribed contest as a leadership training exercise. If they are not serious about the contest, they should consider flying as guests and should fly in contests which are not likely to be oversubscribed.

KM to contact USAFA and emphasize the need to comply with the rules and the spirit of the contest.

26. Entry priority/ranking- review process and documentation   Seaborn/ org 8/27

We've had a number of comments from organizers that the process for accepting entrants is difficult to understand.

X to produce a document that steps through the entrant ranking/selection process. X to talk to A8 about how to do this within the new on-line system. It might be possible for the on-line system to do this automatically.

27. Inverse seeding- related to 27   Seaborn/ org 8/27

Organizer complained that inverse seeding is allowing pilots with no experience into contests over those with some limited experience.

The philosophy of inverse seeding is to draw new pilots to Regionals to get them started in competition soaring. Typically only 5 slots are reserved for inverse seeding. We continue to believe that this philosophy is correct and think that the inverse seeding procedure is working as intended. First-time pilots are given priority in order to grow the sport.

28. Kramer rule- entry priority to previous medallion winners. KM 2/25. Tylers ? date.

Last year we introduced a rule for Regionals that was intended to essentially allow winners to defend their titles. The implementation went a bit awry and had the unintended effect of reserving too many entry positions for previous "winners" (which expanded to be "medallion winners"). It was suggested that we drop this entirely or at least modify it to substantially reduce the number of set-asides. Note that many of these previous "winner" entrants will often get into the contest anyway because they are either in-region or have very high PRL rankings.

Change: 5.3.4.1 will be modified to give priority to just the previous year's 1st place finishers, in that region. X to do.

Motorized Sailplanes

29. Motorized Sailplanes 2007 Item 21. Ensure intent met

From 2007:
Motorized Sailplanes In Nationals
Suggestion is to allow motorized sailplanes to compete in our 15M and Standard Nationals, which are the only classes (along with the World Class) in which we do not permit the use of motorized sailplanes. Motors are allowed in FAI Championships, and some say we are behind the rest of the competition world on this change.
We do not see the rationale for allowing in 18meter/Open class but not allowing in 15meter/Standard. Motor gliders are becoming more popular, more pilots are going to contests without crews and this helps the organizers with the possibility of less workload upon land-out days. Some feel that the advantage of going into unknown terrain is there, however wing-loading plays a role on those weak days. 4 to 1 vote (UH noted as against)…in favor, we feel this is a major change, so it will take the normal 1 year delay before implementation.

This change was implemented in Regionals for 2008 and scheduled to go into effect for Nationals in 2009. The issue was polled in 2008 and supported to extend to Nationals for 2009: 95 yes to 62 no. UH continues to oppose – allows unfair advantage to the motorgliders. We all agreed that the motorglider issues are not class specific.

Vote to extend the motorglider rules to Standard and 15M classes in Nationals for 2009 was 3 in favor (KM, 927, BB), 2 against (UH, QT).

Revisit the issue of a possible penalty for motor use by polling next year.

Change: Allow motorized gliders in Standard and 15M Nationals beginning in 2009. X to do.

30. Allow motorgliders to restart in mid air with restrictions (10.6.3.7) BB

Proposed to allow motorglider to restart in mid-air rather than relight at the contest site. One consideration was including the following: or 20 minutes after the last launch or last relight on the ground at the time of engine restart. However it will add more complexity for Guy.

Change: This will be allowed, with the following restrictions: within 1 mile of field, restart and climbout area and procedures same as normal launch procedures, earliest time to start the task is 20 min after initiating engine restart. This does count as one of your three launches (10.6.2.4). X to do.

31. Make motorgliders fly in their own class – Kellerman 10/20

Can't justifiy a separate motorglider class yet. Not enough motorgliders. Too many classes already. We will continue to revisit motorglider options.

No change.

32. Permit motorgliders to get airport bonus without landing. MacKenzie 10/20

Request that the rules remove the denial of the 25-point airport landing bonus to motorgliders. Suggestion is that if motorglider starts engine over an airport-bonus airport, the pilot would be scored as landed out there and receive the airport landing bonus.

We are very concerned about the competitive advantage of motorgliders over pure gliders. It is already true that the motorglider pilot will save considerable time and energy by self-retrieving from a landout compared to the time and physical effort expended by the pure-glider pilot. The normal safety advantage to the pure-glider pilot associated with landing at an airport is obvious. Given the generally high reliability of properly performed motorglider engine starts, the safety advantage of doing this over an airport is substantially less. If the motorglider pilot is concerned about the reliability of the engine start, he/she certainly has the option of landing at the airport and claiming the airport bonus just like pure gliders.

