



PERFORMANCE HANDICAP RACING FLEET
of the Chesapeake, Inc.
P.O. Box 3169, Prince Frederick, MD 20678

2009 ANNUAL BOARD OF DELEGATES MEETING MINUTES
Eastport Yacht Club, 14 November 2009

Attendees:

Bruce Bingman, President, Proxy RRBC	Al Caffo, Del HdGYC, GRF
Randy Pugh, Past President, Del BBSA	Mayo Tabb, Hdcpr, Del FBYC
Mike Mullarky, VP, Reg I-III, Del CBYRA North, and Unaffiliated Clubs, North, Del MRSA	Mike Dale, VP Reg IV, Del CBYRA South, and Unaffiliated Clubs, South, Proxy YPYC, PBC, YRYC
Rich Hanson, Proxy NERYC	Randy Richter, Hdcpr, Del YCCSC
Glenn Harvey, Del GSA	Heidi Bay, Del WRSC
Bob Thomas, Sec'ty/Treas	Eric Crawford, Ch Hdcpr, Reg I-III, Del TAYC
Stew Buckler, Exec. Sec'ty	Penny Zahn, Del RoBSA
Tom French, Del SCC	Bill Davenport, Del DISC
Rob Mairs, Hdcpr, Coord PHRF	Richard Griner, PHRF Scorer, Reg I-III
Keith Mayes, Del HNSA	Dan Trammell, Hdcpr, Del NASS
John White, Hdcpr, Proxy AYC	Richard Ewing, Del EYC
James Whited, Del SMSA	Chris Johnson, Hdcpr, Del HYC
John Anderson, Proxy RCRA	David Taylor, Del CCV
Uwe Mewes, Del RYC	Christian Schaumloffel, Ch Hdcpr, Reg IV

Bruce Bingman, President, called the 2009 Annual Meeting to order at 1007. He asked the executive secretary, Stew Buckler, to call the roll to determine if a quorum was available at the meeting. The poll of the delegates present indicated that, including proxies, there were 926 of 1078 voting members for 2009 represented at the meeting. This provided a quorum for voting on the motions that would be presented at this meeting. Bruce's opening remarks included brief remarks concerning his prepared report (attached at the end of these minutes) to the delegates. He also noted some of the efforts to communicate with the PHRF classes to better understand the number of boats participating during the year. For some classes participation was very inconsistent, high for some events and very low for other events.

Treasurer's Report. Bob Thomas presented the Treasurer's report, which included expenses for 2009, and the 2010 budget. The expenses for 2009 were up to 12 November, and did not include some significant expenses necessary to provide, print, and mail the 2010 renewal and application packages for members. The 2010 budget did not include expenses for scoring race results or trophies for PHRF high point awards, as it was not clear if CBYRA was funding the trophies or not. It was agreed that PHRF would fund the cost of trophies and the scorer, therefore funds were added into the 2010 budget at the same level as budgeted for in 2009. The additional funds budgeted for the trophies increased the proposed budget from \$33000 to \$36000. The 2009 expenses and 2010 budget are shown on the attached Treasurer's report. The Treasurer's report, including the proposed budget for 2010 of \$36,000 was voted on and approved by the delegates.

US Sailing Delegate Report. Please refer to the attached report from the USSailing delegate (Bruce Bingman). Bruce noted that US Sailing offshore office funding has decreased significantly, resulting in reduced, or delayed services. He requested the delegates consider a donation specifically to the US Sailing offshore office that would help with some of the services they provide which directly help PHRF Chesapeake. A motion was made to donate \$1000 to the US Sailing offshore office. The motion was seconded and approved by the delegates.

Chief Handicapper's Reports.

Both Eric Crawford (Chief Handicapper, Region I-III) and Christian Schaumloffel (Chief Handicapper, Region IV) provided written reports that are attached at the end of these minutes. Both chief handicappers plan to continue in 2010 with the same handicapper board with the addition of one new handicapper in region IV.

