

# Minutes of the 2012 J/24 World Council Meeting

Howth, Ireland  
October 13, 2012

## 1. Call to Order and Welcome

Jim Farmer called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**Attendees:** Mario Di Fraia (Italy), Lorne Chapman (Canada), Tim Winger (USA), Lambert Lai (USA), Nancy Zangerle (USA), Jorge Castillo (Mexico), Kenneth Porter (Mexico), Jim Farmer (USA), Robin Eagleson (Ireland), Koji Matsumoto (Japan), Marianne Schoke (Sweden), David Cooper (Great Britain), Dennis Frederiksen (Monaco), Flor O'Driscoll (Ireland), Jan-Marc Ulrich (Germany), Aorelian Garcia (France). Each individual introduced him/herself to the group.

## 2. Appoint Secretary

Jim Farmer appointed Christopher Howell as the secretary.

## 3. Proxy confirmation

Jim Farmer and Chris Howell reviewed the proxies for the meeting, including VEN, BAR and ARG by Lorne Chapman, NED by Jan Marc Ulrich, GRE by Flor O'Driscoll, PER by Kenneth Porter and AUS by David Cooper.

## 4. Approval of 2011 WCM Minutes

*Lambert Lai moved to approve the 2011 minutes, seconded, approval of the minutes passed unanimously.*

## 5. Chairman's Overview

Jim Farmer recapped the highlights of the year, including the "open" Worlds in Rochester, and other events such as in Mexico. The Class Office has undergone a transition from Eric Faust to Chris & Julie Howell. He thanked everyone for coming.

## 6. Review of Reports

### Executive Director Report

Christopher Howell provided a summary of his non-profit background, including many trade associations as well as the J/22 and J/105 Classes. They both work full-time on the Classes, and aim to provide efficient responses to members. Chris drove to Texas to pick up all of the Class files and records in June, and quickly got the Class Office up and running. They worked closely with the Rochester Worlds teams in regard to measurement, live racing updates online, and daily press releases. The website saw more than 4,000 hits.

### Financial Report

Nancy Zangerle presented the balance sheet from the IJCA accounting records. There is about \$31,000 in the bank, with approximately \$8,000 in accounts receivable (many sail royalties from the recently completed Worlds). Nancy explained that the Restricted Promotion Fund is not additional funds, but a part of the overall account balance. Nancy then walked the group through the profit and loss previous year comparison. She noted that, unlike Eric Faust who was an employee of the IJCA, Chris & Julie Howell are contracted services which saves money in areas

such as taxes, office rent, etc. She highlighted a couple one-time occurrences, such as the non-profit registration fee and noted that the net cost of the magazine is approximately \$6,000, after advertising revenue. Nancy spoke to the merchant fees associated with credit card payments. Robin suggested a system called Chaps, where the person paying the bill incurs the transfer fee. Jorge suggested that the transfer fee be added into the credit card payment. Chris Howell will investigate the most inexpensive payment options available, including PayPal. Looking at the 2013 proposed budget, the EC recommends reducing the Membership income to \$32,000 and Royalties to \$33,000 each, and eliminating the Promotion Allocation. The projected budgeted income remains flat in 2013. Lorne asked for clarification on how the sail royalty tag process for each NJCA works and that this briefing be made to the NJCA authorities. The former sail royalty revenue sharing scheme was eliminated in 2010. Robin summarized the proposed budget. *A motion was made to approve the proposed budget, and the motion passed unanimously.*

### **Technical Report**

Tim Winger will present his rule change proposals later in the meeting. The Technical Committee is standardizing and modernizing the NORs and SIs, with help from other resources. He noted some pushback with regards to competitors serving as volunteers in part of the measurement process at regattas. His measurement observations from Worlds: new Sparcraft booms misbanded and light on boom tip weight, no illegal lead. Marianne Schoke encouraged the TC to work with the supplier(s) to correct the spar issues. Lambert praised the high level of communication regarding measurement at the Worlds. Jim thanked Tim for his tireless efforts on the TC.

### **Copyright Holder/Builders Report**

Jim Farmer referred the group to Jeff Johnstone's written report within the meeting materials.