No change.

Start/ Finish

33. Safety Finish- review again   KS 7/17   Cylinder size/shape- to ground vs cone KM 8/26

It has been suggested making the 5 mile cylinder go to the ground rather than the present cone, or that the maximum radius of the safety finish be expanded.

The basic philosophy of the safety finish is that if the pilot has enough energy to have made it back to the contest finish (i.e. glider is within the range of a 25:1 glide – 200 ft/mile), it is sensible to allow the pilot to avoid a localized problem at the contest site and land elsewhere or wait out the problem in the air at a safe distance away. The pilot is charged a time of one minute/mile (equivalent to a max l/d glide at 60 mph), so there is little time "penalty" for taking the safety finish alternative. It was the intent to maintain the historical priority given in scoring to finishing at the contest site. Replacing the cone with a 5 mile cylinder to ground allows the pilot to simple land out 5 miles from home and still gets points for a speed finish. Increasing the size to 10miles radius gives you a 20mile diameter and becomes more of chance than navigational ability. This is contrary to the basic philosophy of finishing at the contest site.

The safety finish has only been used a few times and appears to have worked well as far as we can tell. There were some problems when it was used a Caesar Creek, but this was due to pilot's misunderstanding or poor utilization of the safety finish option. The safety finish is only intended to deal with the limited problem of isolated thunderstorms. It appears to work well when properly used.

No change.

34. Simplify "start anywhere"   SRA Uvalde

As presently written, the start procedure discourages flying out the backside of the cylinder and the racing through the start cylinder. The language of the rule is a bit difficult to follow. If the language is simplified by eliminating the restrictions designed to prevent starting out the back side there is a safety problem associated with bumping gaggles while flying through the cylinder. After much discussion, it was decided to leave the language as it is. The simple application of the present language is: You can start out of the cylinder anywhere – side or top. If the last start does not incur a penalty, then that is the start you will be scored from. If the last exit out of the cylinder does incur a penalty, then the scoring procedure will look back earlier in time for best-scoring start. There was a later email discussion with new ideas that may be polled for 2009 after more pilots fly with the 'start anywhere' system. Decision was to stay with the 2008 rule and apply it to Nationals.

Change: see #35

35. Start anywhere- review implementation schedule KM 5/12 e mail , timing GFB2/9

The poll was strongly in favor of adopting the "start anywhere" approach in the Nationals.

X to contact Guy Byars to confirm that Winscore is scoring the start cylinder starts as we intended.

Change: Extend the 2008 start cylinder Regional rules to Nationals for 2009. X to do.

36. Refine finish cylinder penalty- BB 8/17

We have discovered a safety problem with the current finish cylinder procedure in that you can thermal up under the cylinder to get a better score if you missed the minimum finish height at the edge of the cylinder. The current rule can actually encourage this. This is undesirable because we don't want to encourage low altitude thermaling at the contest site while gliders are finishing and landing, nor do we want to encourage attempts at low altitude "saves" and climbs to avoid a finish cylinder penalty. The most simple solution is to end the flight when passing through the finish cylinder extension to the ground. With a one mile cylinder, the clock stops and the finish altitude is established when you reach one mile from the finish. If the altitude is above the minimum finish altitude (typically 500 ft), then you get a penalty-free finish with the one-mile-crossing finish time. If the altitude is below the minimum finish altitude, then a penalty will be assessed according to 12.1.4.5 and you receive a finish time at the one-mile-crossing time.

Change the finish cylinder rule to no longer allow finishing into the bottom of cylinder. Penetration of the side of the extended cylinder stops the clock and sets the altitude penalty. X to do.

37. Rules footnote to emphasize limited altitude starts. BB 8/17

The current minimum start height of 5000 ft may force the CD to allow starts which encourage flying near cloudbase. Changing this minimum from 5000 to 3500 will help keep pilots below cloudbase in low-ceiling weather conditions.

Change 5000 ft to 3500 ft. in 10.8.5.1, and change appendix 10.2 to direct CD to set height below cloudbase and below the top of dry thermals. X to do.

38. Revisit multi point starts to break up pre start gaggles   UH

We should increase the emphasis to CDs to use multi-point starts. It is recommended that a letter is sent to all CD's; this has been done in the past with other recommendations.

What does Winscore support? We think it supports 2. X to check with Byars.

No change.

39. "1000M" loss from start to finish- Kelley email 8/23

An interesting proposal to set each pilot's min finish altitude at 1000 meters below their start altitude. In the interest of minimizing changes to the rules and trying to avoid more complications, we decided not to pursue this for now. This would be a significant change from the current rules and also the WGC rules.

