

# 2008 SRA Pilot Opinion Poll Results

**October 9, 2008 8:56 PM**

ALL text responses (no suppression) are listed below. The **View and suppress text responses for question:** selector on the author page may be used to suppress any inappropriate text responses so that offensive language or direct references can be eliminated from a published report. Current suppressed text is presented in red.

## **Answers to value response questions.**

No responsive questions of this type were found.

## **Answers to short responsive questions.**

No responsive questions of this type were found.

## **Answers to medium responsive questions.**

No responsive questions of this type were found.

## **Answers to long responsive questions.**

9.1: Are there any other issues that you would like the SSA Rules Committee to address, any rules-related problems you observed this year, or any questions that you would like to see included on future SRA polls?

1) Consider use of SPOT instead of upgrade to more expensive ELT. There are Pros and Cons to this, but it should be carefully considered. 2) Please get the SSA to do a better job of making this Pilot Poll accessible to all pilots without having to search around for it once it is known that it actually exists! It does not appear anywhere in the Contest rules link, or on other links where one might expect to find it. There was no announcement sent out by email to contest pilots. Yet one more indication that SSA has abandoned contests. Maybe contests should abandon SSA?

1. Reduce number of days at national contests. Participation is quite expensive and long races become arduous after a week. Many pilots and crews have limited vacation periods available to them. 2. Eliminate buffers against FAR violation. Specifically 500 ft margin to floor of airspace and sunset buffer should

be discontinued. The government does a fine job of constricting our sport -- we do not need to artificially expand their constrictions.

1. Please do not change Sports rules and impact one of the most vibrant, and often most competitive, classes at US contests. Euro Club class leads to highly specialised and prepared gliders, so high cost instead of original concept of providing competition flying using the many older types of gliders that Euro clubs own. US Sports allows pilots to compete on pretty much an equal footing with whatever glider they happen to fly -- and which ensures that the best pilots come at the top of the score sheet. 2. The rules committee should be prepared to use common sense and not stick to the precise wording of a rule when there is an obvious injustice. Case in point, Region 9 Sports Class this year at Parowan. It was only a long time after the rules deadline that it became apparent that the Air Force cadet senior officer had told the CD that two of his gliders were withdrawn on the last day, but that as a courtesy they were allowed to take a tow and get some localised flying. The CD forgot to tell the score keeper who scored them as normal. The effect was to reduce the day, reducing the winners score from a perfect 7000. In this instance it made no difference to the overall result, and was mostly a matter of dinging the pride of a pilot who had made a superb effort. Perfect scores are rare. But the next time this sort of issue emerges it could be a serious injustice involved. The Rules Committee has unfortunately created the precedent that it will not apply the rules in any way other than a rigid interpretation, severely constraining its freedom of future action. It would be very easy now to show common sense and announce that the Committee has decided to correct an obvious arithmetical error in the Region 9 case, caused by an unfortunate oversight by the CD resulting from the pressures of office -- with the more important result of not limiting the Rules Committees freedom of decision on some future, more important occasion.

1. The rules committee needs to look at East and West Nationals for each of the FAI classes. When a Nationals is held near either coast there is very little participation from pilots on the opposite coast. Examples of this are Cordele, Montague and Mifflin. Uvalde is an example of a central location that draws pilots from all parts of the country. The time and cost of traveling across country are both factors that have limited participation in the last few years. The fuel cost can be two to four thousand dollars depending on vehicle just to attend a contest. If our goal is to improve both participation and the quality of US pilots there needs to be more contests with higher level of participation and competition. Often individual regionals are weak and do not provide the level of completion required to help pilots improve. These nationals can be done in conjunction with a regional's and combine several classes. 2. It may be a good idea to look at a 7 day nationals or super regionals. Parowan is an example where in two weekends and one week the contest included seven racing days. For those within one day driving the contest only requires one week of vacation. If our goal is to improve both participation and the quality of US pilots there needs to be more contests with higher level of participation and competition.