Executive Secretary Report. The attached report shows valid certificates issued by year, class, and region. 2009 membership has shown a small increase for the first time in six years, and shows that PHRF racing continues to be healthy. Membership and rating applications are available on-line, as are the valid listing and status of rating appeals. Some of the delegates mentioned that the current PDF valid list may be difficult for RCs to use in that format. It was noted that the information on the valid list (in PDF) may be copied to and used in a spreadsheet format. The website will provide direction on how this is done for those that aren't sure of how to use that feature. It was also asked if the valid certificates could be provided in PDF format electronically, as many members send the certificate to RCs electronically. It was noted that the valid certificate, as published from the PHRF office is not complete until signed by the owner/skipper, and after signing the owner could scan the document into electronic format. Also, it was noted that RCs should verify every rating certificate they receive by comparison with the ratings on the most current valid listing, as the online valid listing is the most accurate source for rating, and changed rating information. 2010 renewal packages will be distributed to all members who have 2009 valid certificates early in January 2010. The delegates were asked to remind their clubs PHRF members to ensure the address on the PHRF valid certificate is up-to-date, as some members don't seem to get the renewal packages due to changed addresses. Members may call the PHRF phone (410-414-3270) and leave a message with the new address. All are reminded that it is best to submit renewals and applications well in advance of the racing season so your boat's valid certificate may be provided with race entries throughout the year.

High Point Scorer Report. Richard Griner, the PHRF scorer for regions I-III attended the meeting and provided a brief report, though there were no high point results available at this time. He did note that approximately half of the boats racing are not CBYRA members and therefore not eligible for HP awards. He mentioned it was extremely important for racers to accurately complete the CBYRA race entry form (i.e, declared class, region, sail number, CBYRA number, etc.) to ensure that the race results are correctly entered into the scoring program. Rich also recommended changes to the PHRF high point rules to facilitate more accurate scoring of the race results (see the HP rule proposals later in these minutes).

New Business: Proposals for consideration by the Delegates

1. **Proposal to change Sport Boat criteria.** The sport boat definition is proposed to be revised as some key regattas will most likely require sport boats to participation in ONLY the sport boat class to prevent large differences in performance when both sport boats and displacement boats are in the same PHRF class (A, B, C). This requires a more specific definition of what a sport boat is for PHRF of the Chesapeake. Our current Sport Boat class is approved for region IIIAW only, and is based on LOA (length overall) and upwind SA/D (sail area to displacement) ratios. Some boats usually considered as sport boats may not be on our sport boat list due to oversize mainsail roach not being included in our SA/D calculations. Likewise some boats currently on the sport boat list may not usually be considered as a sport boat. Our SA/D calculations do not contain excess mainsail SA due to oversize roach, which is included in most USSailing upwind SA/D values in their rig database.

The current PHRF of the Chesapeake definition of a sport boat is:

1. All boats <45 ft LOA, and with SA/D > 25 and designed to use an asymmetrical spinnaker or
2. All boats <45 ft LOA, and with SA/D > 33, regardless of type of spinnaker used

Examination of data from the last four years shows that a better definition would include a length limit of 37 feet and an upwind SA/D of 27 if using an asymmetrical and reduce the limit to 31.0 if using a symmetrical. We should also probably include a downwind SA/D of 72 to catch any "sleepers". This will draw the line between the J-80 and Soverel 33 AS which are not sport boats (at least in rated Chesapeake conditions) and the Antrim 27. In addition an upper limit is needed to exclude such boats as the Santa Cruz 37, Aerodyne 38, various "big boats" such as the Taylor 41, and the Swan NY 42, none of which are sport boats. Boats fitting the revised definition are designated as RSB (Revised SB) in the attached sheet.