### **7. Elections**

Jim Farmer presented the slate: Chairman Robin Eagleson, Vice Chairman Jorge Castillo and Executive Committee members Marianne Schoke, Paul Scalisi, and Mark Penfold. There were no nominations from the floor. *A motion was made to approve the slate, and the motion passed unanimously.* Tim Winger presented the Technical Committee nominations and gave a brief history of each person: Michael Johnson (USA), Eduardo Ortiz (PR), John Peck (USA), Reid Stava (USA), Mark Penfold (GBR), Alexander Finsterbusch (ARG), Gianpietro Polessel (ITA), Stuart Jardine (GBR Emeritus), Lorne Chapman (CAN) and Jan Marc Ulrich (GER) with Tim Winger as the Chairman. Kenneth Porter summarized the intent of the TC, which is to preserve the one-design nature of the boat. *A motion was made to approve the nominations, and the motion passed.*

### **8. Submissions**

#### **2012 World Championship report**

Lambert Lai displayed a photo presentation on the recently completed World Championship at Rochester Yacht Club, won by Team *Bruschetta* in a 96-boat fleet. Twelve countries were represented. Robin inquired about the GPS boat tracking system, which Lambert explained is done through a company called Kattack. He showed a video as well. Lambert offered some

advice to the future hosts of the Worlds, including having substantial resources for the measurement process.

### **2013 World Championship report:**

"Project Manager" Emmet Dalton shared a progress report on the 2013 Worlds in Howth, including the event team. The title sponsor is BMW, and all online communication is up and running. The race management team and International Jury are in place, and the NOR is published. The Measurement Committee has been appointed. The organizers have arranged travel agents who can assist incoming entrants, and they expect to have 12 boats available for charter. Information on accommodations and local amenities are available online. He demonstrated where the race course will be as well as the docking situation. Marianne encouraged Emmet to investigate ways to decrease travel costs, particularly ferry transport for moving the boats.

### **2015 World Championship report:**

Jan Marc presented an update on the 2015 event in Germany, held in conjunction with Norddeutscher Regatta Verein. Proposed dates are 28-30 August for measurement/practice and 31 August - 4 September for racing. He showed pictures of the venue, highlights in the area and some history of their regattas. They will have a website available later.

### **Other Championship reports:**

Dennis Frederiksen distributed the NOR for the 2013 Europeans, and David Cooper expressed an interest in the UK hosting the 2017 Europeans. Marianne noted that Sweden may make a switch with another NJCA regarding the 2014 Europeans.

### **2016 Worlds venue:**

No submissions have been received to date. Robin asked Chris to post a request for submissions online for a country other than Europe or North America. Japan has an interest in the 2021 event. Jorge suggested that Mexico may host a Worlds in conjunction with their own national event.

### **2018 Worlds:**

Mario Di Fraia expressed interest in Italy hosting the 2018 Worlds. Robin noted that a submission is required 4 years in advance. Mario was asked to include detailed information on the facilities in their proposal.

## **9. Rule Change Proposals:**

Tim Winger led the discussion on the proposals, which were distributed to all prior to the meeting.

### **J/24 Class Rule 3.6.1 and 8.1.1**

#### **Current Rules:**

##### **3.6.1**

Except as provided in Rule 6.1.7, only one mainsail, one genoa, one jib and one spinnaker shall be on board when racing.

##### **8.1.1 (under Restrictions When Racing)**

The use of more than one mainsail, one genoa, one jib and one spinnaker, or the alteration thereof, during a regatta. Damaged sails may be repaired or replaced at the discretion of the Race Committee. In addition, one storm trysail and/or one storm jib, as described by Rule 6.1.7 may be carried.

### **Proposed Change**

#### **3.6.1**

- a) Except as provided in Rule 6.1.7, only one mainsail, one genoa, one jib and one or two spinnakers shall be on board when racing.
- b) After sails have been measured, they shall not be altered during a regatta. Damaged sails may be repaired any time. Damaged sails may be replaced with the written permission of the Race Committee only if they are deemed to be damaged beyond repair.

#### **8.1.1**

Eliminate this rule – 8.1.1 Not in use

**Reason:** The spinnaker is the sail most likely to be damaged during a day's racing. Racing without a spinnaker (especially if it tears in the first race of the day) is a huge handicap to any boat that tears one. Having a spare on board would dramatically diminish this handicap. Most competitors have a backup on shore anyway. This just keeps it where it is needed. The addition of section b) above eliminates the need for Rule 8.1.1 and allows this subject to be handled in one rule. Concern has been raised that there is enough room in our spinnaker rule 3.6.13 to allow significantly different designs to develop. There has also been significant opinion that this will not happen. There is also a desire to simplify the Class rules, and what is offered here is the simple approach. If implementing this rule change does result in unwanted side effects, additional restrictions could be added later.

