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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Categories</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of detailed data representing All respondants.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I. Equipment

1. Cloud flying instruments
   For many years we have prohibited gliders from “carrying any instrument which; Permits flight without reference to the ground.” (6.6.1) In practice, this has meant that gliders may not carry gyros or Bolhi compasses.
   Now several navigation instruments sold to the glider market include artificial horizon displays. Some cellphones and tablet computers also include such displays, though of questionable reliability. An artificial horizon is now essentially a software switch on existing instruments rather than a whole new instrument.
   This year there was a substantial discussion about this rule. Briefly, advocates of removing the rule feel that there is a safety advantage of allowing artificial horizons as a precaution in case of inadvertent loss of visual reference. Supporters of the current rule feel that truly inadvertent loss of visual reference is unheard of in contest flying, and the temptation to intentionally fly in or through clouds or rain too strong with such instruments present. Allowing such instruments would also lead to greater suspicion that others are cheating and foster an "I have to do it to keep up with the competition" mentality.

   a Do you favor removing the ban on artificial horizons?  
      RemoveBan 31%
      LeaveBanInPlace 68%

   b The RC has developed a protocol, whereby if a computer or vario with artificial horizon option is installed, it must be possible to verifiably disable that option for the duration of the contest. (Please see Restricted Device Policy) This policy requires some programming from manufacturers, and some manufacturers have been reluctant to do it.
      Do you support this policy? (If not, suggest an alternative!)
      Yes 71%
      No 27%

2. Flarm
   Power Flarm is finally here. Already, we have occasional reports that pilots have found the display of other glider’s positions useful for tactical decisions. The RC has been watchfully waiting: we want to see if such tactical information is really useful in practice, and we want to know whether pilots like or dislike any changes in the character of the race that results. The RC has explored with Flarm the possibility of “stealth mode” which would limit the range and amount of information displayed, preserving collision avoidance warnings but limiting tactical information. This would require some programming by Flarm in consultation with RC.

   a Did you fly in a contest with a Flarm this season?  
      Yes 40%
      No 60%

   b If you flew with a Flarm this season, did you find the display of tactical information useful? (If you did not fly with flarm, please leave blank.)  
      Yes 19%
      No 26%

   c If you flew in a contest with Flarms this season, do you think the Flarm display of tactical information hurt the quality of the racing experience? (If you did not fly with flarm, please leave blank.)  
      Hurts 7%
      DoesNotHurt 35%

   d Should the RC pursue a stealth mode, with verification mechanism, and encourage a regional to experiment with required stealth mode by waiver?  
      Yes 37%
      No 55%
Whether or not you flew with a Flarm this season we welcome your comments about how aggressively the RC should pursue some sort of "stealth" mode that limits tactical use of Flarm information.  

3 Radios
There has long been a ban on radio communication between pilots. The motivation is that pilots might feel intimidated if others were flying in teams, so allowing communication would be bad for participation. This restriction is increasingly hard to enforce. And pilots seem to enjoy talking to each other. A few contests have experimented by waiver with letting pilots talk, for mentoring, practicing team flying, rules simplicity, and simple enjoyment. The reception so far has been positive.

The next step is to allow CDs to allow pilot-to-pilot communication at regional contests, without needing a waiver. This would be an allowed option, and could be used for some classes and not others. It may include some guidelines on frequencies, keeping official communications accessible, etc.

Do you support allowing the option for pilot-to-pilot radio communication in regional contests?  

Yes 73%  
No 27%

4 Other devices
More and more devices allow data to flow in to the cockpit. Satellite and ADS-B weather, including radar loop and visible satellite picture, ADS-B position displays, spot, web-enhanced cell phones and tablets, etc. are all coming quickly.

Current rules ban all in-flight data reception or transmission, except Flarm and Spot. Last year's poll strongly supported the ban on weather data.

We welcome your comments on how proactive the RC should be about these developments, vs. deal with new devices as they come and pilots want to use them.  

59%

Part II. Nationals

5 Contest classes for Nationals
Over the last few years there has been substantial discussion on how to reorganize nationals to reflect declining participation, fragmentation into many classes, and the fact that pilots do not drive across the country. We would like to gauge support for some proposals. These are not exclusive. You can express support for as many options as you’d like, even if option “a” precludes option “b”.

a Leave things as they are. If classes don’t attract 8 pilots, they disappear. Co-locate small classes.  

Approve 51%  
Disapprove 30%  
Don’t Care 6%

b Split sports class into 'club' and 'modern FAI.' 'Club' allows all gliders below, say, 0.90, while 'Modern' allows all gliders but tasking and handicap adjustment stop at, say, 0.92. The two contests are co-located, and revert to a single class if less than, say, 12 pilots in each class show up.  

Approve 71%  
Disapprove 9%  
Don’t Care 6%

c Would you prefer that the "modern FAI" class in such contests allow water or to be dry?  

Water 52%  
Dry 42%

d For classes that suffer small numbers, use handicaps in a limited range to encourage pilots of older gliders to compete. (Standard nationals this year used handicaps extending down to 0.95 (LS4). Limited range means a 1-26 won’t win.)  

Approve 75%  
Disapprove 14%  
Don’t Care 4%

e When numbers in a class get small (maybe 12), or too dependent on gliders outside the class (18 or duo in open, etc.; maybe at half the entries), merge classes with handicaps in a limited range.  

Approve 72%  
Disapprove 17%  
Don’t Care 3%

f East/West nationals. 2-3 contests each year are “nationals,” and spread through the country. Every glider can attend each of these contests. These contests can have pure classes or mixed handicapped classes. However, since it is unlikely that sufficient gliders will attend to fill out all pure classes, most gliders will likely fly in mixed handicapped classes. Pure classes remain: At least one pure class contest is scheduled in each class, either at these events or at separate

Approve 63%  
Disapprove 17%  
Don’t Care 8%
events, so long as sufficient numbers participate. The US team will modify its formula for
team selection to use the results of these contests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part III. Contest Procedures and Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Sanction fee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Guest pilots</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 Finish height</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**9 Comments**

Please add any comments you wish the rules committee to consider.

| Comments regarding safety, equipment, and measures we can take to improve contest participation are particularly welcome. |
| All |
| 37% |

**Part IV. US Team Questions**

### 10 20m Participation

The Finland 2014 WGC will host the first 20m two-seater world championship, in combination with the Club and Standard classes. 20M gliders will not be handicapped. Each country will be allowed one 20m entrant. The USTC is considering the possibility of selecting a pilot to attend. Please consider the following questions to help us determine a game plan for the 20m class.

| a | Do you currently have access to a 20m two seat glider? |
| All |
| Yes 25% |
| No 72% |
| b | Do you currently race a 20m two seat glider? |
| Yes 8% |
| No 88% |
| c | If this class is started in the US nationals, or if selection for the class is made via performance flying a 20m glider at Sports nationals, would you participate? |
| Yes 16% |
| No 79% |
| d | Would you make the effort to try to qualify for team selection, and go to the worlds if selected? |
| Yes 16% |
| No 79% |

### 11 Selection

Since there is no time for the typical 3 year window to select a pilot for 2014, we would propose selecting the highest scoring 20m two seater from the 2013 Sports Class Nationals. For the 2016 WGC selection scores from 2013, 2014, and 2015 could be used. 2015 Pre-WGC attendance would be offered to the highest scoring pilot in 2014.

Should the USTC select a pilot for the 2014 WGC 20M two seat class and future WGC’s?

| Yes 67% |
| No 27% |

### 12 13.5 Participation

The one-design PW-5 WGC ends after this year in Argentina. A new 13.5m class has been designated by the IGC. Currently no WGC has been organized for this new class, which was to commence in 2015. Please consider the following questions to help us determine a game plan for the 13.5m class.

| a | Do you currently have access to a 13.5 m glider? |
| All |
| Yes 15% |
| No 82% |
| b | Do you currently race a 13.5m glider? |
| Yes 7% |
| No 89% |
| c | If this class is started in the US nationals, or selection made based on performance flying a 13.5 meter glider in sports nationals, would you participate? |
| Yes 10% |
| No 87% |
| d | Would you make the effort to try to qualify for team selection, and go to the worlds if selected? |
| Yes 10% |
| No 86% |

### 13 Selection

With no 13.5m nationals scheduled, 13.5M pilot selection would be from our US Sports Class nationals and would require flying a 13.5m glider that meets the IGC rules for the new class.

| All |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should the US send pilot(s) when a 13.5m WGC is scheduled?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Pilot selection by ranking list

Teams are now selected by performance in one class only over three years. Due to driving distances to Nationals on opposite coasts, talented pilots often don't follow their classes across the country, and this can affect the team pilot selection. The US Team Committee is considering moving to an IGC style class-independent ranking-based system, aged over a 3 (maybe 4) year window that helps to reduce this effect. It also allows pilots to significantly develop their pilot ranking without driving across the country to follow 'their' class. [RC: Such a system would also be necessary if we adopt East-West nationals or other changes.] We'd like your opinion on how such a system might be implemented. If we were to implement such a system,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Should limited-range glider handicapping apply to establish the best pilot performance? (The US team would adjust final scores of non-handicapped contests for team selection)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Some well-attended Regionals and super-regionals are as competitive as some National contests. Should these contests count more than the existing limit of 92% toward pilot ranking?</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Would you support demonstrated aptitude for team flying counting in some way toward team selection?</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Comments

Please add comments, especially on 20m class, 13.5 meter class, the use of a ranking list as part of team selection, or other issues. 43%
Allow things to evolve. You can make necessary rules later without wondering what unintended consequences have stifled advancement.

As I'm sure you know, the manufacturer strongly advises not to use stealth mode, as it may also detract from the effectiveness of safety warnings. Our game has been confronted with many new things in the past (GPS for example) that were initially resisted because of the "gamer" possibilities. In most of these cases the technology eventually was accepted as a part of the game, and life was improved, usually including a safety element.

At Parowan, I did not fly with Flarm and felt that I was at a tactical disadvantage on the more difficult days. For instance FLARM equipped ships behind me backtraked to dind lift while I wen ton and got stuck. They were only 2 miles behind me and I would have turned around had I seen that. So not having that information hurt me. I think if you allow un-fettered Flarm, then we should drop pretty much all technology restrictions and even the prohibition on Team Flying. It will change the nature of our experience, but it has not hurt elsewhere in the world.

Attempts are ongoing by LX and other vendors to turn flarm data into a sophisticated leeching tool. This is about as sporting in my view, as reading your poker opponent's cards. Flarm anti collision is a good thing. The Flarm "radar" functions, particularly if they can report well filtered climb rates, have no place in competition.

Do not limit FLARM.

Do not limit. This changes the nature of competition as did early GPS adoption, its not bad its just new. Europeans have been flying comps without stealth mode for years - why would we do it differently?

Do not pursue stealth! It is much safer to see a target comming from further away.

Do not worry about stealth mode. Let it sort out a season or two and then take a look.

Don't

Don't pursue. Flarm is the predecessor of ADS-B that will bring new tactical info into the cockpit at all time anyways. This is natural evolution, just like when GPS replaced cameras.

Don't spend much time pursuing stealth mode. The tactical advantage gained is very minor.

Dont force another instrument onto contest pilots, voluntary only please.

Flarm is a joke and should not be mandatory until and unless it becomes a useful technology.

Follow the rules that are being used throughout the world.

For safety reason do not limit the distance. We do not look only for glider but also for airplanes and jets that are much faster and they are a real problem.

Get a couple of years experience with the technology before worrying about stealth mode

Give it a try on a limited basis and check the results to verify its effectiveness.

Go with Stealth

Have a flarm not yet installed. Would not support the stealth mode. As I understand Europeans do not use stealth and have not had issues with competition. Also that is the way FAI (worlds) are done and our pilots should be used to that. Leeching has come up as an issue. Can't see that it would help that much and do not support stealth mode.

Heck no - we should encourage the use of Flarm info! More reason to have a Flarm, and help s team flying.

I accidentally made an entry in response to question 2b above and found that I could not remove an answer...it should have been left blank.

I am concerned that FLARM is another instrument that might reduce the pilot's tendency to keep scanning outside the cockpit.
I am more concerned that Flarm my actually be a distraction in the cockpit. I am also waiting to see if the display will become an available upgrade for CN, LX or other flight computers. I personally do not want any more devices in my cockpit consuming limited panel space and electrical resources.

I am not familiar enough with PF, and wonder if, or how much, a stealth mode would negate its benefits.

I believe it is still too early to understand the effect of FLARM with flying strategy

I believe there are more important issues to address such as ways to increase contest participation

I didn't see any issue that I think should be addressed by the rules committee

I do not consider this to be a high priority

I don't see this as a big issue. People can accomplish the same thing using PCAS devices, so if someone really wants to leach in this way he can.