No change.

40. Land out floor   SRA Uvalde

No support for this at the present time.

No change.

41. Eliminate the cylinder finish and replace with line with raised height- Sullivan message to UH

Monty argues that the cylinder is unsafe because we don't know where people are coming from. Most of our feeling is that the current finish cylinder is OK. In fact, sentiment appears to be moving in the direction of the finish cylinder rather than a finish line. Both types finishes will be retained.

No change.

42 Delete references to rolling finish when cylinder finish is in effect. BB/JJ 10/23

Clean up the rules. Rule in 10.9.2 X to do.

Tasking

43. Eliminate AT in favor of TAT with 0 minimum time - BB

This agenda item was submitted by BB and subsequently withdrawn.

44. Caution against O&R tasking in appendix   BB

Change: A10.3.1.2. Suggest CD try to minimize tasks which cause direct leg reversals (out and return). X to do.

45. Eliminate task changes in the air- Kellerman 9/23

The preferred method is the have pre-assigned backup tasks. We don't want to eliminate the option of changing the task in the air. Consequence of not being able to change the task in the air is worse than changing the task in the air.

Emphasize to CDs that they should have pre-assigned backup tasks. X to add to appendix.

No change.

46. Use sectors for turn areas instead of cylinders- Kellerman 9/23

Richard does not like large cylinders. John Good talked to Richard about this recently and they both agreed that rather than sectors, you are able to get more variability by having multiple (5-6) turnpoints with smaller cylinders, than 2 turnpoints with large cylinders. Problem with sectors is line is drawn differently by different programs. Sectors would also be a major change and add more complexity. X will include this in his CD task setting guide. X also add in the appendix or CD guide that a handicap of 1 should be used as the tasking glider.

Scoring

47. Add one day exemption to FR security requirement   BB

see item 69 below

48. Scoring software/ rules harmony   Seaborn/ org 8/27

We think there is reasonably harmony between rules and Winscore. What we really need is some test data to run through Winscore. We've received some comments from Chip Bearden and Erik Mann. UH will do this. X will also have Guy specify AGL and MSL at appropriate locations in WinScore

49. MAT legs and turnpoints – consistency   KM 8/26

Change: 10.3.1.1 will be changed from "task legs" to "turnpoints" . X to do.

50. Start time/ finish time/ position interpolation- Wagner via KM 8/26

Question regarding inconsistency in the rules regarding start time, finish time and position interpolation.

Probably not an issue for loggers set at 15 sec or less. X to check with Guy about interpolating or taking time and position for the first fix out together for starts. For finishes it would be first fix in for both position and time. X did some more calculations after the meeting and found that interpolating both start and finish is the preferred method.

Change: If Guy says it is possible change all start and finish to interpolation. X rules re-wording.

51. Revisit drop a day scoring   BB 8/29

This has never been tried. X & BB will try to find a Regional to do this.

No change.

52. 15/18 class and 18/open class for regionals Poll

The rules presently allow a combined Std/15M class with the Standard class gliders receiving a 2% handicap over the 15M. This same arrangement has been suggested for a combined 15M/18M class and a combined 18M/Open class. The thinking is that this would only be done when either of the two uncombined classes were too small to be viable alone, or if the group of affected pilots wanted to combine classes. The hope is that this will encourage participation.

This was supported by the 2008 poll.

Change: Both 15M/18M and 18M/Open will be available for regionals for 2009 using a 2% handicap for the lower performance class. X to do.

53. Define a valid day as more than "X" mile minimum. Adjust max score based on winners distance.   Kellerman 10/19

This is being considered but needs more study. Suggest a graduated devaluation relating the scored distance to the standard minimum distance. X & BB will consider a new devaluation. Devaluation formulas are used in the WGC, and they can be very complex.

No change for now.

54. Actual speed for under time '07- It 30.   Poll

If a TAT is so undercalled that you fly almost all of the available distance but still finish undertime, you get full credit for your speed. This was implemented with 11.6.3.2 in Regionals for 2008. The poll supported extending this to Nationals in 2009.

Change: 11.6.3.2 will be adopted for the Nationals. X to do.

Sports/Club Class

55. Club Class- Giltner private poll "We need a Club Class". , Poll

Giltner's proposal from Giltner/Sorenson emails was presented. We are very concerned about protecting the health of our successful Sports Class. We want to encourage overall participation.