Upon a question from Marianne, Tim confirmed the spinnaker measurements. Marianne suggested having a required sail weight. Jan Marc said there's no advantage of one cut. Kenneth Porter expressed concern that competitors will be able to switch spinnakers as the wind changes, giving an advantage to people who can afford more sails. Lorne recapped some history of the proposal, including competitors who miss races at major events because their spinnaker is destroyed. Mario Di Fraia thought the major issue is that the second spinnaker gets away from the aim of the boat as an inexpensive racing option. The second spinnaker should only be used when the first one is damaged, and the sails should have a certified maximum weight. Tim provided background that the prior options to the NJCAs including no change to the rule, 2 spinnakers with no restrictions and 2 spinnakers with damage restrictions. Nancy noted that an additional spinnaker will cost members another \$2,000. She suggested applying the rule to World and Continental Championships only as an experimental rule. Flor O'Driscoll voiced support of the rule to keep competitors on the race course. Robin clarified that if the rule resulted in negative side effects, restrictions could be added on in the future. Kenneth expressed that the Class needs to encourage good sailing. Lorne said that the sailmakers can be utilized to reach a maximum cloth weight. Aorelian Garcia said to use the royalty tags at regattas to track the #1 and #2 spinnakers. Tim worried that this would be difficult to police. He noted that there is actually a cost savings because racers can launch an older kite when aiming to preserve the life of a newer sail. Lambert Lai wants to protect middle class racers, and preferred the proposal to only take effect for a Worlds. *Robin made a motion, seconded by Lorne Chapman. The proposal did not pass by 9-11. Votes against: ARG, BAR, VEN, ITA, JPN, MEX, PER, USA.*

*Votes for: CAN, FRA, GBR, AUS, GER, NED, IRL, GRE, MON. SWE abstained.* Lorne asked whether anyone would alter their vote with restrictions, but it would not change the outcome.

### **J/24 Class Rule 3.2.5**

#### **Current Rule:**

**3.2.5** The deck shall be fitted with two stanchions on each side, port and starboard as detailed in Plan A. Taut lifelines of wire not less than 4mm diameter shall be attached to the pulpit and the pushpit and pass through the stanchions. The height of the lifelines above the sheerline when measured vertically shall not be less than 500mm. Where second lifelines are fitted, they shall be of wire not less than 3mm diameter, attached to the pulpit and the pushpit. When lifelines are secured by lanyards, the lanyards shall be of synthetic rope with an exposed length of not more than 100mm. The stanchions shall not extend outside of the sheer in plan.

#### **Proposed Change:**

**3.2.5** The deck shall be fitted with two stanchions on each side, port and starboard as detailed in Plan A. Taut lifelines of wire not less than 4mm diameter shall be attached to the pulpit and the pushpit and pass through the stanchions. The height of the lifelines above the sheerline when measured vertically shall not be less than 500mm. When lifelines are secured by lanyards, the lanyards shall be of synthetic rope with an exposed length of not more than 100mm. The stanchions shall not extend outside of the sheer in plan.

**Reason:** Most boats in the J/24 Class are supplied with, and sail with, a single set of lifelines. It is easier to get in and out of hiking position with a single lifeline, especially since the height of the primary lifeline was lowered to 500 mm. On boats that carry upper and lower lifelines, RRS 49.2 allows hiking between the lifelines, a practice that the J/24 Class will not allow for safety reasons. ISAF suggested that the simplest solution would be to only allow one set of lifelines, to eliminate hiking between the lifelines. The Class is currently altering RRS 49.2 in our NORs and Sis for each event. It would be better to eliminate the option for a second set of lifelines as proposed herein.

David Cooper asked whether a second line may be fitted, but Tim preferred to proceed as is. *Robin made a motion, seconded by Kenneth Porter. The proposal passed unanimously.*

### **J/24 Class Rule 3.5.2(c)**

#### **Current Rule:**

#### **3.5.2 Mast**

c) The mast shall be fixed at the heel and be chocked at deck level in way of the mast and shall not be altered when racing.

#### **Proposed Change:**

#### **3.5.2 Mast**

c) The mast shall be fixed at the heel by screws or pins to the mast beam, and shall be securely chocked at deck level by any manner of shims or a plate fixed on top of the deck. The position of the mast at the heel and the deck shall not be altered when racing.

