

# 2010 SSA Pilot Opinion Poll Results

October 20, 2010 12:44 AM

Percentages usually do not add up to 100% because multiple selections can be made on many questions. Also, some questions are not answered by all survey submitters.

Analysis Categories		All																												
Summary of detailed data representing All respondents.		227																												
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Crash Procedures</b></p> <p><i>Background:</i> There was a crash at the 2010 Standard class worlds, and several gliders stayed to help rescuers locate the wreckage. As allowed by international rules, organizers called off the day, in fairness to the helpers, and to encourage helpers to volunteer. In a few recent US crashes, some pilots have stayed to help, costing their points for the day; others have continued the task.</p> <p><i>Question:</i> Should US rules specify a procedure for the day to be canceled when help is needed for a crash situation?</p>	Yes 86% No 11% Don'tCare 2%																												
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Short nationals</b></p> <p><i>Background:</i> Currently, four days out of ten are required for a valid national contest. In 2010 it was decided to reduce this to three days, with the winner receiving 95 pilot ranking points rather than 100. As with all major changes, implementation was delayed to 2011 so the RC could hear any feedback. The US team will need to decide whether and how much to devalue such a nationals for team selection. It's the last chance for feedback, so</p> <p><i>Question:</i> Should we proceed as planned, and allow 3-day devalued nationals?</p>	Yes 57% No 30% Don'tCare 13%																												
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Multiple flight attempts</b></p> <p><i>Background:</i> If you try the task a second time without landing and turning in your flight log, an outlanding on the second attempt will invalidate the first attempt. (10.11.13) This rule was put in place to discourage tampering with documentation away from the airport, but that concern no longer applies with secure loggers. So, it is suggested that we delete 10.11.13, and allow a second flight attempt, preserving the first attempt, even if the pilot does not land. (Note: The RC will limit the applicability of this rule to MAT tasks, so that pilots do not come right back to the airport to "finish" before trying more turnpoints.)</p> <p><i>Question:</i> Should we allow multiple task attempts without landing?</p>	Yes 73% No 18% Don'tCare 8%																												
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Short MAT/TAT scoring</b></p> <p><i>Background:</i> In assigned tasks, we give finishers the better of speed and distance points, so that no pilot should ever intentionally land out to improve his score. In TAT and MAT tasks, we give every finisher the better of their speed and the winner's distance points, so that every finisher scores better than any landout. This rule can lead to a great difference between short finishes and short landouts, and a great compression of scores among slow finishers.</p> <p>For example, Day 2 of the 2009 Fairfield regional produced the following result, with the affected score highlighted. 93 flew 64 miles, yet scored better than 9X who went 287 miles but landed at another airport. KL flew 243 miles, but did not score that many more points than 93.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ID</th> <th>Rank</th> <th>Current Points</th> <th>Speed</th> <th>Distance</th> <th>Code</th> <th>Proposed Points</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5E</td> <td>1</td> <td>928</td> <td>85.31</td> <td>264.28</td> <td></td> <td>928 (same)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GL</td> <td>2</td> <td>897</td> <td>82.48</td> <td>247.06</td> <td>MT</td> <td>897</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TA</td> <td>3</td> <td>838</td> <td>77.03</td> <td>230.99</td> <td>MT</td> <td>838</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ID	Rank	Current Points	Speed	Distance	Code	Proposed Points	5E	1	928	85.31	264.28		928 (same)	GL	2	897	82.48	247.06	MT	897	TA	3	838	77.03	230.99	MT	838	Yes 70% No 20% Don'tCare 8%
ID	Rank	Current Points	Speed	Distance	Code	Proposed Points																								
5E	1	928	85.31	264.28		928 (same)																								
GL	2	897	82.48	247.06	MT	897																								
TA	3	838	77.03	230.99	MT	838																								

G1	4	782	71.88	215.16	MT	782
KL	5	722	66.37	243.13		722
93	6	651	22.35	64.28	MT15	243 <- note change
9X	7	646		286.63	AB	646
KI	8	49		11.20	MD, AB	49

Day 5 of the 2009 standard nationals produced the following result. Flights from 67 miles to 139 miles all received nearly the same score, because they were all essentially credited with the winner's 217 mile distance.