I don't think there is so much tactical advantage from Flarm information that big swings in contest placings are likely. I also believe a modest tatical incentive for Flarm adoption is a good thing. In terms of distractions, of all the reasons too look inside the cockpit an anti collision display is about the best I can imagine. I found that tactical use of Flarm increased my enjoyment of racing by making it less solitary - you get more of a head-to-head racing experience without the congestion of calling an AST to bunch the field up.

I flew 3 contests with Power Flarm. The RC should not pursue the "stealth" mode. We do not have enough Power Flarm user data to really decide what the correct answer for the US after barely 1 season with functioning systems. We should fly for a season or 2 to see how it all works in reality. Since, the rest of the soaring world has decided to leave the "stealth" mode off (i.e. you can see your competitors in range), I think, that provides a pretty good clue about the path to take. Time will tell the correct path for the US...

I flew with FLARM in at least 6 different contests, and it alerted me to imminent head-on collision situations in at least 3 of them. FLARM has significantly improved safety of soaring contests and should be required for national contests in 2013 and in regionals in 2014. Forget 'stealth'mode - that is a stupid waste of everyone's time and energy.

I have have heard that it is not a factor in European races. Therefore I am not overly concerned. Maybe just Nats.

I have no opinion on "Stealth" mode but have a STRONG opinion that Flarm should be mandatory for all contests! (It makes just as much sense as seat harnesses, parachutes and ELTs.)

I have ordered a flarm and think that we should NOT have a stealth mode at all. SAFETY FIRST

I like the idea of Flarm for contest but not for everyday flying, a transponder has more value in flying around airspace. It would be great if someone could develop a 1202 only frequency that could installed outside the panel. Panel space for all of these instruments is really becoming an issue.

I only utilized small screen of rental FLARM. I did not rewire brick to be compatible with my SN10. It blew fuses to use SN10 power and FLARM on same circuit.

I say give it a few more contest seasons to see what issues really manifest themselves. Too early to act.

I suggest that the stealth mode should be permitted and that it allow a pilot to show his presence but not his identity

I think it would be best to assure that FLARM is working as advertised before mandating an additional level of sophistication.

I think that FLARM will proliferate. Therefore it is imperative that a stealth mode be established.

I think that the tactical advantage, if any, that accrues from the use of FLARM is a good incentive for people to invest in this new safety-enhancement technology. I personally doubt whether there is an advantage, but if so I have no problem with accepting the necessary changes in tactics in order to gain the extra collision-avoidance assistance.

I think we need to get it working first and solve antennae problems

I would be dismayed to see the rules committee spending time on pursuing something that reduces a pilot's situational awareness. Indeed, I actually found that the increased awareness of the choices other pilots were making enhanced the overall racing experience.

I would prefer we follow current FAI rules regarding FLARM. If internationally the stealth mode is favored, then lets go that direction. Otherwise, no.

If pilots want stealth they can turn it on.

If we are migrating towards the day when Flarm (or equiv) will be required equipment in competition, then leave this issue alone. Eventually the FLARM feedback of other gliders for tactical use will become a part of the sport.

It is crystal clear that FLARM has significant tactical implications which have become obvious as more people become familiar. Look at reports from Uvalde. So, we need admit this and take a call. If we don't go to Stealth mode, then FLARM becomes another "must have" to be competitive.

It is my opinion that the information available from FLARM is not useful enough to significantly affect competition so stealth mode isn't necessary. I think more contest experience with FLARM is needed before rules are changed. There will not be a stealth mode for ADS-B data.

It is not enforceable. Just Accept exisance of technology and adapt to that ( think of it being just flaps or spoilers)

It simply is not that important. You can see gliders in front of you within the range of the the Flarm.

Leave the stealth option to pilot discretion.

Limit all tactical capabilities of Flarm in competition.

May be useful tactically with better displays. But I would allow it.

More head down in the cockpit time will not help our sport.
No aggression at all from RC. Whether Flarm, PCAS, SPOT track reader or some other object sensing device, some pilot is going to use the information to know where pilots are tracking. We already use one sensing device, our eyes. My position is to not pursue any special programming demands on mfg of instruments limiting their capabilities.

**No stealth**

Not a big deal, I prefer to make my own decisions rather than chasing other's.

Not at all. Flarm is a big step forward and we should not try to handicap it before it even starts.

Not very. From what I can tell the Power Flarm needs to go through another generation before I'd use it. Better, less obnoxious antenna set up. Smaller brick. Just looks like a prototype now.

Please consider what other countries allow or restrict.

Prefer stealth mode, but wonder about future adsb devices. Will stealth mode be required and will that make them more expensive and/or delay deployment?

Real Problem with FLARM is antenna in pilots filed of view. To have an antenna in the field of view for collision avoidance is dumb. Work on a better location vice stealth mode. Safety First!

Stealth has proven fairly hopeless in Europe to implement, and not really required. Please dont go down this rat hole - you will add lots of work for organizers for no good reason. Please!

Stealth mode has been available in Europe et al for many years. It is rarely used. the range of Flarm is about the same as the eye can see.

Stealth mode should be required at all contests.

Stealth mode. I am not interested in flying contests where pilots follow each other around electronically. I would find it boring and anti-competitive. I would switch to OLC flying.

The RC should neither mandate or ban a Stealth Mode at this time. Wait until further adoption of Flarm and see if a competitive "problem" actually develops.

The contest I flew in with Flarm, I was the only Flarm equipped glider, so can't really comment on the tactical advantage. The flarm is supposed to be a safety device not a tactical device. Stop this head in cockpit trend!

The information is available to all pilots and is unlikely to change racing outcome. The RC should just adapt to the new reality instead of fighting progress in instrumentation.

The safety aspect outweighs any small advantage given.

There are more important things to focus on like racing participation

This is tricky... tactical info should be limited and perhaps to different levels depending whether you are seeing info from a teammate or an adversary.

Too early to pursue limitations. First priority is to encourage widespread FLARM use!

Too many modes makes this too complicated. Keep it simple. Don't suppress information that is available.

Unfortunately every discussion I've heard on this issue quickly becomes heated. I've heard from some pilots that have used FLARM that the alerts generated by circling ships are not reliable or useful - still in cruising/porpoising it may be worth the effort. I would not like to see more equipment requirements pricing people out of regional contests.

Very aggressively.

Very aggressively. Ban the use of LK8000. FLARM should be used, and provide, collision avoidance information only during US Nationals. Full up Flarm sharing of tactical information at ranges well beyond visual contact range would be of Zero interest to me. I'd rather buy a motor-glider and go OLCing instead.

Very aggressively

Wait to hear if pilots complain that flarm is causing problems.

We need more time to evaluate Flarm before deciding if we need a stealth mode.

We should allow tactical use of Flarm. This would encourage universal adoption of Flarm!

We should note that these are intended to be safety devices. Perhaps we should also ban pilots with 20/8 vision...

What I am hearing from vendors is "this will change competitive soaring as you can see other gliders of choice and their climb rates!" Also, "its completely useless when thermaling with others in a gaggle." Electronic soaring should be left to Condor. Looking outside and keeping distractions low and keeping one looking outside should be encouraged. Should we applaud the winner of a regional or national who found the best climb using Power Flarm...I hope not. I can almost hear the daily winner of a regional or national..." well, I started a little after the top guns, my WizeNav showed the course and arrival altitude of the one who had the best climb. It even set my best MC speed for me to fly to get their. After that great climb, It again picked up which glider to follow showing the least amount of sink between thermals. Finally, after cruising for 150 miles, I got low, maybe around 6,000 agl, so took another climb, which my PF showed and WizNav said would help my speed even more!! Boy, did I kick ass." Ya, baby, just what competitive soaring needs!

Why should you deviate from the rest of the world, once more; and therefore handicap your own pilots at international level competition?

Without stealth remaining competitive requires looking at Flarm. More dangerous and not as much fun. Flarm already has a verifiable stealth mode.

You are missing the point. Is Flarm a real safety asset. Every flight I had where others had Flarms there was considerable radio chatter about seeing each other and how far out they could see. This means they had their heads/eyes in the cockpit looking at the Flarm screen when they should have been looking outside. Seeing someone 6
miles out and watching them means less time outside the cockpit where ships without Flarm are the real issue. They are useless in a gaggle. I think they are a real safety hazard to the sport and now we come to the issue of using them as a tactical instrument which means even more time looking in the cockpit. We hear about alleged ‘safes’ from mid airs but how many of these would have not happened anyway if the pilots had been looking outside!!!

aggressively
bigger fish to fry
do not ban the flarm capabilities or any of its functions allow the manufactures and pilots to do what they will with its functions we should not be afraid of new technology instead we should embrace it and be to leaders to the soaring world in how it is used
dont waste your time. stop doing things that mean so little so most pilots. flarm should be mandatory.
s
slowly
the range of the flarm is such that nearby circling gliders are visible anyway, distant gliders are too far away for the lift to be guaranteed useful - it does add some extra racing information that enhances the race experience.

there are FLARM-tied displays out there that provide tactical information, such as climb rates of other gliders.

b:
What other uses of sanction fee money would you like to see? (Some suggestions: support younger pilots, allow contest sites to apply for infrastructure upgrades, support teams)

1) Scholarship for new pilots 2) Subsidize Continental Championships (high FAI fees) 3) Developmental Racing Camps

? Anything to attract new pilots, improve relationships with hosting communities, infrastructure improvements

Apply to US Team
Basic business principal: you get more of what you subsidize, and less of what you 'tax'!! Why not allow/encourage organizers to make MORE money!? More contests like the 'Seniors' or Hilton Cup might spring up.

Better scoring s/w and internet coverage of contests

Bring younger pilots into competition flying

Budget insurance is a bad idea. Will lead to more blown budgets.

Contest fees should primarily support contests and their sites. General benevolence should come from the general soaring pilot, not from specific contest fees.

Develop racing by paying for a teacher at the Super Regionals.

Don't see any obvious use other than to cover office expenses or unexpected shortfalls. If surplus persists cut fee.

Facilities upgrades.

Flarm rental units. Encourage new racers.

Fund the US teams to the Worlds. We should have an endowment large enough to pay for each member to go to the worlds if we limit the classes and build the fund.

Hard to say without knowing what the sanction fees are used for today. Why not make that transparent, so folks like me can answer this question more knowledgeably?

I don't know how much money we are talking about, but in general I would support encouraging younger pilots and supporting the USA national soaring teams.

I propose sanction fees be waived for any contest that brings in "N" "new" pilots who get scored on at least 65% of valid contest days. N can be chosen, "new" can be defined (not necessarily 1st contest only) and rule fine tuned after a little examination of recent history.

I would prefer it be used to offset contest site expenses.

If a site can't draw an adequate number of entrants, it should not be subsidized and continued as a contest sight. Example is Montague. It is a great place to fly, but very difficult area and tasking is over the top. I prefer supporting locations that people WANT to fly at and are comfortable in flying at instead of someone tossing out a bid at a poor drawing site and the SSA underwriting it. Put the extra funding towards the national team and team flying seminars.

If there has been an excess then lower the sanction fee to make contests more affordable.

Improve insurance coverage for contest organizers

It is very difficult to break even running contest when much of the infrastructure must be brought in just for the contest. The sanctions fees should be eliminated by waiver and if there is money from previous it should be used for establishing new contest sites, XC camps etc

Junior Support/ Entry Reduction.

Junior support

Lower fees for low budget pilots perhaps a two tier fee system with lower fees for pilots flying gliders over 30 years old.
Marketing/PR, youth/scholarship support, world-championships training & expenses.

N/A

No opinion

None, lower the prices.

O

Other suggestions: support for tow pilot expenses due to the need to fly in tow pilots to support the contest.

Pay off debt and once that's done reduce the sanction fee to minimum possible.

Pay the FAI sanction fee

Put surplus into the general SSA Budget.

Reduce SSA Membership Fees.

Reduce Sanction Fees

Reduce sanction fees to eliminate the small surplus, then no need to figure out other things to spend it on. The purpose of the sanction fees is to offset SSA office expenses associated with contests. Why expand its scope?

Reimbursement of travel expenses for USA reps for IGC meetings. Coffee and donuts at SSA yearly bash when competition pilots have morning beanfeast.

SSA purchase flowers for contestant funerals

Safety related expenditures.

Sanction fees should be used by the SSA as working capital for contests awards and supplies.

Sanction fees shouldn't exist. Let the club hosting the race have ALL the money from the contest.

Subsidize junior entries into contests. Subsidize organizational costs for camps.

Support Junior pilots by subsidizing their entry, and tow fees (if applicable)

Support U.S. entries into worlds

Support US Team!

Support XC camps for newer pilots. Bonus if these could occur just before or after a contest and might involve having some contest pilots do a day or two of mentoring.