**Reason:** To clarify the means by which the mast must be fixed at the heel and chocked at the deck. Some questions have arisen within the Class as to the legality of a plate screwed to the deck on top of the partners as chocking. This also makes clear that the mast must be fixed by screws or pins to the mast beam rather than by a clamp.

*Robin made a motion, seconded by Jan-Marc Ulrich. The proposal passed unanimously.*

### **J/24 Class Rule 3.5.3(f)**

#### **Current Rule:**

#### **3.5.3 (Standing Rigging)**

f) The overall length of the axis of the spreaders from the surface of the mast to the bearing point of the upper shrouds shall not be more than 800mm or less than 760mm. A straight line between the shroud bearing surface of each spreader shall not be less than 95mm measured as the shortest distance from the aft edge of the mast, measured with or without rig tension.

#### **Proposed Change:**

#### **3.5.3 (Standing Rigging)**

f) The overall length of the axis of the spreaders from the surface of the mast to the bearing point of the upper shrouds shall not be more than 800mm or less than 760mm.

**Reason:** The minimum measurement of the spreader sweep has become irrelevant. No boat is ever close to this minimum measurement. Simplify the rule.

Kenneth Porter asked that there be a maximum measurement. *Robin made a motion, seconded by Dennis Frederiksen. The proposal passed, but the USA voted against.*

### **J/24 Class Rule 3.5.4**

#### **Current Rule:**

#### **3.5.4 Running Rigging**

a) One spinnaker halyard of synthetic rope not less than 6mm diameter which shall exit through the mast bracket and bear not more than 35mm forward of the mast or more than 40mm above the center of the forestay fixing pin.

b) One mainsail halyard of wire, not less than 3mm diameter and/or synthetic rope of 8mm diameter.

c) Not more than two jib or genoa halyards of wire not less than 3mm diameter and/or rope of 6mm diameter, which shall not intersect the forward surface of the mast above the intersection of the extension of the forestay and the mast surface.

d) One kicking strap (vang) of synthetic rope of not less than 8mm diameter in a tackle not exceeding 8:1 power ratio. A wire strop of not less than 4mm diameter or synthetic rope strop of not less than 8mm and not more than 305mm in length may be used to connect the kicking strap to the attachment bracket on the mast.

e) One spinnaker boom downhaul of synthetic rope not less than 6mm in diameter.

f) One mainsail outhaul (or leech tensioning control) of wire and/or synthetic rope with not more than 6:1 power ratio.

g) Cunningham controls of synthetic rope using a maximum of 6:1 power ratio which may include a single wire strop for attachment to the mainsail or headsail.

h) One backstay adjuster tackle of not less than 6mm diameter synthetic rope and a 4:1 maximum power ratio attached to the bridle blocks.

i) Two mainsheet traveler control lines of synthetic rope with maximum of 2:1 power ratio.

j) One mainsheet of a single length of synthetic rope not less than 8mm diameter and having a maximum power ratio of 6:1.

k) Spinnaker sheets of synthetic rope not less than 8mm diameter.

l) Headsail sheets of synthetic rope not less than 8mm diameter.

- m) Reefing lines of synthetic rope.
- n) One spinnaker boom uphaul of synthetic rope not less than 6mm diameter.

**6.1.31** Does not exist

**Proposed Change:**

**3.5.4 Running Rigging**

- a) One spinnaker halyard of synthetic rope which shall exit through the mast bracket and bear not more than 35mm forward of the mast or more than 40mm above the center of the forestay fixing pin.
- b) One mainsail halyard of wire and/or synthetic rope.
- c) Not more than two jib or genoa halyards of wire and/or rope which shall exit the forward surface of the mast below the intersection of the extension of the forestay and the mast surface.
- d) One kicking strap (vang) of synthetic rope not exceeding 8:1 power ratio. A strop of wire or synthetic rope may be used to connect the kicking strap to its bracket on the mast.
- e) One mainsail outhaul of wire and/or synthetic rope not exceeding 6:1 power ratio.
- f) Cunningham controls of synthetic rope not exceeding 6:1 power ratio which may include a single wire or rope strop for attachment to the mainsail or headsail.
- g) One backstay adjuster tackle of synthetic rope not exceeding 4:1 power ratio attached to the bridle blocks.
- h) Two mainsheet traveler control lines of synthetic rope not exceeding 2:1 power ratio.
- i) One mainsheet of synthetic rope not exceeding 6:1 power ratio.
- j) Spinnaker sheets of synthetic rope.
- k) Headsail sheets of synthetic rope.
- l) Reefing lines of synthetic rope.
- m) One spinnaker boom uphaul of synthetic rope.