Often individual regionals are weak and do not provide the level of completion required to help pilots improve.

3.0 Creating another racing class will not increase the participation in contest flying. Sports class, as implemented in the US, is the best way to get new blood into contest flying. Using the club class list to identify US team members is also appropriate. For me, the most limiting factor in my participation in contests is the number and location of contests. There was not a regionals in my region this year. The closest contest was 1200 driving miles away. I would like to see the SSA/SRA try to encourage each region to hold a contest every year. 5.1 Why would a CD need to call a no-ballast day? The two reasons I can think of are safety and cost savings. The former, well if it is unsafe to fly with water, shouldn't the PIC be able to determine that. The latter, how much do you save for one day of water? Make the entire contest a no-water contest. 8.1 One can always chose to race in the next higher performance class. Anything qualifies for Open class. 15M can race 18M if required. Do we really see a performance difference between the 15M and Standard ships? Seems like I saw a Discus 2 compete very well against other 15M ships. 18M class doesn't differentiate between the LS-8 and ASG-29. Why should we do that for the shorter wings?

Allow the club class to start ASAP

Concerning club class: In all sports class contests require club class fly concurrently. All contestants, including club class, would be scored in sports class. In addition, club class pilots would be scored separately as a sub set. Yes, this means that a club class pilot could win both sports class and club class at the same time. I do not see a problem with that. Scheduling of contest dates: Require a week between contests in close geographic proximity. (Perhaps I should restate that as: Require a week between contests which derive the bulk of their contestants from the same geographic area(s).) The reason: The most accessible (1 day drive) contest sites for people in the Pacific Northwest are Ephrata and Montague. Due to the scheduling, it was not practical for most people to fly both. For example, our club normally makes up about 30-40 percent of the Sports Class at Ephrata. This year (2008), not one of our members went to Region 8 at Ephrata. Why? Because of the scheduling. We were essentially forced to choose one or the other. We all chose to fly Sports Class Nationals rather than Region 8. Many of us wanted to fly both, but could not due to the scheduling. The result - an undersubscribed Sports Class at Region 8. Also note that Parawon was scheduled at the same time as Region 8 in Ephrata, draining even more contestants from Region 8. Poor scheduling like this kills participation, and is bad for the sport.

Delete TS Safety Finish or make Safety Zone large enough to encompass an actual TS (10 or 15 Miles). The justification for many rule changes is to make the rules conform to WGC rules. It should be remembered that USA contests are for USA pilots with the primary purpose to select a USA champion. The National

contests are also used to select USA Team members, however, the pilots truly interested in becoming a team member are a very small percentage of the total entry. SSA contest rules should be constructed to the wishes of the majority of pilots, not the 15 or so pilots that are truly interested in being a team member. If team pilots think that contests should be conducted according to WGC rules, they should hold their own contests. Of course that would be rather expensive. So it seems that they want the rest of the pilots to pay the cost of running a contest in accordance to the rules that they think that they need. Perhaps a contest for potential team members (by invitation only) could be run in conjunction with another contest as is done with the poorly attended PW-5 contest.

Drop the MAT.

Extend the club class glider pool eligible for US Team Points to include modern generation sailplanes.