Allow club class by waiver for 2009 for regionals and super-regionals. Allow Assigned tasks (if this proves to be a problem for Winscore, calling a TAT with one mile circles with a zero min. time

accomplishes the same thing). Poll in 2009 to see what the effects are on sports class and club class. US Sports class rules will be used; gliders will be based on US Team list of eligible gliders and US handicaps. We will consider implementation of a club class in Regionals in 2010, based on practical use and further poll results. We want to make sure this does not result in hurting the sports class. We want to see what the level of participation is. Note that the establishment of a separate club class was not supported by the poll and the number of people pushing this is small, but vocal.

56. US Team- Club Class- Review limitation to Non FAI team members –

Not a Rules Committee issue. US Team committee issue

57. Competition weight Sports 6.12.1/ 6.12.4.4 Cornay e- mail 8/4 KM 8/26

Correction to be done by X.

58. Handicap list- Schedule needs to be set for updates   HN

We need the 2009 handicap list by Feb 1. KM to communicate this to Handicap chair.

Pilots should ensure that there is a suitable handicap for their glider before arriving at contest. How do we communicate this to pilots? With the new and improved SSA contest website we hope this will be readily available. KM

59. Handicaps various. Genesis- Cole, Cochrane 2/27, Cole, KM 5/6   - SZD-37-17 UH 3/3- D2 various mods KM 3/11, 5U 10/16,   ASG-29-15 UH ? date, LS-3/4 Giltner 6/17, Ventus Dan Cole 7/3 Grob Twin II, DG 505 Crawford 10/4, Duo- Giltner 10/16

UH to communicate this to handicap chair.

60. Handicap complexity   Seaborn/ org 8/27

We think this has been addressed. Regionals no longer require weighing, winglet heights no longer are measured, wing fairings are simple, etc.

Open Class

61. Open Class weight – Butler 3/18   Poll

Garret talked to Heinz who talked to Tilo. By waiver pure gliders can now go to 850 per IGC. Motor gliders can go to 850.

Based on an informal list of the 10 known open class racers (Willat, Butler, Tabery, HW, Milner, McLaughlin, Leonard, Robison, Coggins/Nichols, Athuil), there were 8 that we thought would favor 850, one against and one uncertain. There were too many poll respondents to have been just open pilots as intended so the poll results are suspect, or may show 18M pilots opinions as well. We think priority should given to true open owners rather than 18M owners. There was 1 18meter glider at the WGC in open class and she did win 1 day while everyone who could was flying at 850kg. We feel that the 18meter gliders are not out of the race. This is a major change as some gliders may need modifications for the increase in weight.

Note that going to 850 kg may be a problem for tow planes. It will be up to the Open pilots to work this out with the Open Nats contest organizer.

Change: 850 kg max will be allowed for the Open class at Regionals for 2009 and on track for Nationals in 2010. X to do.

62. 850 KG for dry 2 seaters in Open – possibly with handicap Coggins SRA Uvalde

Addressed in item 61.

Nationals No water

63. Nationals no water- '07 It 31   KS. Poll

Suggested that the CD should be allowed to declare a no-ballast day at a Nationals without unanimous pilot consent.

Already in place at Regionals. Poll supports this change. Examples of when justified: Weak short day when operating window doesn't allow for ballasting. This shouldn't be done just for the convenience of the organizer.

Change: Rule to implement this for 2009 in FAI Nationals. X to do. X to write up guidelines of when this should be done

64 Consider East/West Nationals

According to BB's review, typically less that 3-4 pilots cross the Miss to go to nationals on the coast. Based on this, pilots are already essentially doing this. Lots of practical problems. This would have to be coordinated with the US Team committee for team selection. What would be the effect on overall contest participation. Who's the national champion? If combining classes was necessary for adequate participation, would we have combined-class East and West champions? This would be a very large change from the way we've operated Nationals traditionally. It doesn't appear that there is a problem of sufficient magnitude to justify such a change.

No change.

Errata, Administration, Other.

65. Spot monitoring by contest organizers   Ruff

Ruff suggested that organizers monitor SPOT tracks.

The integration of SPOT devices into the contest framework will probably be worked out over the next couple of year as these become more widely used. They are very useful devices and are likely become commonplace fairly soon, but it's too early to impose this requirement on organizers.

66. Spot- allow as alternative to ELT Related to 64 KM 8/26

By waiver, if an organizer wants to require a SPOT or a PLB, a condition of the waiver will be that the SPOT/PLB requirement would be satisfied by an impact activated ELT. We encourage organizers to require such location devices.

67. Make sure all things slated to move to Nats do so   BB

We're working on this. QT has accepted this newly specified task.

68. Rules errata- Seaborn it 18 Seaborn/ org 8/27

A number of errata were submitted by Seaborn. X to do.