Support team training

Support teams

Support teams.

Support to contest organizers. A paid traveling road group with many contest assets. A contest in a van/box. Make is simple to organize a contest.

Support young pilots

Support younger pilots

Support younger pilots, XC camps and the like

Supporting under 21 year old contest pilots

Team practice camps (with enlarged participation of top-level pilots beyond Team members); Team coach; basic non-site specific racing infrastructure such as scales, scales shipment to sites, calibration;

The sanction fee should be reviewed each year and every effort made to "break even - or accumulate a small surplus"

There seems to be a disconnect between contest reports. Get it fixed.

Tow pilot 'show-up' compensation.

Training camps

US Team Fund

US Team Support

US Team support

Use for supporting younger pilots

Use of sanction fees for XC and/or soaring camps introduces new pilots to racing. Build the youth. Sites should provide their own infrastructure to be considered as contest sites. After all they make money.

Use the money to offset entry fees to encourage participation. The goal is to increase overall pilot participation rather than just encourage young pilots.

XC Camp support, as was done for the highly successful CCSC XC camp this year

Youth Rider programs

Camps

all of the above?
assess the surplus at end of year and reduce/increase contest sanction fees. This is seen as simply overhead to the expense of setting up contests.

cover extra cost of international contest in US. lets start with Perry.

flarms

for a) above, I would say "yes" for subsidizing Nats below 18 contestants.

infrastructure upgrades

lower the sanction fee's. lower contest costs.

offset cost of flarm rentals, support younger pilots

reduce sanction fee if there is a surplus

sponsor xc seminars

support remote contest sites

support younger pilots and support teams

support younger pilots, allow contest sites to apply for infrastructure upgrades

supported advertising of contests and perhaps sponsored rides at local sites after contest ships are out on course

team and pilot development camps

upgrades

Answers to long responsive questions.

We welcome your comments on how proactive the RC should be about these developments, vs. deal with new devices as they come and pilots want to use them.

Too much info keeps pilot head in the cockpit and not looking outside.

1. Allow artificial horizons which can be switched on/off by the pilot. But they must set a bit on each GPS point recorded while the artificial horizon is active. 3. I usually switch the radio off, since all the irrelevant talk is a distraction.

4. Racing is where new devices and technologies are truly put to the test and honed in many industries. Also, many companies do not cater to US glider pilots. Therefore it is my opinion that a technology should be evaluated for safety and impact on competition but the focus should be on allowance in the lower ranks without losing focus for ensuring that our top pilots and contests comply with and focus on international regulations. It is very common to see top, evolving technology in the lower ranks of other sports but not see it at the top levels where they can support that burden for enforcement and deal with far fewer contestants i.e video cameras for monitoring in each vehicle is not uncommon and adds to fan excitement. 1b. The suggested alternative is to allow them as enforcement will prove to be more and more difficult with more standard aviation programs and devices including AH's. We should all note that their intention is safety. 3. I believe that if we want to lure more contestants we need to make regional contests more inviting. Part of this involves more local events that last fewer days with shorter tasks. This would also encourage better/more improved pilots to pursue national contests. The other part involves allowing a run-what-you-brung mentality and ensuring contestants that they are not out there alone. I should also note that there were times during both of the regionals that I flew in where contestants broke the radio comm. rules but it was ignored because of other pilots understanding and trying to help novices...did I mention safety earlier? Which is safer- well informed and communicating pilots or pilots operating in the dark that are separated by formats and rules? I can tell you that the blue days and smoke days I saw threw many, otherwise very successful, rules/separation formats out the window.

Accept technology. It does not change the sport. A person most adept in using all sorts of information wins. The problem is that technology increases cost and is becoming prohibitive limiting participation. Equipment rental at contest solves this to some, but very minimal extent because of mounting issues.

Again, allowing more stuff in the ship that will interfere with the pilot paying attention to what is going on outside is a negative safety issue. Remember how we were happy to get rid of charts and cameras. I do not see this as a good move to allow more stuff that will cause pilots to have their eyes inside!!!!

Allow ADS-B for collision avoidance. Don't allow weather.

Allow everything. Stop trying to over-enforce unenforceable rules that are so minor.

Allow use of such aids in the same manner they are allowed ( or not allowed ) in International contesting.

Allowing radio communication between pilots will allow to transmit information about a weather. At the same time the radio communication will be allowed, any devices that display weather information should be allowed as well.

Although I didn't get into the sport until after the photo generation, I seem to recall a huge controversy over GPS devices and moving map/PDA devices which, in turn, were all predicted to be "the death of the sport". I think the introduction of new technology into the cockpit will be better for the sport rather than worse, and with the exception of blind-flying instrumentation (by definition a violation of FARs) should not be discouraged.

As I'd mentioned in the past, I think the first and most important thing to do is to develop a few high-level principles that guide decisions. Once those are agreed to, individual devices/technologies either do or don't support those principles. At the rate that location/communication/display technologies are moving, we will never be able to deal with them on a case-by-case basis.

At this time I support continuing the ban especially with respect to real-time weather in the cockpit. If two way radio telcom is allowed, then we should consider allowing cell phone use. Let's wait and see how this revolution develops.
Ban all electronic gizmos that replace eyes and brains, except for Flarm. Restrict Flarm information to collision avoidance only.

Ban weather data. However, how you do this I do not know. It seems like we are unable to continue to define our sport independent of the flood of technology. Just because it is technologically feasible and practical, does not necessarily mean it should be part of our sport. We should get to define the sporting parameters of sailplane racing.

Continue the ban on in-flight data reception. Racing and soaring generally is becoming an information technology driven sport. If in-flight data reception is allowed it becomes an arms race.

Deal with new devices as they come and only if they become a problem.

Deal with new devices as they come. And, the sport is fundamentally changing as data becomes so readily available to the cockpit. Why artificially constrain it?

Deal with them as requested.

Do not allow

Do not impede technology.

Enable them - it's inevitable that they show up in the cockpit environment eventually.

Even with more equipment and data in the cockpit, pilots still have to make decisions. There's been no time when we weren't making more sophisticated decisions than in previous times! Call it progress. Something we don't want to hinder. I do have concerns over pilot workload and consequent inattention. Perhaps a rule that any equipment to be used in the cockpit must be permanently installed. No fumbling with an iPad or other while thermalling. Only issue: smartphones.

Good luck boys. It's cheating and that's costly.

Having weather data in the cockpit increases safety. Those who want to use it will use it anyways. You can't block someone from having an iPhone and getting weather data from that. Of a pilot wants to see if storms are building up ahead, for havens sale, allow them to!

Hopefully the ability to see the weather on a smart devise won't do to the ability of a pilot to compete based on his interpretation of the sky what GPS did to the pilots need to be able to compete based on his ability to navigate.

I am for the ban on in flight weather etc, due to reasons of costs and distractions.

I am sure that there are contests in Thunderstorm prone areas that might yield a benefit to the pilot with the most data. I think the effort involved to police and restrict it far outweighs the risk of that techie pilot being able to use the advantage for the win. Most tactical decisions need to happen in pretty much real time and I'm not sure that the delays would be worthwhile.

I support the use of weather type information as it may increase safety and is commonly available (ie not cost prohibitive). I would not mind team flying at a regional contest but at a nationals, I believe it would give teams too much of an advantage and someone of similar skill/investment would not be competitive any longer.

I believe that access to real time weather data is a legitimate safety issue and should be allowed.

I believe that receiving wx info via these devices should be prohibited. As a safety issue, there is already too much going on in the cockpit that detracts from visual monitoring for traffic.

I believe these to be distractions to flying a sailplane safely and should not be permitted. The mandatory use of SPOT should be considered for safety reasons as well as allowing interested parties to view in real time the progress of the race.

I do not believe permanent cockpit display of artificial horizon should be allowed. However I carry a Garmin Pilot III as a backup GPS. It does have an artificial horizon but it is a handheld device. I think a person who flies in IMC other than emergency should be heavily penalized.

I do not believe they guy with a big pocket book should be allowed any major tactical advantages. I really don't have any idea how the RC is going to be able to fairly limit technology in the cockpit. Difficult question.

I feel that bans on the use of technologies are not in the best interest of the sport: - They may have a negative impact on safety - They are difficult or impossible to enforce - They do nothing to encourage wider participation -- in fact the opposite is true

I just don't see how it will all be enforced without grid cops. I would rather pilots had their heads out and watching FLARMS, but I can't see banning all this new technology. Might be useful for avoiding t-storms and enhancing safety.

I support ban

I support keeping the ban on in-flight reception or transmission, unless a good case can be made for increased safety.

I support the ban in principle. However, enforcement is simply infeasible and listening to the incessant whining of infants, er, advocates is becoming tiresome. So I am conflicted on this issue. The time lag associated with availability of satellite and radar data on ADDS (typically 15 - 30 minutes) makes this particular source pretty harmless tactically, however I don't like the thought of the connection-obsessed crowd staring at screens instead of the sky, flarm or no flarm. It is likely that in the future, this time lag will decrease, making the information available more useful. Maybe. My observation is that we have gotten so conservative on tasking in anything other that totally robust weather than often as not one can see most of the task area in real time simply by looking out the window.

I support the current ban because the cost of equipment to participate in contests is already very high. Allowing more devices will require more money else fly at a disadvantage.

I support the current rules banning data reception or transmission except FLARM and Spot. ADS-B position displays should be allowed just as FLARM is allowed.
I think this ban is going to become very difficult to enforce. While I don't support inflight information-display (due to the safety concern of having too much "head-down" time) it's going to be tough to police. I favor keeping the current bans and dealing with challenges as they arrive.

I think we should deal with each new development as it comes and invite debate and discussion on it before voting. I would find weather data useful and so far only cost and power consumption have prevented me from adopting a device. This is likely to change pretty quickly, looking at how the market is developing. Avoiding active thunderstorms and other weather would be made easier. I cannot see that banning devices in contests when they become readily and cheaply available would be the best option for the RC - the same attitude I have to artificial horizons. (I did once descend through cloud with the aid of a turn-and-bank indicator when I got trapped over a deck of stratus). Embrace new technology, don't fight it!

I would prefer to have all pilots race with the information that is available at the pilots meeting.

I would sure like to be able to use my Doppler Weather available on my cell phone. If technology brings simplification and less hardware in the cockpit, that is what I want. Today, my panel is full!!

I've had several flights this season where weather data would have helped avoid a landout. Might be interesting to allow this at some regionals and see what the comments are. On the other hand that's another thing that will keep eyes in the cockpit and not outside where they belong.

In my humble opinion, even though most flying is non-contest, the instrument panels of many ships reflect contest thinking. ADS-b would, importantly, make a glider visible to commercial (and soon, GA) aircraft. This is a GOOD THING! We should all be gearing up for ADS-b, and I intend to do so this winter. If that instrument makes me non-compliant with contest rules, then I simply won't fly in a contest. I have come too close to GA and commercial and military traffic too many times. I want to be visible and I will soon make the changes.

In my opinion it is going to be difficult to ban each new thing. I personally think weather data is useful and potentially adds to safety. Although I cannot receive it with my current instruments - I would support allowing weather data...

It is becoming impossible to enforce and is only a matter of time till this rule is changed. In flight weather will eventually become the norm for contest flying. Maybe not yet but the day will come...

It is going to be costly, but, unfortunately, I think it is inevitable...

It is impossible to ban weather data given the number of smartphone apps available. Thus we should allow such data so as not to "advantage" those lacking the integrity to follow the ban.

It is my opinion that such devices are distracting pilots similar to cell phones being used by automobile drivers. The use of such devices compromises safety.

It seems like the cockpit is becoming more and more stuffed with electronic gadgets. I do not want to sound like a purist but I do not advocate getting more instruments into the cockpit to watch.

It's coming, but I do not welcome it. Again, more head down in the cockpit time. However, we now allow listening to AWOS or ASOS. The question is: how far are we willing to go? Let's draw the line for now at information that is critical to safety.

Keep ban in place for now but prepare for future acceptance.

Keep the ban. If a pilot is using unapproved equipment in flight, then that pilot should be banned from the contest immediately. Approximately 50% of phone users do NOT have a smart phone. If we were to support the use of inflight data through these devices, that means that a person would need to plunk down up to $600 annually to keep such devices active. That additional expense is not necessary for a fair and equatable race. Also, I would temper my comments by going along with the current FAI ruling used in Europe.

Keep the weather devices out until the weather services become cheap.

Larger screen android phones with capability for real time wx updates are basically here already. In my opinion these are of limited use except in extreme weather cases. In extreme weather cases these devices may be a useful safety enhancement, allowing knowledge of the extent of certain wx phenomena. Right now the integration of real time wx with PDA displays for example, is possible but hasn't been implemented by the soaring Android SW vendors to my knowledge - But it will come for sure.