First: In conjunction with 8.1 consider a 2%-like rule which would be applied to non-flapped 18M gliders to be more competitive in the 18M class. I have seen situations where this could make a difference for a viable 18M class in Regionals. Second: I believe the super-regional concept as now implemented is discriminatory to certain Regions. It was explicitly created for Parowan under the guise that non-R9 folks ran it and it is unfair for non-region 9 folks to not be able to attend. Look at this year, it was pretty much run and attended by region 9 folks. Region 9 is one of the most active in growing new competition pilots, it is patently unfair to disallow these new pilots the opportunity to participate. I am not against a super-regionals, I am against compromising a regions pilots ability to attend their regions contest. I propose the following which I think benefits everyone. One, specify that a super-regionals cannot be held unless a standard regions is held in the region. To discourage fake attempts to hold a regionals, specify if only a super-regionals is held in the region any given year, super-regionals will not be allowed in that region for the following 3 years. Two, since pilots in the Region will have the opportunity to fly a standard regionals, remove all preferential pilot entry requirements for the super-regionals. Thus all pilots entry is handled like a Nationals. This serves the purpose of allowing anybody, within the region or not to attend based on National ranking: truly making it a super-regionals. I would also like to point out that with a little thought, both a standard and super-regionals can be run in a two week period (similar to the resource commitments for a Nationals) including a full stand-down day in-between for operations rest.

I believe that it is unfair to allow two pilots in modern two place sailplanes be allowed to compete against single placed sailplanes. This allows for the distribution of the work load and clearly places the single pilot at a severe disadvantage. What ever happened to the rules against a pilot receiving any outside help?

I believe the main thing facing us in these fairly stable times is the start. I feel we could massage the start rules to discourage attaching oneself to a good number at the start. This was serious at Uvalde. I favor a revisit of multiple start points, but is there anything else to consider?

I would like creation of the Club class fast like Sam G proposes.

I would like to see some way devised to penalize pilots who exceed the structural limits of their aircraft, especially the practice of exceeding the red line speeds.

Identifying changes in turnpoint bases 30 days prior to starting the contest.

If we introduce a Club Class to the US racing scene, will all pilots be allowed to fly the class (even if they have participated in an FAI World Championships (not Club Class or World Class WGCs)???) I.E. will the banned pilots list be abolished since the entire effort is really aimed at getting the best pilots in club class-type ships to the world championships so they might win it. If we bring Club Class to the US, it should be a virgin class with any and all comers welcome, to bulk up the interest level, and eventually eligible for making the club class team.

Implement Club Class ASAP! No phase in. By definition, WGC Club Class is an exclusive, specialist class (I argue against the assertion it is mediocre); however, if the US remains intent to continue participating in world Club Class competitions we should compete here using the WGC rules (like everyone else in the entire world does!). Otherwise, as an example, the Mosquito pilot that is benefitted by a Herold handicap here gets creamed by a grossly more stringent WGC handicap once over there. Here in the US we hamstring potential Club Class participants by imposing different, subjective handicaps and a venue (US Sports Class) designed with a wholly opposite participatory philosophy (inclusion rather than exclusion). But rather than debates the merits of such philosophy, the fact of the matter is if the US intends to continue to participate with the hope of success in world Club Class events, we need to train accordingly. Club Class can be flown in conjunction with Sports Class caveated with the important point that bona fide WGC Club Class be handicapped per their WGC assigned handicaps even when flown within a US Sports Class venue. Personally, I think there should be only two classes: UNLIMITED and HANDICAPPED. If the latest and greatest (= most \$\$\$) gliders always win the UNLIMITED class, so be it! Rule #1 - Life Aint Fair. If all the rest are properly handicapped then they can theoretically adequately compete. Keep all the classes you want at the regional level. WORLD class is a joke and should no longer be sanctioned--the few people who got stuck with a PW-5 can always do their own thing, like the 1-26 Assn. To have an OPEN class and a 18M class, a 15M flapped and a 15M not flapped (STANDARD) class, is arguably induced overdistinguishment. Whats next--a 19m class? Concerned about participation? Go to two national classes--Problem solved! Cut down on the number of Classes and hold two natl competitions of each class each year--one west coast and one east. BTW, dont misinterpret my

underlying desire to cut down the number of classes as contradictory to my supporting the SSA sanctioning of Club Class events. CLUB CLASS is a HANDICAPPED class. National Competitions should be 7 day events--10 days is too long and thats unrealistic for the average Joe to do logistically (work time off plus travel time plus expenses).