**6.1.31** (Optional Equipment)

**6.1.31** One spinnaker pole downhaul.

**Reason:** Removal of size requirements on running rigging are brought to this changed rule because advances in materials, particularly synthetic rope, have been so great since these rules were adopted that it makes the size restrictions inappropriate and unnecessary for safety. The strength of the type of material selected for the lines must be considered by the sailors along with the feeling of the ropes in their hands. Reducing size can save significant cost in rigging and maintenance of the rigging on the boat. Wording has been standardized from item to item. The spinnaker pole downhaul is removed to Optional Equipment because it is so seldom used.

David Cooper inquired about the expense of tapered line. Tim clarified that the rule change would actually be a cost savings overall. Kenneth Porter questioned whether changing the line takes away from the one-design nature of the boat. Tim pointed out that the rule only makes the line change an option (not a requirement), simplifying the equipment. *Robin made a motion, seconded by Aorelian Garcia. The proposal passed 15-6. Votes against: MEX, PER, USA.*

**J/24 Class Rule 4.1.9 and 4.1.10**

**Current Rule:**

**4.1.9** (Required Equipment When Racing)

One outboard engine with a minimum weight of 14kg, which when not in use shall be securely stowed under one of the main berths or aft of the sill of the companionway.

**4.1.10** (Required Equipment When Racing)

There shall be a minimum of 2 liters of fuel for the engine carried in reserve when the boat crosses the finish line for the last race of the day.

**Proposed Change:**

**4.1.9 (Required Equipment When Racing)**

One outboard engine with a minimum 2 horsepower rating or equivalent thrust, which when not in use shall be securely stowed under one of the main berths or aft of the sill of the companionway.

**4.1.10 (Required Equipment When Racing)**

There shall be enough fuel (or battery power) appropriate for the engine carried in reserve when the boat crosses the finish line for the last race of the day to get the boat back to port.

**Reason:** The traditional outboard engine, for which this rule was written, was a two stroke gasoline engine. These engines are becoming unavailable for purchase in many areas due to regulations based on their emissions. Under the current rule with no adjustments, the simple replacement is the four stroke gasoline engine. The four stroke engine is much larger, heavier and harder to handle on and off the motor mount, and it does not fit under the berth without a modification to the bunk board. Electric engines have reached the level where they have the power to push the J/24 through most conditions. They are lighter and easier to handle than gasoline engines. They may require extra batteries to be carried when the racing area is farther from port. Propane powered outboards may also be an option. At this time the propane engines tend to be the same size as the four stroke gasoline outboards. With this proposed change, the Class is ready to accept an appropriate outboard engine powered by any type of fuel.

Kenneth asked whether 2hp is enough for the safety of a J/24? Tim said that these problems would have been apparent by now, and Jim noted that individuals are responsible for having the fuel they need to get in/out of the race course. *Tim revised the proposal by removing the minimum horsepower (eliminating the phrase “with a minimum 2 horsepower rating or equivalent thrust.” Robin made a motion, seconded by Jan-Marc Ulrich. The proposal passed, but the USA voted against.*

**J/24 Class Rule 3.5.5(d)**

**Current Rule:**

**3.5.5 Main Boom**

d) The tip weight of a boom at the outhaul without a vang, mainsheet and blocks shall be not less than 3.3kg.

**Proposed Change:**

**3.5.5 Main Boom**

d) The tip weight of the boom at the outhaul without a kicking strap (vang), mainsheet and blocks shall be not less than 3.0kg.

**Reason:** When this rule was written, most boats were carrying reefing lines in the boom. Class mainsails no longer require or have reefing points and the lines and hook have been removed from the boom. This may be why we are seeing so many boom tips near or just under minimum weight. Lowering the boom tip weight should have no effect on performance. Lowering the minimum by 0.3kg should bring the large majority of booms into compliance and eliminate the chasing of small weights to be affixed in often temporary ways to the boom to pass measurement at events. Booms are required to be supplied to builder specs by licensed spar manufacturers, and the extrusions are not allowed to be altered. This rule (3.5.1) should prevent competitors

from cutting holes in the booms to lower the weight. The term kicking strap was also inserted in order to be consistent with the rest of the J/24 Class Rules.