Let pilots use all the information available!

Let's allow all new technology in the cockpit. I probably will not fly a contest in the future as I prefer to have up-to-date technology in my glider without having to disable it. Let's get our rules current with the new technology.

Maintain ban for now

Maintain the ban on in-cockpit data.

More devices to look at should be restricted for safety. Additional devices will take pilot's eyes into the cockpit. I see an opportunity to watch the downloads at the expense of using the eyes to avoid other gliders.

New technologies always bring new capabilities. Each has to be evaluated as to its desirability for the racing environment. Go slow with them and be sure that they add to the experience and not just a way to make racing more expensive. The greater expense limits participation in racing.

No change! Increased access would just give techies an advantage and keep eyes in the cockpit.

No radio reception of weather data or any other data.

Not pro-active. Patience is best. Leave ban in place to maintain leveled field in contests. Changing these rules too soon would force these pilots who don't have them yet to purchase devices to remain competitive in contests. Essentially, allowing them would be equivalent to mandating them for competitiveness. Safety benefits in contests of such weather-
receiving/transmitting devices haven’t been shown. The choice of equipping gliders with such weather-receiving
devices should be left to the pilots, not forced by a mandate of the RC without well-proven safety benefits to
contests.

OK to use them, just not in contests!

Open the 20m two-seat class to all data and devices. Use this class to test and develop the new technology that will
ultimately advance our sport. Thermal detectors should ultimately be more important than satellite images and
weather radar. This is where they should be tried. If we won’t evolve with this technology, a new sport will arise in
place of what exists today. Why the 20m two-seat class? Safety - there are two sets of eyeballs. The backseater
can take the role of the Flight Information Officer. Load factor - the span can support lots of battery weight.
Cost - if you can afford an Arcus you can afford some very cool electronics. You aren’t forcing someone racing a
Cirrus to spend more than the glider is worth on gizmos. I despair that there are too few 20m two-place ships, but
look at all the new open class ships that have suddenly appeared. Imagine how many people you could develop
into cross-country pilots if there was a fleet of high performance two place ships doing things that had never been
done before.

Our game has been confronted with many new things in the past (GPS for example) that were initially resisted
because of the “gamer” possibilities. In most of these cases the technology eventually was accepted as a part of the
game, and life was improved, usually including a safety element.

Outside information should not be allowed during contest flying.

Overly complicated rules lead to loss of interest in racing. Make the rules simple - people who want to cheat will do
so anyway. The top pilots win anyway regardless of gadgets and gizmos.

Philosophically I feel that all data should be OK. However, there are concerns about cost and pilot distraction.
Pilot growth along with increased soaring skills, including meteorology which give the riches human reward is what
should be encouraged. Electronic growth is only for the manufacturer’s and vendors who are making the bucks. Its
best to remember, any sport that “races” has risk. That risk is what needs to be better understood and accepted by
all rather than stuffing the cockpit with more and more electronics. Also, don’t fall into the RAS ranks, you should
have more esteem than that.

Pilots talking is very distracting. It will promote some of us to turn off the radio and thus we may miss a warning from
another glider or announcement from CD You cannot prevent pilots from viewing weather. It is readily available on
cell phones. Since Wx is available to all pilots, it should be allowed. It is also a safety enhancement to be able to
see t-storms developing.

Please, Please, Please, keep it a soaring competition and not tech battle won by the be$$t panel installation. The
cost of a good racing panel is already into 5 digits, no more gadgets, keep your friggen eyes outside and go race.
Prohibit all except those directly associated to safety

Question is, how are you going to stop it? I don’t like the ever increasing distractions in the cockpit. But all this tech
is getting small enough folks will never know if it is being used.

Re 3 Radios I support pilot-to-pilot communication providing that the pilots talks on a “public” frequency accessible
by all the pilots

Receiving and displaying weather information can enhance flight safety and should be allowed. Getting weather
information over the radio is of course already possible and is not far removed from seeing inclement or favorable
weather on a screen.

Regarding AH devices, the SSA RC should follow the FAI. In 2012 at the WGC the local rules section 4.1.2.
prohibited the use of these devices.

Reminds me of GPS ban. In my history of flying, instruments have increased the enjoyment and discovery of flying.
It seems we are limiting our full experience of this time limited sport. I suggest the RC use regionals more for
removing such bans, opening up the use of instrumentation, and be open minded to what might be discovered with
less rules.

Right now, keep ban on inflight data reception - due to cost. Eventually, if it becomes simple and cheap, and
common among XC pilots - then allow it for racing.

Stay on top of coming devices and do not let them adversely affect the character of the sport

The RC should continue to ban these devices. Every device requires displays in the cockpit and we needs heads
and eyes outside.

Take it easy, wait for request to use devices or complaints that others are doing so.

The RC actions to date have been appropriate, I currently support the ban on inflight data reception, but think we
need to keep evaluating the rule as technology changes and becomes more affordable.

The competition is more interesting when it is pilot against pilot. The RC should stick to the philosophy of one pilot’s
wit vs. another’s. The RC should not let data collected, organized and analyzed by others enter into the competition.

Data should be limited to what can be collected from immediate vicinity of the glider plus certain fixed database
items like turn points and terrain. Team flying, firem following, and external weather data all detract from the
competition experience. These subjects are related to our obsession with doing better at the world competitions. We
are trying to keep up with the Europeans by changing our rules. Let’s keep our rules based on the best possible
competition and not follow the “anything goes” mentality of the European gliding community. P.S. The reason we do
poorly at the world level is a lack of a proper cross country development program for our youth. Not enough of our
young pilots have access to gliders and competitions while they’re still young. Most people do not get to cross
country soaring until they are mid thirties and employed in a good job. They are not ready until for international
competition until forty plus years old. This leaves a short window until they are too old. No world champions to
date older then 50- some years old, I believe.

There are at least three considerations at work: (1) Safety: Having weather info in the cockpit could enhance
safety. This is a plus. (2) Enforceability of a ban: Given what smart phones can now do, its going to be hard to
enforce a ban if someone wants to cheat and the rules bar the devices. (3) Giving an advantage to competitors
who can see where the "good" weather is: Only #3 is a minus from the competition point of view, and it won't
mean to much except in tasking that allows wide choices (big turn areas for example). Thus I think the factors
weigh in favor of allowing weather depiction electronics in the cockpit.

There is no practical way to enforce the ban. Stop pissing into the wind and allow onboard weather.

There are at least three considerations at work: (1) Safety: Having weather info in the cockpit could enhance
safety. This is a plus. (2) Enforceability of a ban: Given what smart phones can now do, its going to be hard to
enforce a ban if someone wants to cheat and the rules bar the devices. (3) Giving an advantage to competitors
who can see where the "good" weather is: Only #3 is a minus from the competition point of view, and it won't
mean to much except in tasking that allows wide choices (big turn areas for example). Thus I think the factors
weigh in favor of allowing weather depiction electronics in the cockpit.

There is no practical way to enforce the ban. Stop pissing into the wind and allow onboard weather.

There should be NO ban on pilot collecting weather data with any device they wish to use. The rule now is
impossible to enforce.

These devices provide an unfair advantage for those that can afford them. They should still be banned. The
except to this is if they are allowed in the rest of the world, then we need to allow them here to stay competitive
on an international level.

These new devices should not be restricted for any competition.

WX information will not hurt anyone, if systems are available why not use them... as a matter of fact it could be
safer to know about it.

Weather data should be available. This rule was created many years ago when cockpit weather data required
expensive instruments. This gave an advantage to pilots with money for these expensive instruments. Now
weather is available on a smart phone to everyone and this rule is senseless. Regarding 1(d) above, my
suggested policy is to rely on the trust of the pilots at regional and national competitions. This is mute at the
world level because US rules differ from IGC rules. I would like to see some effort by the SSA and the RC to
lobby the IGC to modernize their rules.

Well, I guess as a relatively new pilot to the national racing scene I'm going to be unpopular. I'm strongly in
favor of letting pilots use whatever information is available, including streaming weather. Furthermore, how
would the rules committee credibly enforce this--ban me from carrying my iPhone/Android/Windows phone?
Furthermore, broadly unenforceable rules are open to abuse--real or perceived--because they will always be
seen to be applied selectively. The assumption will generally be: Everyone else is doing it, rule or no rule, so
why did the contest organizers choose to single out that pilot?

What do we want to measure in contests?

With so many sources of information now available, I think that RC should allow reception of weather data
You are not going to stop technology; it is inevitable. It should be welcomed. Much new technology enhances
safety as well. Lift the entire silly ban on in-flight data reception or transmission and don't squander SSA time
and money on "dealing with it" on a case-by-case basis. If contests didn't allow technological progress we
would all still be flying wood and fabric!

again we should embrace new technology not discourage it or live in the dark ages it's time to step up and be a
real leader in the soaring world

allow them
continue to BAN .

deal with new devices as they come and pilots want to use them.
i'm happy with the current rule as-is.

impartial - it is probably going to happen eventually.

it is very important to maintain the requirements that a pilot shall not receive info from the ground during the
flight. just. Because it is possible should not be a reason to allow something. Feel that the use of any
electronic devices which obtain ground based info should be prohibited. For instance cell phones can certainly
be turned off and hopefully placed in non in-flight accessible locations. it is probably not needed to get crazy
about policing this. if someone wishes to cheat, preventing it is going to be hard.

it would be nice if we could push this off to another frequency.

keep the band in effect

no opinion

Comments regarding safety, equipment, and measures we can take to improve contest participation are particularly welcome.

I for one see no real correlation between handicapping and participation. it is sort of accepted that there is a connection as a
matter of faith. I Ask that we monitor the entrants of contests which have gone to handicapping very carefully. I believe it does not
increase entrant numbers. it does help in contests where no class is possible due to low participation. Feel it is possible that it
actually reduces participation. I for one will go way out of my Way to not attend a handicapped contest. that. Was the choice of my
local regional this year. I wentTo a different contest elsewhere. Do not make such structural changes to the way we race
assuming that. It will improve participation. it is not a given that participation will improve. it. Is very. Likely to backfire. regarding
As evidenced at the Perry Rules Meeting, pilots are in favor of eliminating the requirement that you must land at the finish. The idea of Many nationals on both coasts to let everyone fly in nationals is silly. Calling it one is politically correct but it is still merely a glider race with just a few of the "big guys". The issue of what happens to national races due to the modern pilots inability/unwillingness to drive cross country will sort itself out. If people continue to not drive the nationals will become less important. For one thing they will recombine into a single 75 person contest containing multiple classes. This would be economically viable and preserve the nationals as a real contest. It should probably be in a central location.

While the very competent racing pilot can usually accurately assess the finish height problem, the aspiring pilot often cannot. Let's not undo the safety benefits of the present rule. Keep it relatively simple and absolute.

- Consider using true handicap values for each glider type and model. A German DAcC handicap list could be used as a starting point. - Consider combining Open and 18m class into one class "Open with handicaps". Rationale: not enough open class pilots; small difference in performance - Consider combining 15m and Standard class into one class "15m with handicaps". Rationale: not enough Standard class pilots; small difference in performance

1. We need to raise the minimum from 8 to 15 or more for a class. If they can not field a class for three years the class should be dropped. It is time for Standard class to be merged with 15M and eliminated. Open should likely be dropped as well. The US should support Club, 15M and 18M an no other classes. Stronger competition in fewer classes will make our teams stronger and more competitive on the international level. More competitive racing will attract more pilots.

- Everyone getting a gold star in their own class discourages pilots from racing. 2. Please do an East/West nationals and a pilot ranking system that includes scores from all contests and classes. 3. Consider a North America championship with Canada and Mexico.

1B. Don't mess with the 'manufactures'. 6B. Help the organizers MAKE money. More incentive! Lighten up on the Taxing and the Heavy Handed bureaucracy.

8b. Does this mean for a 500 AGL resulting altitude, the finish height would be set to 800 AGL? I find the higher the finish ring height, the harder it is to eyeball judge the final glide and more time is required on the computer screen. IE 1000 AGL, in my opinion, is too high. 500-600 ft AGL at 1 mile is reasonable. If the finish ring is centered on a point at the middle of the runway, this gives an added safety margin.

A consideration might be: If they are not going to make it they are not going to make it. Therefore we are assuming a field near the finish cylinder, a pilot with enough altitude to land at the field near the cylinder and that they may be playing with points and finish altitudes in their head. This rule might lead to an off field landing as the pilot struggles to gain altitude outside the cylinder i.e. we have just established a no-fly cylinder near the best field. This could be taken into account with task planning but I believe that it is not ideal.

Add a box to the online contest application to apply to rent a Flarm and have it delivered in time to install before the competition.