Thus the new proposed definition would be:

1. All boats <37 ft LOA, with upwind SA/D >27 using asymmetrical spinnakers, or
2. All boats < 37 ft LOA, with upwind SA/D > 31 using any type of spinnaker, or
3. All boats < 37 ft LOA, with downwind SA/D > 72

The new proposed definition above was made to a motion and seconded. The motion included that the sport boat class would be expanded to all of regions I-III. It was pointed out that having a strict definition of sport boat would still probably include some boats that realistically are not sport boats. It was therefore proposed that the board of handicappers have the final decision on which boats are, and are not, sport boats. This would in effect make the proposed definition a "guideline" for the board of handicappers to follow. This was made into a proposed amendment to the original proposal. The amendment was accepted as part of the proposed change. After further discussion, the question was called and the motion was voted on, and passed by the delegates. Sport boats determined to meet the new rules will have a "SB" suffix following the model designation on the valid certificate and valid listing.

2. **Proposal to include FB (frostbite) Ratings on the PHRF Valid List.** Currently FB ratings are provided only on an as requested (currently 10 to 15 per year out of almost 1100 total) basis, and are valid only for the normal Frostbite season. FB ratings do not count against the one change limitation for valid certificates for each year. Presently, as PHRF of the Chesapeake provides only one rating per certificate, the FB ratings replace previous ratings provided during the normal racing season. FB ratings are only valid during off season racing (i.e. November through March), and expire on 31 March. The valid list is normally published during the usual racing season (April through October). This proposal would require PHRF of the Chesapeake to have a dual rating system in effect for the entire year. A motion was made and seconded, for PHRF of the Chesapeake to provide boat spinnaker and non-spinnaker ratings on the single valid certificate. Dual valid certificates were discussed also. It was pointed out that FB ratings may not be the same as non-spinnaker ratings (one headsail vs two headsails) and individual clubs may have different FB rules while NS is a current PHRF class. It was also discussed that a large number of boats would have to be re-rated by the handicapper boards as it was not as simple as subtracting spinnaker penalties for all boats. After further discussion, an amendment to the proposal was made to make dual ratings optional (via a check box on the application/renewal forms) for an additional \$15 fee, above the regular renewal/application fee. There was further discussion of the amendment and the question was called to vote on the amendment. A show of hands indicated the vote was close; therefore a roll call vote was taken. The amendment was defeated (196 for, 730 against). Shortly after the amendment was voted on, the proposal was voted on and also defeated.

3. **Proposals to revise the High Point scoring rules for PHRF classes:** A couple issues regarding high point rules and proposals to correct those issues are detailed below.

a. The first high point issue relates to the use of “wild card” races to qualify for high point (5 qualifying races minimum). Currently as written, “wild card” races are meaningless. The original intent of these races was to allow a boat that did not have enough races in its home region to qualify for high point to use one or more “wild card” races to supplement the home region races and qualify. The secondary intent was to increase participation in the “wild card” events: Northern Bay Race Week, Annapolis Race Week, Southern Bay Race week and Screwpile Race Week. After the concept was originally enacted, the delegates expressed concern that unbridled use of wild card races would allow a competitor to qualify without ever racing in their home region, which was not the intent of including “wild card” races. The rules were changed such that a boat still had to qualify in its home region without any wild card races, thus rendering the concept meaningless since once qualified, all sanctioned races count to high point anyway. The following revisions to paragraph 4 of the high point rules were proposed to address the “wild card” issue.

4a and 4b. Add the following to both paragraphs 4a and 4b (Qualification for High Point awards).

“Wild card races may count as one of the five qualifying events”.

4d. Change paragraph 4d as follows (changes are underlined).

“d. All Annapolis, Northern Bay, Screwpile Lighthouse Challenge, or Southern Bay Race Week events will be considered as wild card races for boats from “declared regions” outside of the regatta venue region. Wild card races will be scored as home region events for all boats only after that boat from “declared regions” outside of the regatta venue region, has been scored in at least four (4) sanctioned events in it’s declared region. The wild card races shall be scored on a daily basis.-

The revisions to paragraph 4a, 4b, and 4d above, were made into a motion, seconded, and passed by the board of delegates.