Jan-Marc questioned how the boom is supplied from the Builder, and whether the Class is driving its Rules or if the Builder is. Many people concurred that the Class needs to guide its own rules. *Robin made a motion, seconded by Flor O'Driscoll. The proposal failed 6-15. Votes against: CAN, FRA, GBR, GER, NED, ITA, JPN, MEX, PER, MON, SWE, USA. Votes for: ARG, BAR, VEN, AUS, IRL, GRE.*

#### **J/24 Class Rule 6.1.14**

##### **Current Rule:**

##### **6.1.14 (Optional Equipment)**

One spinnaker sheet Barber hauler may be fitted port and starboard, each consisting of a fairlead or block with accompanying cleat.

##### **Proposed Change**

##### **6.1.14 (Optional Equipment)**

One spinnaker sheet Barber hauler (also known as “twing”) may be fitted port and starboard, each consisting of one or two fairleads or blocks with accompanying cleat.

**Reason:** To facilitate effective fairlead location and control at the cleat, more than one fairlead or block may be needed. This change simply allows what has evolved in the effective use of twings.

Nancy felt that the wording is misleading. Jan Marc suggested different language, ending the rule at "port and starboard." Nancy noted that the mention of the cleat is needed to keep in line with closed-class rules. Tim considered removing the words "one or two" prior to "fairleads." In the end, Tim decided to keep the wording as is. *Robin made a motion, seconded by Jan-Marc. The proposal passed, but the USA voted against.*

#### **J/24 Class Rule 6.1.22**

##### **Current Rule:**

##### **6.1.22 (Optional Equipment)**

Watertight inspection ports, not exceeding 102mm inside diameter may be fitted to the cabin top and cabin liner directly above the lifting beam. Ports shall be closed when racing.

##### **Proposed Change:**

##### **6.1.22 (Optional Equipment)**

Watertight inspection ports may be fitted as necessary to facilitate use of the lifting rig and to allow access to fittings and sealed spaces. Ports shall be closed when racing.

**Reason:** The original design of the J/24 had no inspection ports or sealed compartments. Over the years, the builders have added sealed compartments along with the necessary inspection ports for various reasons, one of which is safety. Additionally, some fittings are exceedingly difficult to reach for service (rudder gudgeons on the transom). There would seem to be no performance advantage in adding inspection ports, so why not allow them as owners find necessary for proper servicing of the boats.

*Robin made a motion, seconded by Flor O'Driscoll. The motion passed unanimously.*

## **J/24 Class Rule 6.1.30 and 8.1.4**

### **Current Rules:**

#### **6.1.30** (Optional Equipment)

Does not now exist

#### **8.1.4** (Restrictions When Racing)

The adjustment of standing rigging, including all turnbuckles and the ability to adjust the position of the mast heel by any method. The connection to the mast heel of any adjustment device or equipment.

### **Proposed Change**

#### **6.1.30** (Optional Equipment)

A device to adjust the position of the mast heel on the mast beam.

#### **8.1.4** (Restrictions When Racing)

The adjustment of standing rigging, including all turnbuckles and the position of the mast heel.

**Reason:** Currently, there is no rule to allow a mast heel adjuster. Such devices have been in wide use within the Class for many years, and it is the desire of the Class to allow the use of such devices, except while racing. Rule 8.1.4 makes mention of the adjustment devices in reference to their not being allowed to be attached to the mast while racing. While the Class does not want to make any change in the principle of not allowing adjustment of the mast heel during racing, the Class does not want to penalize those who simply forget to unhook the device. Turnbuckles are still attached to shrouds and rigging while racing, but not allowed to be adjusted. The mast heel adjuster would be addressed in the same way.

*Robin made a motion, seconded by Lambert Lai. The motion passed unanimously.*

## **J/24 Class Rule 7.1.19**

### **Current Rule:**

#### **7.1.19** (Prohibitions)

The use of elastic (shock) cord to adjust the standing or running rigging.

### **Proposed Change**

#### **7.1.19** (Prohibitions)

The use of elastic (shock) cord to adjust the standing or running rigging with the following specific exceptions:

- a) to hold down sails.
- b) to retain, but not to retrieve the tails of running rigging.
- c) to return the backstay adjuster toward the untensioned position.
- d) to return the mainsail outhaul toward the untensioned position.
- e) as the spinnaker pole downhaul.