An entry fee including ten tows, using three, and denied a refund does not encourage future contest participation. Ignoring rule 13.3 tends to raise an eyebrow.

Any rule that penalizes a pilot performing a worm-burning low finish gets my vote!

As a process, I think the RC should establish high-level priorities each year and ensure that more energy goes into those that bubble up the list. For instance, the whole artificial horizon issue, while indicative of a larger, looming issue, was a waste of a lot of emotional energy IMO. If pilots understood "what's hot/what's not" on the RC agenda, then maybe we could channel pilot energy. As a for instance, I think we've gone overboard in "social engineering" safety such that certain rules are creating unintended consequences (e.g. setting the top of the start height well below cloud base has spawned new and possibly more dangerous behaviors). Point being, we seem to get wrapped up in some pretty silly debates while the bigger problem - significant decrease in participation in many contests - gets less energy.

As evidenced at the Perry Rules Meeting, pilots are in favor of eliminating the requirement that you must land at the finish airport. Once you legally enter the finish cylinder the race should be over.

Currently Hobbs is considered a "Central" contest site. Moriarty (which is only a few hundred miles northwest of Hobbs) should be given the same consideration for the same reasons.

Disqualify or end flight points when thermaling below 'x' altitude AGL.

Don't allow FLARM Antennas in field of Vision!

Due to low participation the RC has suggested several new rules (ie: complicated scoring of low finishes, Handicap all Regional, mixed classes in Nationals, East-West nationals). What is not realised is that some of the low participation is due to all of the rule changes.

Eliminate the 200 foot finish rule. Thanks to the Rules Committee members for their work.

Eliminate the 500' minimum altogether

Finish height: any downward change to the rule adds risk to the rest of the contestants. I do not like someone else determining my risk level, especially at the last minute. In fact, to reduce risk to the field, the finish height could be RAISED! Then, everyone would have the space to fly an actual pattern, just as common sense would dictate at a crowded airport. Also, the finish height could be within a range but determined for each contest by the CD based upon the size of the field of contestants.

FLARM should provide collision avoidance only. It should not be connected to a PDA/PNA that may be running 3rd party software that aggressively (does not respect the Stealth Flag) acquires and displays non-threat FLARM data for tactical processing and display. PERIOD. Our goal should be to keep the eyes outside until the FLARM goes beep, quick look inside, than back out to avoid. Not eyes inside buried in the drool cup of info overload. FLARMS connected to PDA/PNAs running LK8000 will guarantee that some FLARMS will be turned off by some competitors. I can think of many scenarios where I would feel pressure to turn it off, and I would.
Finish cylinder needs to be rethought. Options above do not solve issues. Eliminate step functions in points below pattern altitude. Mandate cylinder finish at unclosed public use airports with min of pattern altitude and one mile. Give wiggle room on finish altitude of 100' and 10 sec after crossing finish to achieve it. No penalty. Lower is a landout. Works just like line finish (land anywhere on the airport is good, 1 foot over the fence is not).

Flarm is dangerous: -Improper antenna location reduces dependability. -Suggested Proper antenna location has the antenna as a direct obstacle to view from the glider. Ask any eye Dr and they will tell you that as you scan ones eyes are constantly focusing on the closest thing as they move. This means that there is a loss of distant focus as one scans by the antenna on the top front of the panel and vision is lost as ones eyes refocus for distant view during the outside scan. -Pilots are spending too much time looking at the screen instead of looking out.

Flarm needs to be mandatory in any contest, now.

Get away from the penalty concept. Award folks landing short a bonus.

Have the regional champion be from the region that he lives in. If the overall winner in a regional is from outside the region, make him the overall champ, but the regional winner should be from the region the contest is in. Let 15 meter ships that can safely takeoff and land with neutral flaps compete in the standard class. Have an overall national in each class one year and a east/central/west semi-national the next. Don't put any more barriers to competition than already exist. Reading the weather conditions is such a part of the competition that letting gadgets take over may spoil that variable the way GPS eliminated the need to be able to navigate. Have a team and individual champion at the national level. Reseave team flying at regionals for mentoring only.

Huge TAT radii effectively wipe out handicaps in sports class, even with minimum times. I’d like to see very small cylinders, or at least have very small cylinders for club class, so that we can develop a US team that can win. Since club-class qualified ships are currently tracked separately anyway, perhaps all of the sports class events can offer the option to register as either club or sports: club-class ships use the smaller cylinder for club scoring, or the larger cylinder for sports scoring. Club ships that score as sports (i.e. large radius tp’s) wouldn’t be eligible for club class team points.

I believe that the IGC handicaps are sufficiently accepted to allow all US meets to be handicapped if this is expected to increase attendance.

I believe the major motivation of a pilot on a low final glide is to make the airport and avoid the risks of an outlanding at the last minute. This year’s low finish rule does not improve that situation and therefore should be eliminated.

I continue to be appalled at the lack of support for team-flying options. When I was R10 manager in 2011 I had the best intentions for applying for a radio comms exemption but I was told that all teams would have to use ONE frequency. This is absurd. Despite of the fact that I was very committed to trying this and giving team-flying a chance, I did not apply for this exemption since one frequency would not only be unrealistic, but also useless. I urge the committee to support team-flying, not actively discourage it as it has traditionally been done. Every time we compete overseas we are at a serious disadvantage over the teams that team-fly well.

I continue to favor a rule that requires the CD and his advisers to consider the fairness of any day on which less than 1/3 of the individuals who attempted a task finished the task. They would not be required to disallow the day, but this rule would require that at least give consideration to whether the day met the requirement of the rules that the task was fair and feasible. I have seen several days at contests that warranted this sort of consideration, but it was not undertaken. The result is rewarding pilots who were lucky enough to start early or stupid enough to fly into dangerous conditions.

I did not fly in contests in 2012 but was crew at the Nationals and spoke with a number of pilots. It appears to be that most will not or are still making the decision to get back to the airport even if they are going to have to perform a straight in landing. I do not believe the rule has legislated any safety.

I know of at least one case this year (at Dansville) where a pilot elected to turn back and land safely at an airport rather than attempt a marginal final glide over unlandable (due to high crops) terrain because he knew he couldn’t meet the 200' below criteria and would be scored as a landout anyway. Notably, during that same week a non-contest pilot was killed in a classic stall-spin accident doing exactly what the other pilot did not do - attempting a marginal final glide back to the airport. Keep (and strengthen) the 200' below landout rule. Require FLARM at national contests in 2013, and regionals in 2014. Do nothing with FLARM 'stealth' proposals for at least one full competition season where FLARM is required for all contests. Promote more XC camps around the country, and encourage U.S. Team members to lead/participate. Promote Condor (Condor soaring simulator) in-person regional and national contests around the country. Sponsor and support a Condor ‘Nationals’ at SSA conventions, with significant prizes (vendors like Cumulus Soaring would probably be willing to donate prizes). This one area would do more for increasing participation in the sport of soaring than anything else, by far.

I really like the idea of having the contest director or some appointed person on frequency at the finish to give wind data, traffic update etc. At the end of a long day it is nice to have a second pair of eyes in the pattern. Charlie Minner was good at that as was his mentor, Charlie Spratt.

I would be extremely interested in seeing a more organized national effort to create East/West xc-training racing camps for both pilots new to XC and new to racing. A great example of this is the DustUp put on by the SGC at Ephrata, which has alternated between new to XC and new to racing. As a relatively low-time pilot who has enjoyed some racing at the regional and national level, I would be very supportive of a serious effort at creating a coaching/racing camp that is focused on mentoring the next generation of top-ranked US pilots.

I would like to see penalties for "low saves". As you know, we have had a bad year with failed attempts with either thermaling 500’ above the ground or ridge running on the trees. It may be difficult to implement but worth it. SSA needs to encourage safety, not risky behavior. The days of making a hero of the one who digs out from a few hundred feet should be over.
In contests involving gliders with widely differing performances, such as the Sports Class, include a rule saying that the CD should not call a task on days where the weather conditions, such as wind strength, exceed the placard restriction of the lower performance gliders. For example, in Parowan this year, a day was called when wind conditions were such that pilots of lower performance ships had no choices other than violate their ship’s placard restrictions or forfeit a day. That is unfair, and not aligned with the spirit of the Sports Class to allow all ships a fair chance to compete on even grounds.

In the beginning there was only 1 National now there are so many I lost count. I like the idea of having fewer Nationals so each National has more meaning. Nationals should rotate between East and West of Mississippi. So previous Central and West are combined. The alternative would be to have only 2 Nationals (One east and one West) For Regionals I support Glider Handicapping, but not for Nationals. It needs to showcase the best technology. I think it is time for some big change and would be willing to work on any subcommittees to make this happen.

Is say go back TP the nuckle dragging neanderthal era of a good ole finish line.

Just get rid of the start circle. Its dysfunctional! Use a start line. Use a finish line. We can make GPS points ANYWHERE!! This way there will be no circle overlaps as start lines and finish lines can be set 2 or whatever miles away from the airport which allow better traffic flow for landing! Start making the rule yellow phone book smaller.

Team flying should be practiced on their time AFTER US Team selection takes place. If they can't figure out the weather, how to call a task and need to inflate their egos by flying together AT a regional, do they really need to be on the US Team? Regional tasks are supposed to be easier anyway for the new folks to "learn". Just think, a new entrant, going to a regional and costing him over $1000 with food, lodging, entry fees and then watching the US Team members beat him up because "they have the need for speed". Really! Several folks have come on to the contest scene recently and seem to think they become experts on competitive soaring. Yet, they themselves, don't do very well...that's a fact.....except at the dessert bar ( fact...belly size). Its amazing how they have become experts in such a short time and know so much about so little. To try and "place" yourself on the top rung without demonstrated performance is dysfunctional in any sport! Now, several want to go as US Team members to a Regional contest, just so they can be on top of the score sheet with no thought of sportsmanship towards anyone else. You gotta be kidding me! On the rules. Ours are just fine (except for that dysfunctional start circle). If someone on the US Team blames their past performance because of rule confusion (FAI to ours) or unable to be able to practice Team flying, it best be remembered names like Renner, Kawa, Harvey, to just name a few, they did it by themselves. The USA doesn't copy other countries, it leads. What's wrong with the performance of the US Team, nothing is wrong, as the Worlds best pilots have simply learned how to be more efficient, practice more and compete more. They have earned recognition and deserve respect for their accomplishments. The Worlds were never intended for team placement. There's one top spot per class. Its as simple as that and that individual who rises to that spot has the mental, character and integrity to be a World Champion!

Let's finish races like te rest of the world so our pilots can practice under the same rules they will compete under if selected to represent the United States in a world championship. The Rules Committee needs to stop trying to micromanage decisions in the cockpit by adding rules. Allow high speed finishes at ground level. If you way to promote safety, do so with an online safety recurrent course each spring that educates pilots. Make that a requirement to enter a regional contest. If the true intent is to make racing safer, then teach safety not micromanage with rules. In the airlines I am required to go through online recurrent training where I must read about sobering accidents about fatal accidents, along with gruesome pictures. This wakes me up and gets my attention much greater than a rule change in the FAR's.

Limit the cost of participation. There's been an increase in contest fees that far outstrips general inflation. Contests are getting too expensive, especially the tow fees.

My Clear Nav navigates me home to GPS altitude, penalties are set for pressure altitude, it was big problem for me in Parowan , with differences of more than 200ft. I dont have time to watch the computer on final,other traffic is more important!

On 1 hand you disregard safety when it comes to cockpit technologies and radio communications but on the other hand you want it be safety Nazis when it comes to love finishes and using the technology that we have with regards to performance ie low finishes and grand prix style racing ect You can't have it both ways your just showing the gob form of control get over it and lets actually race.

Once again overcomplicating the rules, just one more chance for the pilot to make an error, and not be scored fully. If the pilot returns to the airport, they should be scored. Start gate over complicated now. Can't start out the back side anymore...etc.. And the rumor that thermaling below 500 ft would count as a landout. Are you serious? Another stupid rule. The pilot should know when to stop flying on their own. Rules committee trying to Micro manage once again. I'm ready to quit contest flying completely, and you say your trying to encourage participation. All your doing is pushing me away from contests. Power Flarm, might as well be a tracking tool, Don't make it mandatory, and make it so it has to be in Stealth mode in contests.