b. The second issue regards the races that count toward a high point score. Currently PHRF counts any CBYRA sanctioned race that meets requirements toward a high point score. This has led to having a high point race (sometimes two races) every weekend, which dilutes the number of competitors participating in each event. This is unlike every other class on the Bay that designates selected races that will count for high point and lists others as class starts but not counting towards high point scoring. This proposal would determine if PHRF should reduce the number of races that should count toward high point with the intent of providing more participation in the fewer number of events. The proposal to address this issue could revise paragraphs 6, 7, and/or 8 of our high point scoring rules. If such a proposal were approved, the delegates would need to determine how such a selection would be made, by vote of all delegates in the club’s home region, or by the Executive Committee. Pros: In addition to the issue noted above of races every weekend, sometimes competing against each other, thus diluting the number of competitors at any one event, this would allow for competitors to plan their racing schedule better and be more assured of sailing against their closest competition in a select number of races. Also it would eliminate the current “numbers game” which makes it a virtual necessity to sailing 15 to 20 (or more) races if your competitors do simply to be able to compete for high point (historically nearly all high point winners are required to sail 20+ races to diminish the “denominator” factor in the high point score). Sailing every weekend is no longer an option for many of our members with families and other competing events on the weekend. This has hurt our sport in that some competitors are simply walking away when it becomes obvious that to be competitive they will have to devote almost every weekend of the season to racing. The PHRF B class held a recent meeting on participation decline and noted that most of their members are not planning on attending the single day

weekend races, particularly those with no social event after, since it is too much time and expense to arrange crew, prep the boat, and spend an entire day to come out for only 2 or 3 hours of racing and then go home. Cons: This would require that some clubs to consolidate the race days or combine with other clubs to provide a joint sponsorship of a weekend. It will provide fewer race days for those competitors that want to race every weekend. The delegates would also need to determine a method to select the races awarded high point status. After consideration of the pros and cons by the delegates, the discussion was completed with no motion for a change.

c. The PHRF scorer noted that part of the scoring issues results from members deciding late in the racing season to join CBYRA and complete for high point, long after sailing in many sanctioned events. This basically requires the high point scores be re-calculated for those races sailed before declaring the intent to complete for high point. The proposal to address this issue is to revise paragraph 1a of our high point rules as follows;

- “1. To qualify for CBYRA High Point awards in any PHRF class, an individual must:
 - a. Be a member of CBYRA, prior to their first race qualifying for PHRF high point, and,”

The revision to paragraph 1a, above, was made into a motion, seconded, and passed by the board of delegates.

4. 2010 PHRF Class Splits. The following class splits are the revised splits from the original proposed for 2010. The original proposed splits would have had the same splits in all regions of the Bay. The region IIIAW delegates agreed to have only three divisions of PHRF A, versus the four divisions in 2009. This will hopefully increase participation in each class. As well, PHRF C and D were combined, again looking for increased participation in the combined class. The sport boat class will be expanded to include regions I, II and III. Note that the sport boat definition has changed (see the sport boat proposal in these minutes). The region IV delegates indicated that their participation levels would not support uniform class splits and that the 2009 splits were generally correct. Region IV South indicated they wished to keep the 2009 splits unchanged, while region IV North indicated a slight change to the splits for 2010. The regional delegates independently voted for, and approved the splits for each region as shown below for 2010.

Region	Class	2010 Splits
III AW	A0	Up to 040
III AW	A1	041 to 076
III AW	A2	077 to 115
I, II, III SE	A	Up to 115
I, II, III SE, III AW	B	116 to 154
I, II, III SE, III AW	C	155 and up
II PR	Spinnaker	All
IV North	A	Up to 112
IV North	B	113 to 160
IV North	C	161 and up
IV South	A	Up to 109
IV South	B	110 to 163
IV South	C	164 and up
Regions I-III	Sport Boat	All ratings
All regions I-IV	Corinthian	All ratings
All regions I-IV	Non Spinnaker	All ratings

5. PHRF Foundation. The foundation only provided one grant for 2009. This seems to be due to low visibility of the foundations goals to the general racing public. Some means to increase awareness of the foundation were discussed, with better communication through organizations such as CBYRA. It was mentioned that grants might be provided to crews that wish to participate in the Lloyd Phoenix regatta.