Flight Loggers

69. Revisit fixed list of approved loggers

The biggest concern is the scorer not checking security and ignoring WinScore warnings. Directly downloading from a GPS to the scoring computer does avoid some security issues. Scorers need to look into security warnings from WinScore, it would be better if there was no score allowed until all warnings were removed or checked by the scorer. X and QT will work with Guy for devising a security checking plan, whether it is through WinScore or another program.

There is no change on the Category of loggers, and Category 3 will still be allowed for Sports Class regionals. QT to contact DJ to see what the US Team wants to do regarding flight logger requirement for US Team qualification and what the US Team intends to do about checking to see that the logger-related US Team selection requirements have been met.

There are two types of security, "box" security that verifies the logger was not opened and tampered with, and "file" security that verifies that the igc file was not modified after download. In addition, some loggers (SN10) produce the file security internally; in other cases the file security is created by a software program (seeyou, g72win) that do the downloading and create the igc file. Category 1 – igc certified and legacy (Cambridge 10-20) -- produce both kinds of security. Category 2 produces file security but not box security. Some PDA implementations do (seeyou mobile) and some do not (GNII) produce file security.

After the meeting there have been a plethora of emails regarding security, downloading and the many COTS loggers. X did find one online for $50. Questions have come up if a category 2 logger would be okay as a back-up to category 1 if needed at a National, but have it shown on the score sheet. QT, X, P3 and JB are working on having a list of suitable COTS loggers.

70. COTS logging, Bearden 9/23, BB 10/6, Mann 10/23

Change. BB/X/P3 to investigate COTS in Cat 2, subject to file security check or observed download.

Electronic Weather Data

71. Cockpit wx equip KM 8/26. In-Flight Weather Data

From 07 agenda: Suggestion is to eliminate the prohibition on the in-flight use of electronic devices that report weather data, since we cannot police their use. Weather depictions are now commonly available on cell phones and GPS navigation receivers.

Not practical for us to do anything about this now. We don't want to allow it and can't do much to prevent it. Eventually this will be allowed as technology improves, costs will decline, and devices will become widespread in non-contest related soaring.

No change.

Communications With Pilots

72. Getting Our Message Out

Communication and engagement continues to be an issue. How can we improve? What other media do we have available? The magazine is clearly too far behind the speed of communications of today, and we need to put more immediate processes in place.

Communication from pilots: emails, SRA meetings, poll, personal discussions, .ras.

Communication to pilots: same as above, BB competition corner, magazine.

We are likely to have access to a contest pilots email list as a result of the new on-line contest system.

X suggest a contest committee website. KM to discuss with A8. Could Kochanski help?

73. SRA- Function- relevancy- future KM 2/23

See item 20. No change.

New Business

74. Safety Review.

BB suggests letter to CDs every year summarizing the safety report.

We have had several accidents at contest where pilots did not turn in logs after the accident.
What do we do about it? No requirement in the rules that the pilot report the accident. The CD is required to make a report.

Do safety talks.

BB to write a safety report to CD. Also an operational report to CDs.

75. Protests and Scoring language

2008 SSA Rules Committee Meeting Minutes
Waller Texas
November 15, 2008

Several changes required to clarify protest procedures and the process by which scores become official:

8.2 from the 2007 Rules was inadvertently removed from the 2008 rules and needs to be put back in.

Within the 2007 8.2, "must be delivered to the CD with 24 hours of the protested incident or act" should be changed to "must be delivered to the CD with 24 hours of the protested incident or act or when the relevant information became available".

10.5.1.5 changed to: "The Scorer shall publish daily flight documentation to be available to the entrants no later than the next daily pilots meeting. This requirement can be satisfied by posting each day's flight documentation in an accessible place (the preference being the SSA website), or available onsite in zip file for downloading to a thumb drive. Not that this language needs to also deal with the last day, when there is no next daily pilots meeting.

10.5.1.6 changed to: "At the end of the competition the Scorer will publish all flight documentation to a publicly accessible website."

11.9.3.1 changed to:
The status of a contest day becomes official 24 hours after the latest of:
• All flight documentation is analyzed and published (10.5.1.5).
• Final unofficial scores are published
• Protests are resolved
The CD should announce when the day has become official.

X to do.

76. Airspace files.

10.12.4 Organizer must publish to the pilots the actual scoring file used for closed airspace so it is blended with the rules. For example, the Mexico border must be added to the sua file for Uvalde. Class C extended to 18,000ft, removal of MOA's, Parachute, and Class D. QT is going to see if Leibacher would be willing to do this. QT thinks there is a program available from Ted Wagner that will help with this. QT to check with Ted and Liebacher.

No change in rules, possible addition on Liebacher site.

meeting adjorned at 19:45.