It is clear that enabled motor gliders have a distinct advantage over a pure sailplane. Not only do they fly at a heavier wing loading during a no water meet but they sometimes fly where a non powered sailplane would not go. I would propose that motorgliders fly in a Motor Glider class of their own to level the playing field. The previous argument that recognized that there were only a few of these types is no longer valid. Note that most of the European production includes the addition of motors of various kinds so there are now or will be adequate numbers to support a motorglider class. An interim measure might be to handicap motorgliders a certain percentage due to wing loading differences.

Just further comment about question 7.0, the answer would depend on my satisfaction that "fairness" was imposed by the rules. That said, it is clear that it improves safety not to have additional traffic landing back. So if you can come up with a good set of rules I would favor the idea for all contests. Your proximity and thirty minute rule would be fine, but I would make sure it is 30min after the last "normal" launch in the class...

Kill super regionals.

My gliders handicap is just wrong! How can I expect to compete?

My only reservation about Club class is the possible negative effect the introduction of this class may have on Sports. Sports scratches the itch for a wide range of pilots and I would not want to see any of the current participants left homeless. However, it is clear from my experience in at least six sports class contests that we get better racing when the fleet is similar in performance. Reason: A Nimbus 3 and a Ka-8 simply do not fly the same task any given day. A handicap, no matter how sophisticated, cannot correct for this, especially on a 90 minute task with a 6000 agl gate. At typical regional performance level, this is not an issue. At nationals level, it clearly is. Club Class avoids (most of) this problem for obvious reasons. A further comment is that the restriction of Club Class against current generation 15m and Std class ships is a bit artificial. My experience shows that in dry contests (i.e. the Club Class scenario), there is very little performance advantage to the current generation 15m/std ships over 1980s ships. So extending Club participation to owners of new ships with 15m span -- with appropriate handicaps -- would not in any way harm the quality of racing and might considerably increase participation, particularly at nationals. I do understand that part of the objective of Club Class as currently formulated -- whether stated or not -- is to exclude current FAI class competitors. This is clearly the basis for the exclusion of modern 15m ships. I personally think that's bs, even if it improves my chances of winning a Club Class championship (and it

does).

No

None.

Nope... Thanks for all of the hard work.

Not sure what could be done but I believe calling a task where one or no turnpoints are specified and then you are on your own favor local knowledge and seems unfair to pilots with less experience.

ON 8.1 ABOVE INDICATE I APPROVE OF ALLOWING 15/18 AND 18/OPEN COMBINED CLASSES IN REGIONALS ONLY.

Re: Club Class In Europe, Club Class has a literal meaning: a club member goes to the club hangar where a club-owned glider (typically ranging from LS-4 to Discus) is available for use, including for entry in a contest. There are thousands of such gliders and probably tens of thousands of club members who have access to them. The fundamental purpose of Club Class is thus to make competition accessible at low cost to a group of pilots most of whom don't own a glider. In the US, the situation is quite different: a very few clubs own a very few gliders (perhaps a couple dozen across the entire country) within the Club Class range that are available for use in contests. To meet the same need that is met by the Club Class in Europe, we need a handicapped class that admits the gliders to which a significant number of pilots have access. The actual patterns of glider ownership by racing-oriented US pilots dictate that this class include recent 15-meter span ships such as the ASW-27, Ventus 2 and Discus 2. If we go with a Club Class as implemented in Europe, a typical racing-oriented US pilot will need a second glider; many will not be able to afford the cost, which will lead to a smaller, less competitive class. There is surely something wrong with an approach that says you should own two gliders to be competitive in a class that originated to provide competition opportunities to pilots who own no glider. Arguments have been advanced to the effect that there are plenty of pilots out there with Club-class-range gliders, eager to race, but currently discouraged by the presence of newer & better gliders at US Sport-class competitions. No good evidence for this has yet been presented, and the argument that the newer gliders are discouraging ignores the fact that Sport-class competitions are handicapped (and a glider like an LS-4 is widely thought to be treated rather well in the handicap list). Another argument says that what's discouraging is the presence of better pilots in Sport-class contests. This is much more plausible, but should not command much attention. A pilot who says I'll participate in sailplane competition provided you arrange things so a beginner like me can consistently finish high and believe himself to be a hot pilot is one unlikely to persist, and not one to whom the Rules Committee should cater.