Organizers have trouble making money at contests that are not well attended. Getting sites to bid Nationals increasingly difficult because it takes a lot of effort and the money doesn't justify it. Combining Classes at Nats may help (Montague 2012) so would increasing the allowable entry fee. The OLC pretty much gets a site the visibility that holding a Nats used to. Per the next part below, there are too many classes flying Nationals already. Winning a Regional contest, just so they can be on top of the score sheet with no thought of sportsmanship towards anyone else. You gotta be kidding me! On the rules. Ours are just fine (except for that dysfunctional start circle). If someone on the US Team blames their past performance because of rule confusion (FAI to ours) or unable to be able to practice Team flying, it best be remembered names like Renner, Kawa, Harvey, to just name a few, they did it by themselves. The USA doesn't copy other countries, it leads. What's wrong with the performance of the US Team, nothing is wrong, as the Worlds best pilots have simply learned how to be more efficient, practice more and compete more. They have earned recognition and deserve respect for their accomplishments. The Worlds were never intended for team placement. There's one top spot per class. Its as simple as that and that individual who rises to that spot has the mental, character and integrity to be a World Champion!

Per the Standard and 18M class contest, the current low finish penalty was eliminated by placing the the finish at 200' one mile out. Thus effectively allowing a rolling finish. This was approved by the the SSA prior to the first contest day after a couple of pilots protested! What the hell are you guys thinking? If you have a rule, enforce it! Don't let a CD bastardize it. I personally don't agree with the severity of the current rule, BUT, it is a rule and should have been enforced and not skated around. I personally would prefer a graduated penalty. 500' to 401'AGL = 2 minute penalty per 20 feet, 400 to 301 = 3 minute penalty per 20 feet, etc down to the deck. Better yet, if you really want to have a safe finish, do what REG 8 does and place a hard deck at 1000' minimum at 2 miles. The more
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We have in the cockpit, the more our heads are in the cockpit. We should NOT be depending on instrumentation for collision avoidance. That is a job for our eyes. The rules should encourage the eyes outside and looking instead of inside and oblivious. We are becoming as bad as the power pilots we scoff at regarding not seeing where we are going.

Please encourage the new 13.5 meter class rather than publicly condemning it to failure before it has a chance. I think this new class could generate some new and much needed comp pilots.

Question 8 is poorly worded, and I have no idea how a-d compare. Yes, the rule is good. Yes, 500ft agl, 1 mile from the airport is quite sufficient. c. and d. are pretty absurd.

RAISE the Finish Cylinder floor! 45knots airspeed at 500agl 1 mile plus pattern distance from landing with traffic at Perry almost got me and another guy Killed. 1000ALG should be the minimum.

Reduce the distance and time involved in competing at the national level.

Regarding bans on cloud flying instruments, FLARM Stealth Mode, and in-flight weather, etc... While I understand and support the reasons for limits on these devices, I fear that we may be discouraging some non-contest pilots from competition because they would be required to reconfigure their panel in order to compete. It seems more and more instrument manufacturers are adding these features to their latest devices. Are we eventually going to end up with the latest and greatest instruments unavailable to contest pilots? How is this problem being handled outside of the U.S.A.?

Rules can't cover everything! I feel strongly that much should be left to the descretion of the CD who should be considering many variables such as site conditions, weather, pilot skills, volunteer experience, tow planes and other support equipment, FR's, etc. Everyone's safety is of the utmost importance. Talk to the pilots. The CD should be paying very close attention at all times to the contest, listening to advisors and other valued resources and adjusting accordingly. For instance this may mean the FAI classes fly one day with ballast and the next without it. It also implies that the CD should not be sniffing or given the option of flying in the contest.

Safety: Allow pilots to land anywhere they choose after they cross the finish line. No pilot will choose to land if the airport is a viable option but current rules force the pilots to land at the airport even though it may be unsafe to do so. Encourage CD's to call more assigned tasks (limiting the HC range in handicap classes makes this possible) Encourage longer duration tasks, I go to contest to fly, not to make sure I am home for dinner at 5. If a pilot gets burned out by flying long tasks they have the option of competing in sports class, the entry and exit class.

Selection of the US Team for Club class should be open to all participants in today's sports class. One need look no further than the 2012 Sport (Club) class nationals to observe the bankruptcy of the present system: Jacobs won but wouldn't qualify! A no-brainer if the objective is increasing WGC competitiveness.

Some sites are just not good contest sites. Appalachian mountain valley sites are great when the ridge works, but suck otherwise. The sun gets over the ridge late and sets behind the ridge early. Chilhowee is an example. If a popular site bids for a contest. Give it to them. I understand the desire to foster new sites, but not at the expense of having a safe, well attended contest at an established site.

Sport is a game of rules which by definition are arbitrary, so let's make them focus on safety. One Rule change that would solve the landout problem would be to define a land out as flying below 1000' agl of the area within 5 miles of the pilots position.

Strict rules on when tasks can be changes after launch starts: can only change to a printed backup task, or change task time, or reduce turnpoints - not change areas! More guidance for CDs on when and how to use Assigned Area tasks vs Speed tasks, and how to use the MAT task intelligently (NO ONE-TP MATs!). More emphasis on Racing, less on "group OLC flying" that results from excessive use of large area tasks on good days.

Strongly consider adopting the International Contest rules in all US National contests .

The dirt is the dirt! If you decide the dirt is 500 feet in the air for safety reasons (for which I agree), then you need to finish above it ... period!

The practice of treating foreign entrants the way they are currently treated (as a "G" on the scoresheet) is embarrassing, ridiculous and shameful!!!! If a foreign pilot wins one of our National Championships, they are the US Champion, full stop!!! (See all other sports with National Championships (US Open Golf, US Open Tennis, etc)). They don't have to get US Team points (they are not eligible). THEY DEFINITELY SHOULD BE THE UNITED STATES (insert name of class) CHAMPION and definitely should get the trophy!!!!

The proposal to create a Super FAI class is just another way to perpetuate the sports class, which I believe is suppressing participation in the entry class and also potentially keeping young pilots out of competition. Bite the bullet and create a club class without any ifs or buts. On Flarm there appears to be a disproportionate fear of leaching because other people will be able to see what you're doing from a long way off. This seems paranoid and I think we're in danger of slowing rapid adoption of a key safety tool because of our fear of possible downsides.

There has also been some discussion about creating a rule to penalize pilots for low thermaling. I think creating such a rule is a bad idea and more difficult to enforce fairly than some people realize. I would however support directing the contest directors to advised pilots that low thermaling will be considered unsafe flying (a bad precedence for newer less experienced pilots) and that if observed thermaling below say 600 feet an unsafe flying penalty will be imposed. Flight logs could be reviewed to confirm visual reports.

This might make sense for the higher performance gliders, but not for us flying the lower performance gliders.

This rule neither has nor resolved the concern regarding marginal energy final glides. The rule has just moved the issue away from the finishing airport.
We need a 1000 ft hard deck rule to be considered. Similar to the land out finish rule. This should be an option at least and should be experimented with, promoted more. Why not a simpler but strong rule like 1 point per foot (100 points per 100 feet) which effectively is the same as giving distance points if you’re about 2-300 feet low but removes the arbitrary “threshold” value. Why should a pilot need to memorize an arbitrary threshold height - it’s just too complicated! Regarding Super-regionals, this seems like an unnecessary complication - just call them nationals and have more than one.

You cannot legislate safety. Pilots will take the chance if they want to win. It is entirely possible to have adequate height for a legal finish and get dumped in the last 10 miles. I have been there. To get only 600 points for a 4 hour task sucks. 200 points is hardship enough. solving the points incentive for pushing too low is to set the finish cylinder radius such that there are landable options for not making it to the field, and having a low height finish penalty ONLY - ie going through the finish cylinder counts as a finish just like the Worlds. This worked in Argentina and Slovakia. This involves a little intelligence in the task setting and cylinder size but is not difficult.

Please add comments, especially on 20m class, 13.5 meter class, the use of a ranking list as part of team selection, or other issues.

* 13.5 m class is IMHO doomed to fail just as the PW-5 class failed. * 20m will likely succeed as more and more 20 m gliders are purchased and flown by competitive pilots * A ranking list may well be worth considering if we find that such a system works for other competitive countries .

1. Please KILL the 20M and 13.5M classes now. There is no need for these classes and in the long run there are not enough pilots and resources to support these classes. The 20M class is the Arcus class and 13.5 will be dominated by a new ship or a cut down 15M or Standard not one of the current models. The US can politely tell the IGC we refuse to join in their madness. We have too many classes currently and it is hurting participation, contest organizers and our team quality. We need to raise the minimum from 8 to 12 to 15 for a class. If they can not field a class for three years the class should be dropped. It is time for Standard class to be merged with 15M and eliminated. Open should likely be dropped as well. The US should support Club, 15M and 18M an no other classes. Stronger competition in fewer classes will make our teams stronger and more competitive on the international level. More competitive racing will attract more pilots. Everyone getting a gold star discourages pilots from racing. Please do an East/West nationals and a pilot ranking and team selection system that includes scores from all contests and classes. 4. Consider a North America championship with Canada and Mexico.

13.5 m class Worlds might be the only one the US could be competitive in if team flying is NOT allowed - we have a lot of pilots flying 1-26s, but then again many of the small wing glider pilots are not that interested in competition. I support the 20 meter 2 seaters because I’ve flown contests in 2 seaters [including a duo discus], anything that encourages the growth of 2 seat cross country capable gliders will help the sport for the long term [can teach a whole new generation to fly cross country and contests that you can’t do in a blank]. And it is fun.

14 - the proposal for super-regionals said that these would not count for team points. The new ranking system should count all levels of contest.

14C. Please review Ryder Cup selection - it seems a very similar circumstance. Individual performance, Team Captain has some open picks to balance out the ‘personality’ issues.

14c. How would you measure competence for team flying?

Db. Don’t restrict the equipment, restrict the behaviour. Treat cloud flying as is done for airspace - huge penalty for anyone reported by other competitors to have been flying in cloud. CFR’s require 500 ft clearance below cloud. 14c. I don’t know how aptitude for team flying would be judged and ranked. It seems that this would move away from the objective points system currently in use to a subjective system that would be difficult to define. There is no mention of a change to the rule that requires a landing at the airport after crossing the finish ring. This was discussed at Perry and many felt that the pilot should have the option to land anywhere after crossing the finish ring.

20m class: Seems to be limited. But, even though I doubt it would happen, a good opportunity to mentor new pilots and transition champions techniques to upcoming champions. 13.5m class: why? It just splits up the participation more and more. Can’t see where many 13.5m will come from anyway? Rankings for team selection: The RC should, like it or not, adapt a use of the OLC to impact the selection of pilots for worlds. IKR, these pilots don’t practice rules but maybe this is where one of the 2 pilots for 20m 2 place comes from? Super-regionals: Water should be allowed for FAI class! Mixed classes: It seems the rules are bit vague when an FAI class is combined with Std, 15m, and 18m. This should be cleared up a bit in regards to handicaps. It also seems that handicaps are not being adjusted annually on results demonstrated from contests and from results available in OLC. Could be an annual analysis report be generated that demonstrates the effectiveness of handicapping results? This would support changes, if needed, to the handicap numbers. Seems this will only get increased attention as wing spans are currently going into 2 directions (duck hawk vs JS1-C) and soon to be in flight ‘adjustable’ (ok IKR adjustable in 10-20yrs).

20m/13.5m - Are we really talking about having too many classes and adding more classes in the same survey? We can send some willing pilots to the worlds in these classes if they can pay their own way. In no way should we add more classes and dilute US contests more. Too many contests - We have to alternate sites and possibly limit contests to one per region per year. Contests that are poorly attended are counter productive for everybody. Ranking - The US Team needs a coach who can select and match teammates out of a pool of ranked competitors. Two pilots are selected for the 15m class, for example, regardless of which class they qualified for the pool, but based on their demonstrated ability to fly in the weather expected at the world site and their ability to obtain pre-worlds practice with their partner. The subjective judgment of a coach is essential to putting together a team. Again, a junior development program is essential if you want to win.
Actually have access to a Let L33, which unfortunately has a 13.7m wingspan.

All glider racing should be handicapped. There should be three classes of gliders (high performance, middle performance, and low). Handicapping should be adjusted each day for lift strength and wind. Handicaps should be based on the on the polar of the glider. Water ballast can be used only in high performance class. International team pilots be selected for 13.5 meter from pilots flying in the low performance group. Club class pilots from the middle performance group. All other teams from the high performance group.

Choosing pilots based on four or five years of results makes sense as that would probably be more statistically valid. Team flying is part of the world champions whether we in the U.S. like it or not. If we are going to compete there we need to be ready. A team and individual ranking at nationals makes sense in both preparing for the worlds and maintaining our "American Individualism". The members of the U.S. world team should be able to fly in that years nationals as a team if possible. Thanks

Clearly, team flying may influence success at the world level. I would like to see more preworld team strategy gatherings with other interested comp pilots invited. Perhaps as a precontest seminar or as a discussion topic during regional or national contests. Thanks very much for all the work you folks do for the rest of us. Most say "we should". Thanks for saying "I will".