### **Reason:**

While one senior member of the Technical Committee and Jeff Johnstone of JBoats have cautioned on what may develop with unrestricted use of shock cord, it is the desire of the class to open up these specific uses of shock cord for the convenience of the sailors. ITC interpretation of the existing rule had allowed use of shock cord to hold down sails and tails, but this makes it clear to all that such usage is allowed. The backstay adjuster and the mainsail outhaul are reluctant to return toward their untensioned position without help. Shock cord would provide that help. Use of shock cord as the spinnaker pole downhaul will help crews maintain control of the spinnaker pole.

Jan-Marc supported a couple exceptions, but has concern about the shock cord use with the backstay, outhaul and downhaul. Lambert suggested that the shock cord should be able to be used to remove slack from the backstay adjuster, but Tim believes that this issue is already covered by *c. Everyone agreed to remove exceptions d and e. Robin made a motion on the amended proposal, seconded by David Cooper. The motion passed unanimously. MEX and PER abstained.*

### **J/24 Class Measurement Certificate**

#### **Current Measurement Certificate:**

Item 9 – Rule 3.4.2 – Depth of rudder tip measured between tip and transom – min. 860mm-

Actual measurement – max. 890mm

Item 12 – Rule 3.5.2d – Distance between mast bands “P”- min. none – Actual measurement –

max. 8538mm

Item 13 – Rule 3.5.2f – Highest spin. boom ring above bottom of mast ht. band – min. none –

Actual measurement – max. 1555mm

Item 14 – Rule 3.5.3 – Standard installed fixed spreader length – min. 760mm – Actual

measurement – max. 800mm

Item 15 – Rule 3.5.3 – Spreader sweepback distance – min. 95mm – Actual measurement – max.

none

Item 16 – Rule 3.5.6 – Length of spinnaker boom including fittings – min. none – Actual

measurement – max. 2895mm

Item 17 – Rule 3.5.6 – Weight of spinnaker boom including fittings – min. 2.7kg – Actual

measurement – max. none

Item 18 – Rule 3.5.3b – Height of forestay attachment above the sheerline “I” – min. 8125mm –

Actual measurement – max. none

Item 19 – Rule 3.5.3c – Distance between fixing point of the forestay on mast and intersection of

stemline and sheerline - min. 8595 – Actual measurement – max. 8670mm

Item 20 – Rule 3.5.2b – Distance from lower band on mast to stem at the sheerline – min.

2895mm – Actual measurement – max. 2925mm

Item 23a – Rule 3.5.5c – Distance of 20mm boom band from rear face of mast “E” – min. none –

Actual measurement – max. 2970mm

#### **Proposed Change:**

Item 9 – Rule 3.4.2 – Depth of rudder tip below transom is within spec – min. 860mm - Yes/No

– max. 890mm

Item 12 – Rule 3.5.2d – Distance between mast bands “P” is less than max.- min. none – Yes/No

– max. 8538mm

Item 13 – Rule 3.5.2f – Spinnaker pole rings to bottom of lower mast band less than max. – min.

none – Yes/No – max. 1555mm

Item 14 – Rule 3.5.3f – Spreader length is within spec – min. 760mm – Yes/No – max. 800mm

\*Item 15 – Rule 3.5.3f – Spreader sweepback distance is over min. – min. 95mm – Yes/No –

max. none

Item 16 – Rule 3.5.6 – Length of spinnaker pole less than max. – min. none – Yes/No – max.

2895mm

Item 17 – Rule 3.5.6 – Weight of spinnaker boom more than min. – min. 2.7kg – Yes/No – max.

none

Item 18 – Rule 3.5.3b – Height of forestay attachment above the sheerline more than min.– min. 8125mm – Yes/No – max. none

Item 19 – Rule 3.5.3c –Forestay attachment on mast to of stemline at sheerline within spec. - min. 8595 – Yes/No – max. 8670mm

Item 20 – Rule 3.5.2b – Distance from lower band on mast to stemline at sheerline within spec.– min. 2895mm – Yes/No – max. 2925mm

Item 23a – Rule 3.5.5c –Boom band from rear face of mast under max. – min. none – Yes/No – max. 2970mm

**Reason:** Some of these items change with wear, some can change with each mast setup, and for the rest of the items shown here it is just not necessary to record the actual measurement. It is necessary only to make sure and record that these measurements are in spec. Is it a J/24 or not. Some actual measurements have been allowed to stand on the measurement certificate to allow the Class to track important changes in the boat from measurement to measurement.