Rules for second task attempt are snarled: I wasn't able to hand in

documentation prior a second flight ! Needs a cleanup. Why not just allow second attempt without landing, and without penalty if second attempt is aborted or landed-out or motored home ? Simpler and more practical.

SPORTS CLASS - I disagree with the rule to only allow pilots flying gliders on the approved list to get credit (points) to be eligible to be on the world team. If we are really trying to get the best pilots to compete in the club class worlds, there should not be a restriction on the type of glider flown. I do agree that the club class pilots should be chosen from pilots who have not already participated in an FAI world competition.

Sports/Club Issue: The US should send the pilot with the best chance of winning the WGC. Remove recent changes that removed most of the pilots and gliders from consideration. Keep the provision for reverse seeding in sports class so that new pilots can enter.

Standard & 15 Meter Class is decreasing in popularity and new glider sales. Consider handicapping, replacing the World Class.

The 1-mile finish cylinder with a 500 AGL floor is clearly safer than the low-level finish line, so Im not quite sure why the SSA still allows CDs to use a finish line. All it will take is one fatal accident with the finish line to put the CD, the contest organizers, the SSA, and the entire sport in jepoardy.

The FAI classes should be exactly what they are. Mixing classes and adding a handicap pushes all gliders toward the Sports class. We pay big bucks for a state of the art FAI glider and and the classes should be separate. If an 18m wants to compete in open, ok but it is the open class. Likewise, if a standard wants to compete in the 15m ok but no handicap.

The RC should look into how to handle two-seat sailplanes flown in competition. Specifically, to whom should seeding points be awarded? Options are: A) Both if both pilots are eligible to fly that glider in that contest and class, B) Eligible PIC to be declared prior to the first day of the contest, C) The eligible pilot with the higher seeding at the time of the contest. I prefer C) as it prevents people from buying higher seeding. To the extent that we want to allow team flying (trading of pilots for a single competing glider) a similar rule should apply. Whether there should be any additional restrictions on two-seat entries might be worth discussion, but I would not want to prohibit two seaters from competition. My personal experience is that two experienced competition pilots in a single glider are more competitive than either one alone, but to what extent is impossible to measure. I suspect this has been discussed before, but I am not aware of it having been dealt with.

The change disallowing commercial off-the-shelf GPS receivers that meet the performance requirements for Category 2 FRs was a step in the wrong direction. Having to buy a second, backup Category 1 FR for national competition is a

\$1000 cost that is unnecessary and yet another impediment to competing on a budget, as many of us do. Too, COTS FRs have proven to be more reliable than soaring-specific FRs. The change made for 2008 was significant and was not announced in advance. The same comments apply to a certain extent to disallowing Category 1 FRs with invalid security seals but which otherwise meet the performance requirements of Category 2 FRs. If a box meets the specs, it should be allowed. If theres a problem with that, change the specs. For example: Category 2 FRs are unsecure from an IGC perspective. So is a Model 20 CAI GPS/NAV with a dead battery. Yet Category 2 FRs are allowed (except for pilots contending for the US team) and a Model 20 is not. Ive proposed several changes to the rules to address this and hope the RC will consider them.

We hardly have enough participation to make a Regional contest, splitting and adding a club class will kill regional competition, especially sport class.

Why cant we just use IGC scoring rules and tasks for the FAI Classes. Club Class - Start doing it now within the sports class and score it according to club class rules. Club class worlds only for pilots who competed in the club class - not sports class!!

