Minutes from AYC KHF Handicap Committee Open Meeting
Feb 13, 2007

HC Committee Attendance:	J. Johnstone R Meyers R. Shull J. Welles J. Maddalozzo T. Lappin
1. Observers	S. Vaughn S. Ehlers D. Dobson J. Saunders S. Brown J. Bartlett A. Jensen

1. Call to order at 7:30 PM.
2. Introduction of John Bartlett, Sail maker, AYC Member and our Guest Speaker. We wanted John to help us understand what we should consider when handicapping boats on Lake Travis.

   John opened with a history of the development of sail design with respect to masthead rigs. When fractional rigs began to appear several years ago, they were configured with large mains and smaller jibs. The fractional rigs allowed the top part of the main to twist away from the boat's centerline without becoming back winded by the jib. This and the ability to bend the mast and flatten or fatten the main sail allowed the main to develop more power in a variety of wind conditions and proved to be a faster rig.

   In response, boat owners with masthead rigs asked for better sail designs so they could compete with the fractional rigs. Sail lofts then began to produce larger mainsails with more roach. In some classes, such as the South Coast 21, the jib was also made smaller to prevent back winding the main. Some mast head rigs also found that a smaller headsail like a 130 instead of a 150, in combination with a larger main provided better results.

   John also commented that continuous development of the South Coast 21 sails and rigging had made this a much easier boat to sail to its rating.

The Handicap committee had four questions for John regarding his opinion on the performance impact of various sail configurations.

The first question we wanted to address was the proper PHRF differential for J22's that carry a 150% headsail versus those that sail with the class legal 100% jib.

John felt the 150% Genoa provided an advantage downwind when running wing on wing due to projected area and a small advantage upwind until the wind speed exceeded 5 MPH. The disadvantage of the larger headsail was slower tacks.

J22 sailors in the audience thought there was no advantage to having a 150% headsail.

The second question was to address the proper PHRF differential for a Catalina 30 with roller furling versus a hank on headsail.

John's opinion was the roller furling headsail was slower for two reasons:
a) the added weight of the protective UV cover made the sail harder to shape in light air

b) The roller furling mechanism keeps the sail up off the deck and allows air to escape underneath it marginally slowing the boat.

A Catalina 30 sailor in the audience commented that above 12 MPH of wind, the Roller furling sail, when fully extended, overpowered the boat, and when not fully extended could not be optimally shaped for speed.

Ray Shull pointed out that we currently do not give any allowance for roller furling vs. hank on headsails.

The third question was should there be a differential given for full batten versus partial batten mainsails?

John's opinion was that the primary advantage of full batten mainsails was that they lasted longer. In his experience he found the partial batten sail was easier to adjust while sailing for variations in wind conditions. He did not recommend any differential.

The final questions was should there be a differential given for type of sail material, for example Dacron versus Mylar, Kevlar, or Carbon Fiber?

John's response was that it is easiest to adjust the draft on Dacron sails while sailing, while the other materials were lighter and more expensive, and some were currently unavailable due to consumption by the military.

Overall he felt Dacron was the most practical material for sails and did not recommend any differential be applied for use of other materials.

When asked what could be done to encourage more PHRF racing on Lake Travis, John responded to keep the rules simple and encourage more fellowship after the racing so that skippers and crew could learn from each other.

3. Jim Johnstone reviewed the current assumptions the handicap committee is using. See attachment.
4. A copy of the PHRF championship (Acura Key West Regatta) rules and PHRF handicap request form was handed out. Although more complicated than our ratings procedures, it is still simpler than some other PHRF fleet forms.
5. A copy of the Catalina 30 class association PHRF rating procedures was also handed out. They show 3 keel configurations x 2 mast heights x 2 bow configurations for a total of 12 different boat configurations. They apply 2 different ratings depending on whether the wind is more or less than 10 knots.
6. One ratings request was received at the meeting which will be reviewed at our next working meeting on March 13.
7. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM

Attachment

Lake Travis PHRF fleet Handicap Committee Assumptions/Decisions

1. Crew weight is not regulated.

   Decision: US Sailing does not impose crew or weight limits for PHRF racing. Neither does Lake Travis PHRF.

2. You may carry as many spinnakers of as many different types aboard as you wish, although you may only fly one at a time. (RRS50.1)

   Decision: Boats will be rated according to the dimensions of their largest spinnaker

3. There is no differential for boats with and without spinnakers.

   Assumption: Non Spinnaker boats always compete against non spinnaker boats

4. There is no PHRF differential based on wind velocity.

   Decision: We have chosen to keep things simple for ourselves, the RC, and Scoring.

5. There is no differential for wet sailed versus dry sailed boats

   Assumption: You keep your bottom clean no matter where your boat is parked.

6. There is no allowance for the type of material your sail is made of; or age of sails.

   Assumption: You are using relatively new sails of the latest design.

7. There is a differential assessed when you modify your boat or sail configuration.

   Assumption: Racing sailors seldom modify their boats to make them slower