\*Item 15 would be eliminated if an accompanying rule change is passed.

Robin expressed that the idea of this is a simplification of the process. Tim noted that many measurements are already pass/fail. Lorne offered questions about measuring new items, such as a rudder. Jan Marc prefers to keep more data on the measurement certificate (especially the original one), although he doesn't mind using more pass/fail at a World Championship. Tim feels that the pass/fail items actually make the certificate more consistent. Several people voiced concern about how this change would affect charter boats. Tim summarized that the main question is whether the boat is a J/24 or not. The major measurements will still be measured numerically. *Robin made a motion, seconded by Lorne Chapman. The proposal passed 11-10. Votes for: CAN, ARG, BAR, VEN, GBR, AUS, IRL, GRE, JPN, MON, ITA. Votes against: FRA, GER, NED, MEX, PER, SWE, USA.*

### **Moving the Rules into an ISAF format.**

Tim asked if anyone has concerns? Marianne and Lambert voiced concern. Robin shared the importance of complying with ISAF, but wanted to make sure that the TC not let the rule re-write get in the way of other Class initiatives. To make sure that the Rules are well taken care of, Tim will work with a small committee. After the rules are redone, they will be voted on. Robin commended Tim to start the work.

Robin thanked Tim for his diligent work on the proposals and noted that the proposals are not final until approval from ISAF.

### **10 & 11. Magazine/Marketing & Promotion**

Although Robin supports the Magazine in general, there are no funds to support the expense this year. David Cooper wondered if we could do it electronically, and Robin spoke about the importance of communication. Nancy summarized a recent survey with the USJCA, which revealed that those members prefer a monthly e-newsletter. Nancy suggested that the IJCA make the survey available to all NJCAs, which can be tailored and helps obtain demographic information. Chris offered to distribute a quarterly e-newsletter at the cost of less than \$500 per issue for graphics. Another idea would be a segmented country-by-country update. Challenges will be securing content each time around and also collecting all of the International e-mail addresses. Robin supports the quarterly e-newsletter for the IJCA. Chris will also solicit

advertising. Nancy added that the intent of the IJCA web banner at the top is meant for use by the following Worlds organizers' sponsors. She also noted that countries are supposed to be able to post regatta reports/photos directly onto the IJCA website. Jan Marc shared some success from the German Class with their newsletter. Marianne spoke about a successful European newsletter, and likes the immediacy of the newsletter idea more than the static nature of a magazine. Nancy thought the the IJCA should consider producing a brochure. Jorge voiced support of a hard copy magazine for the future. Robin said that the Class can go to the Builders to assist the Class with advertsing options/funding. Robin stressed the importance of the relationship between the IJCA, ISAF and J Boats. The Class needs to make the many years of knowledge accessible.

## **12. Chairman's Discussion Points**

Robin requested a change of wording of the Class Rulebook to "Class Rules and Constitution" on the cover. He also asked that the Class print the By-Laws at the back of the Rule Book as well as the policy document on measurement compliance.

## **13. Annual Objectives 2012-2013**

Robin spoke about what he wants the World Council to achieve with him as chairman. His shared his background in manufacturing management and eventually as owner. His would like to bring his management skills in coordinating efforts of others for the success of the J/24 Class. He asked Nancy and Chris to overhaul the financial process to bring it to a trustworthy and reliable state. He asked for an interim report in 3 months. Given the financial restraints, he asked that we be realistic about the marketing capabilities of the Class. We can still spin the image of the Class with low-cost efforts. Robin will be working with the Technical Committee on ideas throughout the year. Robin wants to rebuild the relationship with ISAF, and Robin will be meeting with Henry Thorpe of ISAF, and Flor O'Driscoll will be attending their upcoming meeting.

## **14. Date and place of the next meeting**

Robin recapped the protocol is to go to the location of the following Worlds, although everyone is familiar with the Newport area, and the costs are quite high. Nancy suggested meeting in Annapolis, Maryland near to the East Coast Championship. Chris will do some further research, and the WC will make decisions via e-mail.

## **15. Awards**

Jim spoke to everyone about the Councilors of Honor, a place of recognition for those who have made extraordinary contributions to the J/24 Class. Jim announced with pleasure the appointment of Lorne Chapman as the newest member of the Councilors of Honor.

## **16. Other Business**

None

## **17. Closing Remarks**

Robin thanked everyone for coming, and the meeting was adjourned.