Yea. Who the hell wrote: A US club class will be a small, mediocre, "specialist" class. Most national-level US contest pilots (72 of 88 entries in 2008 standard,15,18) fly recent-vintage ineligible gliders. These pilots will fly sports, and be part of the US club team, but the vast majority are not going to borrow or buy an old glider to fly club class when they have a much better glider sitting in the garage. The sports class has been around a long time, giving just as much incentive to develop a pilot and glider base, but this has not happened in sufficient numbers. Most serious contest pilots move on to better gliders. The world class was founded on a similar "build it and they will come" promise, which did not pan out. In my opinion, just about EVERY class is a specialty class. I dont know why you singled out Club Class for this moniker. It hasnt happened in sufficient numbers because the pilots who wanted a new glider could buy one and still fly in Sports. Why dont they fly in their FAI class? Take the Ventii, Disci, LS8s (I wouldnt even let LS4s in Club...) and such and fly in the FAI classes. Leave the REAL club class to those of us with REAL club class gliders. Dont have one? Then go buy one. They are A LOT cheaper than the new stuff. Checked the price on new, or almost new gliders lately? When Im racing, I want to know for sure that the pilot is beating me (okay, I know that EVERYBODY is beating me, but I can still dream...) and not the Uber Segelflugzeuge. I know we score our races with handicaps, but its still disheartening to see the ASW-27s and Ventii and such in the same class as me. Yea, who cant win flying something like that? Also, we need to have our Club Class handicaps match the WGC handicaps. The establishment of a handicap should be based on flight testing. No, I dont know how the WGC set handicaps, but I dont think they are changing handicaps because they think it needs to be changed. If zig zag tape is added to the wings, does that hurt or help the performance? Before a handicap is changed, there

should be good testing to show it can make an improvement. Dont change the handicap based on gut instinct but valid testing. I suppose if their arent enough pilots at a Regional for either Club or Sports, the class could be combined, as done now for Std/15m. American pilots havent fared well at the World Gliding Championships in a long time. Maybe we should adopt our rules to follow their rules, and that includes providing us with a Club Class and WGC Club Class handicaps. Just dont call it a mediocre class because you have your LS-23 on order and you dont want to go back to a Libelle 201. Respectfully, Ray Lovinggood

Yes, I would like to see a different set of questions regarding Club class. Currently the questions are formed in such a way as to introduce a scare factor. If I vote for a Club class the Sports class participation may fall. Why not to hold them together but have two score sheets. This should not be considered a major change. I would simply ask a question? Do you favor keeping two score sheets one for Club class gliders and one for other gliders? This is all that needs to be asked not to scare people from thinking participation will be reduced. I plan to fly in at least a couple of contests next year, but I am not happy to be scored along with other Sports class gliders like ASG-29 and alike. This is not fair and it could eventually take away my desire to fly in contests all together. I appreciate all work RC is doing but I think more openness is needed e.g. formulating questions. Why not have a forum where you could ask for potential questions before you decide what to include. I will support RC financially but I would like to feel I have input into creation of these questions. Thank you for all your hard work and please don't be afraid make changes quickly. Four years is too long to wait by then I may have enough of waiting. Please, this is not criticism of your work but rather a plea to be more open.

Yes, as gas prices continue to rise. Please keep that as a major consideration with all rules issues. For instance, please consider the multiple (east/west) nationals concept. Its great for say Slovenia to have one national contest for the various classes but its only a country the size of New Jersey. This is not Europe with lots of little (size-wise) countries. As for adding Club class? I think the current rules (take from sports class from those pilots flying club class gliders), is just fine. Those pilots who are REALLY interested in club class consideration will fly the right gliders. Sam Giltner and his pristine LS1f is a perfect example. Again, this is not Europe. Im a little surprised that the Europeans continue to hold so fast to the Club Class actually with the relatively limited glider selection. But I guess they have enough participants that participation isnt a consideration for them. It is here.