Concerning the new FAI classes at WGC, the USTC should select pilots provided there is adequate participation at a high enough standard in the classes at home.

Consider handicapping the 13 and a half meter classes as well so you can get the 1 - 26 pilots into the race

Demonstrated aptitude for team flying is very subjective. It certainly is an advantage if the selected pilots are experienced in team flying, but someone getting nudged out of team selection because of a subjective measure would not be right.

FAI 20m and 13.5 classes should be dropped, the proliferation of classes should opposed at the FAI level. It is hard enough to gain participation with the current number of classes. 13.5 and 20m two seaters can compete in limited range handicap classes for instance Club "B" for PWS, SZD 51 Junior, Libelle, 1-26. Arcus can compete in a handicapped FAI class against LS-8-18, ASW-26, ASG-29 etc...

For Item 14B above, I think, this could be an interesting idea if there is still a limit to the amount of ranking increase from the current regional amount of 92%. We need to be careful not to provide an incentive or benefit to not go to a nationals. I would recommend a maximum of 95% toward pilot ranking. For Item 14C above, I like the general idea, but how would you create measurable and objective criteria to enable pilots improve this skill? Additional Comments: Contest Classes for Nationals 5E) When numbers in a class get small (maybe 12), or too dependent on gliders outside the class (18 or duo in open, etc.; maybe at half the entries), merge classes with handicaps in a limited range. What's wrong with an Open class which includes 18m, Duo, and other ships to make up 12 or more ships? I do not think, you want to start using handicaps in the Open Class just because you have a mixed group of sailplanes which do not fit the traditional definition of the Open Class. An ASG-29, ASW-27, or an Arcus are very competitive in the Open Class in the correct hands and conditions. Take a look at the Open Class Nats results in Minden this year for some interesting data and results. I think, we need to be careful with applying handicaps to any class. We just might have some unexpected consequences. We should continue the Std Class handicapping approach which was started in 2012 and see what happens in the 2013 season. It will be interesting to see if the overall participation increases in Std Class this year. And, do we see other generation Std Class ships come to the Nats? Selecting Pilots for the 20m Class for the US Team: Why limit the selection process to only Sports Class Nationals? Why not add the Open Class Nationals as another class which the results would count towards a slot on the 20m team as long as you are flying a 20m 2 place sailplane? I would propose that you could qualify for the 20m Team slot if you flew in the Sports or Open Class nationals. The team slot would be determined by who has the highest percentage score of the winner's score from either nationals. This approach could help support and possibly encourage new participation in both classes, since you would not probably not need to drive all of the way across the country to qualify for the team slot. We should do everything we can think of to encourage participation in national contests and the quest for a slot on the US Team.

For pilot rankings with E/W Nationals or to achieve Section 14 you can utilize a system that the HG and PG folks have used for years. The rankings are accumulated over 2 or 3 years and the best 4 or 6 contest results are used for each pilot. Along with the scoring software that automatically adjusts the scoring for a day based on quality parameters each contest would be assigned a 'validity' factor based on the pilots participating. Each pilot brings 'ranking points' to the meet and based on the sum of the 'ranking points' the validity of the meet would be determined. Contest organizers would be encouraged to get high ranking pilots to their meets. If E/W nationals are implemented then the 'National Champion' award should be assigned based on a rolling 2-3 year ranking, similar to the ranking used for world team selection. I have shared with John Cochrane the details from HG/PG competition rulebook but would be happy to send along to others if there is interest. Thanks for your time and efforts to support SSA contests

Full disclosure should be done showing how votes are counted. No one likes to be deceived. So what gives a few the right to deceive those who vote! On the US Team election before last, the person who received the most first place votes didn't win. It was quite apparent that the US Team committee choose a way to count votes to put in who they wanted! They (US Team committee) never disclosed the vote totals and how they were counted! Only a posting on RAS that it was "really close"! That's really shallow and more in line with sick 3rd world country powers! Yes, think about that, it is the "US Soaring Team committee)never disclosed the vote totals and how they were counted! Only a posting on RAS that it was "really close"! That's really shallow and more in line with sick 3rd world country powers! Yes, think about that, it is the "US Soaring Team committee". I even have more information. How one US Team member shortly after being selected was called and told that his father could NOT crew for him! Another, who was found guilty of being verbally abusive to women by the US Team and the committee)never disclosed the vote totals and how they were counted! Only a posting on RAS that it was "really close"! That's really shallow and more in line with sick 3rd world country powers! Yes, think about that, it is the "US Soaring Team committee". I even have more information. How one US Team member shortly after being selected was called and told that his father could NOT crew for him! Another, who was found guilty of being verbally abusive to women by the US Team and was NEVER, YES NEVER, invited to the trial! I even have more! Many, including myself, have given freely in funding the US Team. Remember, it represents the USA. The men and woman in our National cemetery didn't die for the government, they died for several pieces of paper which they believed in. Those pieces of paper give us our way of life. Best that be remembered! These changes (14.c) are being pursued by a few who continue to act irresponsible towards this sport. I am sure they were never involved with any sport while attending high school or college. A total lack of sportsmanship and integrity is shown concerning place in 1932 did so for good honest reasons. They had principles, ethics and honor when standing in front of our flag and their friends! Now its our turn to act responsible and be honest. Correct the wrong done against the soaring community when the votes were counted the way they were! Give full disclosure. Also, do any of you want a National or World Champion who needed some help because he was having a bad day? Maybe pressure should be made on the FAI, as there's only one podium spot for a World Champion per FAI class. Return the Worlds to a test on an individual basis. Stop team flying. We do have a IGC President. We need to
stand up and be strong. We need to stay focused as this is a individual sport which will lead to a life time of improvement, reward and riches which others also enjoy in other sports! Do and take all steps necessary to not socialise it! In closing, I never left, so I can't say "I am back!"

How in the hell could the SSA measure demonstrated aptitude for team flying when the SSA does not allow team flying. The SSA needs to climb off its high horse and adopt the European scoring standards if the US ever expects to be able to compete against rest of the world. In case you need some evidence, look at the 2012 World Soaring contest results in Texas. The real problem is there are just a few people in the SSA that have controlled the game for a very long time. The time has come for them to step aside.

I currently own a PWS & have raced it in regionals. The new class is a developmental class with an uncertain future. All current manufactured gliders are now obsolete. We should wait & see how this plays out before supporting yet another class. If someone wants to spend their own money and has a hot new glider that has a chance of doing well, let them go, but no team money.

I just don't see a lot of interest in competition from the owners of the 13.5m ships around me. 5 on our airfield, not one even flew in our local contest. Seems like a waste of resources to dedicate to such a small group. 20m is an interesting option. Great for training and sharing the contest experience. I have a Duo and enjoy flying in the occasional contest, but the time and resources required to pursue WGC level of competition is beyond my interest. In general the cost associated with competition when it all happens just for ego and bragging rights is hard to justify. It's fun, that is the reason most of us fly contests, but expensive fun.

I suggest combining the 20m gliders (anything >18m) with the new 23 and other open gliders into a handicapped Open Class. Since we have too many classes already, adding another one is not making any sense.

I support the 13.5m as an economical way for someone to get into competition. More junior pilots have flown in World Class than any other and with the inclusion of other sailplanes under 13.5 meters I believe we will see more here and helpfully in Club Class. 20m is exciting to be able to provide a dual experience, otherwise the performance and pilots won't be drastically different. (Duo have won or placed in the top 5 at several sports class nationals).

I think we are at a point where we should make some serious changes to nationals. One possibility is an FAI Short-Wing class (15/Std) and an FAI Long-Wing class (18M and above), and Sports/Club. The proliferation of classes is a bigger problem here with our very long distances to drive compared to Europe, so we shouldn't necessarily follow the "rest of the world". Clearly, there are countries with smaller gliding populations (e.g. South Africa) that have started dealing with this issue and remain highly competitive. As far as 20M or 13.5M, just because a class exists at the World level doesn't mean we need to participate.

I think we have too many classes currently. I'm not particularly keen on adding a 20m class but if there is support then OK. The 13.5m class just looks like the World class rehashed. The goal was noble but not realized. Let's shed the class and move on.

I think we should support a new class of pilots irrespective of the ships they fly. A US Team Class. These pilots would have to have and sustain a high rank (say > 0.96). They would have to establish a continuous pairing. They would be allowed to fly in any contest as a team. But, like guest pilots they could not officially place in the contest. However their contest ranking would be counted. Yes, this means some pilots on the ranking list will have a score greater than 100. (It also means getting on a team isn't about winning a Nationals. And I think that will encourage newbies to race.) There would be annual US team champions and second and third place teams with the associated medals. (Maybe even "western" and "eastern" champions if we need to spread the glory more.) Placing maybe determined by the average of each teams individual ranking score or something. Also, there would be some fancy method to select teams for the international event. However to go to an internationals this would be the only path. If I'm going to support the US Team, it needs to be set up so that the team we send has a good chance to win. If you don't like the specifics of my idea, come up with something else like it. The status-qua is such that I don't want to continue to contribute to a losing proposition any more.

I think we should support the 20M class. It is an excellent way to bring new numbers into racing. The number of competitive 20M gliders needs to increase but without the support to allow racing in the class I think it may not grow as fast. We have an ever aging club fleet of 2 seaters. We need new blood in the sport and I think this would help. I have been able to bring out new cross country pilots on long flights so they can see what the sport is truly about. We should also compete in all of the current IGC classes at a national and world level.

I understand many people's concern of too many classes but I think that if we can field enough gliders to have a viable class there is no reason not to have a 20 meter 2 seat or 13.5 meter team. Same applies to all the other classes. I would rather see a handicapped 13.5 meter Nationals combined with the 1-26 Championships than Sports Class Nationals. I liked the idea of limiting handicaps at the Std. Class nationals this year and as a Std. Cirrus owner that would encourage me to attend Std. Class Nationals in the future (even though the handicap range didn't go all the way to 1) if it was a closer drive than Sports Class Nationals. I think that allowing pilot to pilot radio use could really help convince first time pilots to attend contests with their friends from their local club. This could lead to clubs acting as teams, bring back the club trophies in regional contests, and generally make contests even more fun. As far as well attended competitive regions and super-regions getting more ranking points I can understand the reasoning but can't think of a way you can determine which ones should count for more. Same thing with a demonstrated aptitude of team flying. No doubt selecting pilots who know how to fly as a team would help our teams, but how do you measure that aptitude and then convert into a pilot ranking boost? I think that allowing team flying at regionals, and eventually in nationals, will naturally result in pilots with team flying aptitude ending up on the US team.

I would not fly 20meter because its during club class selection. Some regions are fierce...a lot are not.

If there is a WGC in those classes, we should send a pilot to compete. Pick the pilot based on demonstrated performance independent of class.

In terms of adding two more classes to the US and World racing scene... I think we have problem of finding enough / competitive pilots. From the numbers of participants point of view - there are very few 13.5M and 20M racing pilots.

While I support the idea of sending US pilots to a World Championship, the reality is that there are few pilots who might
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It baffles me that we're different from the IGC in this respect. This is too complicated for me to grasp the subtleties that differentiate the two approaches.

It is going to be very difficult to fund all these classes. Possibly the answer is to self fund participation in the less popular or smaller attended classes.

Keep US Classes and rules as much like the international as possible! If we ever want to really compete in World Competition we have to fly by those rules as much as possible.

Moriarty is about to submit a request to sponsor a 13.5m "Nationals", coincident with the 1-26 Champs, in 2013. (Re. your section 13 above.) The use of the term "Nationals" was suggested by the PW-5 flyers who normally have participated in past World Class Nationals. I know this may be presumptuous, but it appears that there is a strong desire among those who are interested in the 13.5m class to get things rolling ASAP. I'm the CM for contest, and would hope I get authoritative guidance from SSA before I design logos and order literature. -:-) (BTW, 1-26's flew against/with the 13.5m folks this year at TSA, and we were able to win one or two days of the six!) :-)

N/A

NC

No problem for US pilots to attend future 20 meter and 13.5 meter WGC's, but US Team financial resources are limited, financial support should be limited for these classes until they become established.

No strong opinions here, but I don't see the point of creating a new class--especially a 13.5m class--that further fragments the racing scene.

No world team entries until demonstrated interest in domestic contests. Do not follow the PW-5 situation where there are only about 5 pilots even interested in contest flying.

Not sure what "having an aptitude" for team flying means. When I taught air combat maneuvering at the U.S Navy's Pacific Fleet Adversary Squadron, we had a saying: "You fight like you train." Pilots were ranked on their performance not their "aptitude." I believe that if the US wants to ever be competitive in the current WGC environment that allows team flying, we need to TRAIN to that. It's time to allow team flying at contests in the U.S. It could start at the Regional level and eventually move into the Nationals. Actually flying as a team is the only way that we in the Navy could develop two individual pilots into an effective "section" of flight lead and wingman. Besides it's a lot of fun!!