ID	Rank	Current			Code	Proposed
		Points	Speed	Distance		Points
16	1	790	72.50	217.38	MT	790
P7	2	671	61.30	182.53	MT	671
BP	3	641	47.60	139.28	MT15	519
2T	4	622	38.58	113.35	MT15	420
7HV	4	622	38.75	114.10	MT15	422
JP	6	614	35.36	104.47	MT15	325
CG	7	601	28.46	82.59	MT15	310
1CR	7	601	23.33	66.99	MT15	254
4Q	9	134		51.22	MD	134

We can eliminate these issues, by giving every finisher the better of speed points and his distance points, not the winner's distance. Technically, we would replace "MDP" (Maximum Distance Points) by "MDP\*DIST/BESTDIST but not more than MDP" in 11.6.8. The result is the "proposed" scores in the right hand columns above.

This change would preserve the principle that no pilot should ever intentionally land out. There would remain no point to heading off downwind and racking up extra distance, because distance is capped at the winning finisher's value. It would also remove an agonizing decision – go back to the airport for a very short "finish," or keep going?

However, this change would not preserve the principle that every "finisher," no matter how slow, beats every landing away from the home airport, no matter how long. For that reason, it is a poll question – we need to know if you approve of changing this philosophy for TAT and MAT tasks where "finishers" do not all have the same distance. We would think of a very short return to the airport (62 miles on a 270 mile day) as equivalent to abandoning the task and landing out at an airport, not as "finishing the task."

*Question:* Should we change the scoring formula as suggested, to give finishers the better of their distance points and speed points, rather than the better of the winner's distance points and their speed points, even if this means that "finishers" with very short flights will score worse than landouts with very long flights?

**5 Safety Finish**

*Background:* Occasionally, weather is so bad that the whole 5 mile safety finish area is dangerous. Some think we should increase the safety finish radius to 10 or more miles in such a situation. Others think that doing so introduces too much luck into the race, since gliders can suddenly finish 20 miles apart.

*Question:* Do you favor:

- a) Keeping the 5 mile safety finish as is.
- b) Allowing the CD to state a radius as large as 10 miles.
- c) Other (Please comment below).

- a) 26%
- b) 59%
- c) 12%

Other comments:

21%

**6 Flarm**

The Power-Flarm unit will be available in the US this winter. Flarm is an anti-collision device that many pilots have found quite useful in Eu**Flarm**

rope, and the majority of European contest gliders are equipped with Flarm. Flarm includes a flight recorder that can be used in US contests and will drive your PDA or other computer. Power-Flarm also detects transponders and ADS-B equipped aircraft. However, Flarm will only be useful if a large fraction of the fleet at a contest are equipped with Flarm. For more

64%

	<p>information, see the <a href="#">US Flarm website</a>, especially the <a href="#">FAQ</a> and the <a href="#">simulation</a> of what the Parowan pilots would have seen with Flarm.</p> <p>Though many pilots have suggested mandating Flarm, the RC believes that this step is at best premature. We also recognize that the right answer is different for different contests, i.e. 18 meter nationals vs. small sports regionals.</p> <p>We have no specific survey questions for this year. However, we welcome your input on how aggressively to promote voluntary and coordinated Flarm use, and what practical steps you would welcome. Please comment below.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<p><b>World Class World Gliding Championship</b></p> <p><i>Background:</i> The IGC recently announced that the World Class will be subsumed into a 13.5 Meter Class, which will hold a standalone World Gliding Championship beginning in 2015. A new 20 Meter two-place class will take its place at the 2014 "unflapped" world championship. The 2012 "unflapped" WGC to be held in Argentina will include the World Class, as well as Standard and Club Class (our Sports Class). Participation in our World Class US Nationals has been very small (6 pilots in 2010) with little change in the participant list. The US Team Committee continues to struggle to provide financial support as the number of venues, pilots, and classes in world competition continues to expand. Therefore, the US Team Committee is considering either not sending a World Class team to Argentina at all, or not providing support so that its limited resources can be focused on more popular classes. Your opinion on the value of our team efforts in smaller classes is important to this decision however.</p>	<b>All</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<p><i>Question:</i> Should we field a US Team in the World Class for 2012?</p>	<p>Yes 29%</p> <p>No 45%</p> <p>Don'tCare 26%</p>
<b>7.2</b>	<p><i>Question:</i> If so, should the SSA and US Team provide financial support to the World Class for 2012?</p>	<p>Yes 17%</p> <p>No 51%</p> <p>Don'tCare 23%</p>
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>In addition to clarifying your views on the above questions, please use the comments section for general comments about the rules. We always want to improve the fairness, enjoyment, participation, and safety of contest flying. We are interested in any incidents or experiences you had that bear on these goals.</p>	44%

Return to the [2010 SSA Pilot Opinion Poll survey form](#) to check your input.

Return to main [survey page](#).

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