Yes, at no water contests, for example, Parowan Region 9 contest: I competed against three ASH26 ships with motors vs my Lak-17AT with sustainer. The difference in weight was 200 to as much as about 300 pounds! That is a rather large advantage to the ASH26 pilots in the strong conditons at Parowan. I would like to see the playing field leveled by assigning a handicap so that I dont have to

go out and buy a ASH26 to be competitive. (I need all the help I can get} Im sure we could come up with a mathematical formula based on wing loading to help even the playing field. My initial calculations suggest somewhere around a 5-7% handicap. Sincerely, Clay Thomas N44VH Lak-17AT

for 2.1, participation in world club class team should be restricted from pilots who have previously competed in OTHER classes. Previous club class pilots should be allowed to fly again in club class. We should not lose the experience base by restricting club class to a one-time training experience and then requiring the pilots to move up to another class. The question seems to be poorly worded in this regard.

9.2: Did you experience or witness any significant safety-related incidents that the rules committee should be aware of?

Before start gaggles are very crowded with close to and into cloud flying being done. Folks are playing with too many PDAs and such in their cockpits and some just fly-by never looking out. We need to come up with a better start for ALL competitors before their another mid-air. There's really a lot of leaching going on before start, and shouldn't we be tested for on course soaring skills rather than our before start leaching anarchy. Now, before start, means some just hunt contest numbers and follow them around. It's really become a joke in our sport and then they even admit they are doing it at the next day pilots meeting. You all are aware of this. Let's develop a new start where entrants are tested ON Course rather than before start luck. With starting out the top, as A8 said about Parowan, he found a 12 kt thermal and climbed out the top, which he even felt was an unfair advantage for everyone else. It's not fair for one or two to get lucky before the start. We should not be testing luck. Use the altitude as we pass out the side of the circle and our finish altitude can be not less than 1000 meters of our start altitude. No more out the top starts. Period. To keep the start speeds within reason, speed traps can be put on the start circle by an inner and outer ring, which would then give us a trap speed. This is easy, it increases safety, allows a fair and equal start for ALL entrants and now tests out skills on course and requires simple math. The 1000 meters can be adjusted for different sites. Our minimum finish altitude can still be applied. If it's 500 ft. MSL, then our start altitude should be higher than 3,800 msl. We still can leave lower, but we still must finish above 500 msl. If we start higher, then it's simple math, 5,300 msl mean we finish no lower than 2,000 msl. This also takes care of the high speed finishes. They are ended, gone, before we have anymore errors in judgement. If pilots wish to do high speed passes after they finish, it's their choice and judgement, along with the contest officials, etc.

A mid air caused by a pilot who had caused a near miss just a day before suggests that the rules committee should address this issue. He did not appear to take responsibility for his reckless behavior. Contest directors should have the authority to remove an individual displaying unsafe flying. In addition there

should be a disbarment from future contest participation if the contest board believes the individual represents a significant safety hazard in future contest. There should be some significant consequences for those who fly recklessly and endanger other contestants.

Aggressive thermalling before the start and in the start gaggle should be sanctioned and unsportsmanlike penalties applied.

At Uvalde this year there were a number of days where there were multiple gliders on final to the south, and multiple gliders on high-speed finishes to the north, both using the same basic airspace. On most days it was reasonably easy to keep the two streams separated by a few hundred yards, but on one day the east taxiway became saturated and several pilots had to use the south end of the main runway. This put those pilots, who were already busy dodging other landing gliders, right in the path of incoming high-speed traffic. I know the finish line finishes are fun and look really cool, and I'm just as bad as the next guy about crossing the line at 50 or less at 130kt or more, but as a professional pilot I know in my heart that it is more than a little bit stupid. We talk all the time about how to increase safety in our sport, while allowing a clear and present danger to persist at the whim of the CD. Please eliminate this hazard from U.S. racing .