On 20m and 13.5 - The first duty of the US Team is to facilitate the participation of US pilots in international competition. If pilots want to participate in a class, the team should open the door for them with a selection process and official blessing. The funding decision should be a separate issue. Once you get rid of the idea of equal funding, there's no problem. The poll question should read, "Would you make the effort to try to qualify for team selection, and go to the worlds if the US team provides less than the pittance given to pilots in the classes we care about." Let team contributors choose the class they want their money to support and the team can provide administration.

Pilots should pick a class in which they want to participate at a WGC according to the order in the ranking list. It should not matter if a pilot hasn't flown a 20m glider at the Nationals in order to be qualified to 20m WGC.

Please no more classes, stop with the 13.5 except as handicapped sports.

Please note 14b. One thing that has been proven in other arenas is that contestants travel and gain support with buy-in. Many sports have developed layered contest structures that rely on one layer feeding the next. The lower layers require less enforcement, less commitment and are more inviting. Success in these feeds the next layer.

Therefore I believe a structure where for example you place in the top 5 of 2 regions you may attend a national for the next 2 years would encourage qualifying pilots to travel. This also has fellow competitors want progressing pilots to succeed at higher levels of competition. This brings well earned pride to their local contests and organizations. Unfortunately this kind of pride seems to only be achieved by the OLC at my location. My uninformed, novice opinion is that U.S. soaring contests do not offer enough variability in task planning, enforcement, commitment and participation. For example- I would not take off the time for a national and barely afford that of my local Regional in the current format. However, if under a new format I earned a spot at a national I believe that even my employer would be interested in sponsoring me with time off to compete and I would be super excited for achieving the new level. This is the reason why someone with the legs or their gold is more willing to pack up and travel to say Minden for a diamond altitude than someone without that buy-in and the sense of earlier struggle and reward.

Regarding the question about 20 meter team selection, why doesn't this class dovetail with the open class contest instead of sports class contest? But more importantly, aren't we spreading limited contest resources a bit thin now? Why support this class at all? Regarding the 13.5m class... Let it die. There is no need to keep it afloat. That need/niche is adequately accomplished with the club class.

Selecting and sending pilots is not the same as funding pilots.

Selection for Club, 13.5 and 20 should not be from one and same contest (Sports Nat) Club class should have own Nationals. We should have same gliders like IGC for Club Class. We should try to overcome extra requirements for contest in Perry to be international sanctioned. 20 and 18 and Open should have combined, water, handicapped
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There are too many classes flying Nationals already. In 1984 there were 3 National Championships, today many classes, this just gets Rediculous.

1-26 class and group them into sports class or club class. When you have a national championship for many participation. Doing so makes it a pseudo-Nats, which would diminish the status of Nats even more. If you want ranked #1 (100) on the seeding list. I strongly object to increasing the seeding of a Regionals based on Nationals today has about the same status as winning a Regionals 40 years ago. Today there are 14 pilots there are 6 (STD, 15M, Open, 18M, Sports, World) And 2 more 92 point Nats (Seniors, 1-26). Winning a international competition.

contests for these types of gliders, I see no reason why the SSA should not certify qualified pilots for ranking system is measuring your wallet, not purely your skill.

Sports Class should not be multiplied by 92% for ranking purposes. It should count for 100%. Otherwise the ranking system is measuring your wallet, not purely your skill.

Team flying: how important is it that the US Team win? Is it more important than keeping our individualistic approach to racing? Maybe this issue goes hand-in-hand with question 3 above. Not knowing the extent to which we might relax the communication restriction, it is impossible to say No to one without saying No to the other.

The 13.5 meter class is unlikely to succeed in the USA, based on history to date - trying to resuscitate it will divert resources from other more deserving classes. Let it die!

The 20 and 13.5m classes will have very limited participation in the short term but could become very interesting in the long term. The two seat class can be a lot of fun for many pilots. The current 13.5 meter gliders are not great performers, but racing gliders designed for this class are likely to be much better. We should try to keep these classes alive so they can develop.

The Flarm area of the survey is flawed. If one did not fly with a Flarm the remaining questions should be disregarded. Instead, a series of vague errors is displayed if you do not answer the questions that only pertain to someone using a Flarm.

The US has not had a world champ in ages. It seems that our structure does not develop the best candidates. I'd like to see US contests mirror the IGC more closely.

The artificial horizon ban issue could be eliminated if an inexpensive device were used in competitions logged to an IGC recorder. I passed this info on to Peter Ryder after WGC 2012: "Balloon-borne disposable radiometer for cloud detection” Review of Scientific Instruments http://rsi.aip.org/resource/1/rsinak/v83/i2/p025111_s1?isAuthorized=no

The biggest obstacle to increasing participation in racing remains the lack of real beginner tasking that can accommodate gliders of modest performance. A quick look at the entrants in regional sports classes shows that gliders of less than 40:1 performance are rare. There is simply little opportunity for pilots of gliders commonly owned by clubs (Grob 102/103, etc.) to compete with peers. Tasking in sports classes should be set such that a pilot of moderate experience flying a glider of more modest performance should have a good chance to complete the task. It should be "boring" enough to encourage expert pilots of high-performance gliders to move to another class. Open class in regional competitions should use limited handicapping, so that such expert pilots have a place to go, even if they aren't flying the latest gliders.

The maximum points at all US contests should be based on the strength of the field of pilots competing and adjusted for small numbers of competitors. Something like setting max points to the average pilot ranking score of the highest seeded 5 pilots plus 0.05, but not more than 1.00. You could make this the whole formula or average it in some proportion with the current regional/national max score or with 1.0. Imagine a contest with the top 5 pilots with an average seeding of .95 versus a contest with the top 5 pilots with an average seeding of .90. What if the first one is a regional and the second one is a Nationals? Which is a better test of national caliber racing skills? This is particularly important with the new contest formats being contemplated. It would create an incentive for a critical mass of top-seeded pilots to show up at the same contests. In our east-west bifurcation it would help by having one contest that could still count for team placement if it had high-caliber competition and it would reduce the chance of someone getting on the team through a poorly attended nationals.

The ranking list concept needs more thought. Combining this change with handicaps risks some unexpected outcomes.

The selection process is not broken, the USTC is broken.

There are few 20 m gliders being flown competitively and few of the 13.5 meter machines as well. The latter seem to make little sense to me for a number of reasons. But if contestants want to participate in international contests for these types of gliders, I see no reason why the SSA should not certify qualified pilots for international competition.

There are too many classes already that dilute the participation of other classes. Cancel the 20M, the PW5 and 1-26 class and group them into sports class or club class. When you have a national championship for many many classes, this just gets Rediculous.

There are too many classes flying Nationals already. In 1984 there were 3 National Championships, today there are 6 (STD, 15M, Open, 18M, Sports, World) And 2 more 92 point Nats (Seniors, 1-26). Winning a Nationals today has about the same status as winning a Regionals 40 years ago. Today there are 14 pilots ranked #1 (100) on the seeding list. I strongly object to increasing the seeding of a Regionals based on participation. Doing so makes it a pseudo-Nats, which would diminish the status of Nats even more. If you want to kill Nats, this is a good way to start. If you do go this way, then you should consider limiting Nats participation dramatically (15-20 per class), combine 2 or more classes at a site, increase the allowable fees to encourage sites to bid for them.

There is no way to develop a ranking system that will be consistently equitable in the US. A ranking or handicap system in some system of pre-nationals maybe. I repeat my recommendation; east and west nationals qualifiers and a single multi-class nationals at a central location (perhaps every two years?) with a 4y...
cycle for team qualification?). I would not be opposed to using some sort of ranking system in the regional comps as an alternative to east and west Nats. qualifiers.

There is only one competitive 20m 2 seat type, of which we have "four" in the country. This does not constitute a class and does not deserve support from SSA membership. If someone wishes to campaign on behalf of the USA at their own expense (or funded by donations), I would not oppose this. 13.5 m class... WHAT 13.5 meter class? We don't have ANY meaningful competition happening in this class despite a fair number of qualifying gliders in the country. As above, if someone wishes to campaign on behalf of USA on their own nickel, I will not oppose this. SSA support should be limited to open, 18m, 15m, std and club... and being honest here, only 18m and 15m are anything like healthy competitive classes. We are spread too thin.

To many classes now, I purchased a 15m ship to be competitive in 15m, now you can handicap into the class at a regional. Why should I own such an expensive glider if so much handicapping is going on. Why not let everyone handicap into 18m if they choose so? I don't believe the current rules make this possible. Just fed up with over complicated rules and procedures ever happened to keep it simple? Just about fed up with the whole contest scene!

True one-design competition has obviously failed. If the 1-26's wish to compete with the Sparrow Hawk and/or vice versa, have at it.

Water ballast and it's correct use are big players in competition. Many Regionals don't allow ballast, but even if they did, the disparity in the handicaps between older and newer gliders (lighter fully blasted vs heavy fully ballasted) would be increased. How would that be addressed? And let's don't go back to the limited wing loading days. Re-read the first sentence. That's the main reason why we got rid of the 9 pound rule.

We are facing declining participation even in the mainstream classes (18-meter and 15-meter), so the idea of applying more SSA resources for yet more classes (20-meter and 13.5-meter) doesn't appeal to me at all. Why should we worry about sending a 13.5-meter and/or a 20-meter pilot to a WGC just so we can be on the bottom of two more WGC scoresheets! The current system of selecting U.S. team members sort of works, but not very well in our current environment. The 2012 15-meter nationals at Logan saw 3 top pilots (Bill Ruhle, Mark Keene, John Cochrane) essentially removed from consideration for U.S. Team selection, and IMHO considerably weakened our 15-meter U.S. team performance at Uvalde. I strongly support the idea of giving pilots more opportunities to gain ranking points toward national team selection, thereby biasing team selection toward pilots who have a wider range of experiences and fly more, in different contests around the country (of course, since I fly every contest I can reach, I might be a wee bit biased in this regard :-)).

We are trying to support to many classes now

We have a major problem with contest participation. Adding more classes (20M, 13.5M) does not help this problem. We also need to eliminate existing classes that do not have a critical mass of participation from nationals and include them in regionals through handicapping, if that can be done fairly. For example, it may not be wise to allow an open class glider to compete in certain regionals where it may pose fairness as well as logistical problems. The passing of the PW-5 Class is long overdue. For years, it unfairly siphoned US Team money away from more populated classes while straining the budget. If the US really wants to do well in WGC's, we must get better at team flying. This needs to be part of the way we fly, not just something we do in preparation for a WGC.

We need to be more selective and focus on which teams we want to support. I would support 2-3 classes vs 5-6 classes. Let's send fewer teams with higher qualifications that can be supported more completely. I think we should focus on 18 M and 15 M and stop supporting Open since there are very few pilots to draw from and then add 20M or 13.5M but not both.

We need to set a criteria for how much involvement by "any" class justifies the US Team Fund supporting pilots.

We should be making team selection more flexible BUT if pilots are not willing to drive how bad do they want it? Let's not lower the bar on team selection but enhance the ability to test for the best.

We should consider eliminating the current selection system. It has failed to produce any positive wins for the US in over 20 years of competing at WGC's. I would strongly urge consideration of reintroducing the peer voting procedure, if only for 50% of the pilots score. Current system is a failure. Accept it and move on to something better.

We should establish a "National Tour" like the 4 Grand Slam events in golf or tennis. The national team would consist of the highest ranked pilots earning points (IGC style) in this tour. Events qualifying for the tour could include Perry (with separate classes as today), plus three FAI combined classes Nationals (East/Central/West) plus perhaps two other super Regionals modeled after Perry. Top ranked pilots would be offered to fly Worlds in the class of their choice, instead of being limited to the class they flew in the Nationals where they earned most of their ranking points. Such a system would allow for geographical choice for the pilots, while increasing the chances that our Team will be composed of the best.

With handicapping becoming used in more regional, the handicap should be based on calculated factory provided performance adjusted for actual flying weight.

You don't distinguish "send" and "pay for." I support allowing self-funded entry to 20m and 13.5 m, but no team resources. A good test for resources is the classes can round up 8 gliders to stage a nationals.

the team needs to rethink its role within the US soaring movement.. pilots selected should be willing to shoulder almost. All the cost of participation. team funds should be distributed as available from the performance of these investments. the team should be responsible for all team activities personally.
beyond the allotments available. The present WTC has completely ignored much of this. Simply voting for a disbursement of money has nothing to do with whether the money is available. Available money should be identified early. It should be disbursed as the WTC sees fit, but any deficits must be paid by team members within 2 months of the conclusion of a Worlds.

Return to the 2012 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.