Changing task in the air will sooner or later cause midair collision. I had 2 misses already :one in Elmira last year and one in Mifflin last sports class. Only in US we still play Russian rulle. On one occasion CD changed task in the air twice (cezar Creek sports nat), and every day would task was changed in the air. Ryszard Krolikowski (RW)

Dump tasks with a marginal last few miles of land-out options created some interesting flying at both Cordele and Sugarbush this year.

Having 65 gliders in one thermal is not safe. This happened at Cordele this year. Gliders from all classes were sent on the same task at the same time. I saw two gliders almost colliding. They both reacted to avoid a collision and almost caused collisions with other gliders. In addition, I noticed at the Seniors Nationals this year a pilot getting into clouds violating VFR rules. I also heard others saying I will not fly near this individual because I don't believe he can see properly.

I believe the new rule covering the start gate will help spread out the field and reduce congestion.

When a competitor wrecks or causes another ship to wreck three times in a relatively short period of time, should they be banned from competition? Also, I was a bit annoyed by the Air force pilot management at Parowan this year when they caused the Sports Class to have to devalue a day (or more?) because they were not allowed to fly the task. In addition they pulled out of the race the last day. Their leader also stated that their mission was to

teach leadership more than teach racing. I say they should not compete if they are going to jepordize the civilians that are there to race.

Keeping gliders in sight in a thermal continues to be a problem.

██████████ In the interests of safety and accident prevention, pilots should be required to submit full info about any crash or incident - no future contest entry unless/until this is done.

NO.

No

No

No

No.

No.

No.

None.

Nope....

Not a rule item, but just a question regarding what might be a good practice. With multiple arrivals it seems sometimes the first folks in line attempt to stop short to be near their trailer. Depending on the location, this leaves someone next in line with a very short landing, or landing over, a decision which may need to be made very low if the intentions of the person ahead are unknown. It would seem to make sense to have folks land as long as possible and roll to near the end of the runway. This leaves a lot of room to land for the next person in line, and makes a little more work for the first folks to tow back. It has been my experience that it is easier to get a glider to come down, than to get it to stay up, and this eliminates the super short landing, or the low altitude overflight.

Pilots are flying above red line on strong days. Sooner or later there will be catastrophic aircraft failures. Also this is not fair for pilots who dont wish risking their lives to win. Not sure how to address, but it has discouraged me from continuing to compete.

Rules 11.2.2.6 states its the pilots responsibility to review his/her score and report any problems before the scores become official. Thats an assinine statement. :) I know of very few pilots (John Good, Jonathan Gere, et al., excepted) who have much understanding of the scoring formulas today and

none who arrive with WinScore installed who can do a valid check of their score against the official results. Im not advocating allowing protests long after the fact because the software (or the scorer) made a mistake, but the current rules dont allow for that under any circumstances after 48 hours, and that seems harsh. No specific suggestion other than to revisit this area.

Smoke was so thick at Montague on most days that we couldnt see the ground. Two pilots got into spiral dives and only recovered when the ground re-appeared through the smoke as they spiraled down and got closer to earth! I was using the bottom of the Qs as my horizon, because I couldnt see the ground. We were flying in less than VFR minimum, as proved one day when I was unable to see the airport when the GPS said I was 3 miles out. I reviewed my bailout procedure twice on one particular day, because I was afraid I would suddently see another saiplane right in front of me with no time to react. Judgement call on the part of the CD, but if you cant see 3 miles, we shouldnt be flying! Rule could say something like; Tasks will only be flown under VFR conditions and when a significant portion of the task area is ..... JJ

Start cylinder repeatedly caused very compressed gaggle at cloudbase near optimum start point. Start-anywhere just moves the gaggle. IFR flying and traffic hazards abound near the start.

Return to the [2008 SRA Pilot Opinion Poll survey form](#) to check your input.  
Return to main [survey page](#).

If you have problems or questions contact the [survey administrator](#).