6. Other New Business. The question of whether PHRF Chesapeake was going to allow credit card payments was discussed. Currently, payment must be provided by mail (check or money order), which for some members, is inconvenient. In certain cases, members need “last minute” renewals, and sending payments via overnight mail adds to the expense and time of obtaining the rating certificate. It was noted that there are a number of secure payment options on-line, and the executive committee will evaluate the options and attempt to implement the best choice for PHRF Chesapeake and our members.

7. **Election of 2010 PHRF Officers.** The following slate of officers was proposed to the delegates as nominations for office for 2010. With the nominations complete, the delegates voted to approve the slate of officers as below to PHRF of the Chesapeake. The 2010 officers are as follows:

President -- Bruce Bingman
VP Region I-III -- Mike Mullarky
VP Region IV -- Mike Dale
Secretary/Treasurer -- Bob Thomas

8. **Appointments.** The 2010 President, Bruce Bingman made some brief remarks, provided the following appointments for 2010:

Chief Handicapper, Northern Bay - Eric Crawford
Chief Handicapper, Southern Bay - Christian Schaumlöffel
US Sailing Representative to Offshore Committee - Bruce Bingman
PHRF Representative to CBYRA - Bruce Bingman
Executive Secretary - Stewart Buckler

7. Motion for adjournment was accepted and approved at 2:45pm.

2009 President's Report to the Board of Delegates

Welcome to the 2009 Annual Delegates Meeting for PHRF of the Chesapeake. Despite the tough economy, we have had a steady year. To date we have issued almost 1100 certificates, about the same number as last year. Racing in the major regattas and point-to-point races has been strong although some of the local weekend racing has been down, particularly in the PHRF B and C classes. For the first time in several years we have mid-year scoring reported and hope to increase this as more clubs embrace a common reporting format to allow our scorer to more easily compile results. There are several important topics on the agenda for the Delegates consideration and action as discussed below.

The first is class splits. Due to the reduced attendance at many of the smaller races in Region 3, the number of A classes is proposed to be reduced back to 3 (A0, A1, A2) as was present prior to 2006. There is also a proposal to have the splits between the major divisions (A, B, and C) be the same Bay wide which would greatly ease the burden on the scorer when boats race in different regions (and would hopefully increase the number of boats travelling). This may not be practical due to the distribution of competitors but we should discuss.

The second item comes from the scorer's desk and is the treatment of the "wild card" race week races. As currently defined, they are treated just the same as any race although this was not the original intent. The original intent was that these races could count as a "home" race for the purpose of high point qualification, even if they did not occur in the competitor's home region. There was great concern that this would allow boats to simply use these races to qualify and never sail in their home region but the language put into the requirement currently prohibits use of any of these races as originally intended. The proposed revised language will allow a competitor to use one "wild card" race as a home race, thus requiring them to sail at least 4 races in their home region but then allow using a single away "wild card" race as the 5th race. Based on a quick review by the scorer, this would have allowed several more boats to have qualified for high point and if publicized should encourage better attendance at the "wild card" race weeks.

The third item comes from the competitors and regards the very light displacement 27 to 33 foot boats now referred to as "sportboats". These boats typically have a large sail area to displacement ratio (SA/D) and fly large asymmetrical spinnakers. Because of their SA/D, they typically have ratings that are much faster than their actual length would indicate. This results in sailing characteristics that are very different than the conventional displacement boat. They tend to sail upwind much as any 30 foot boat would but they are far faster downwind, even planing in some instances. Thus except for a narrow band of about 8 to 10 knots of wind speed, the single number PHRF rule is hard pressed to rate them fairly. They either run away downwind, or in very light or very heavy air, or conversely are "tail enders" in 11-17 knots with chop or an all upwind race. One proposal to "fix" the problem is to have sportboat classes when enough of the boats are present and force the boats to sail in such a class. For this to work, two things need to occur: 1. We must have a good definition of a sportboat and 2. Enough clubs must offer a sportboat class start or score a subclass of sportboats to allow these boats to compete for high point. We (PHRF) can attack the first of these items and the delegates can encourage their clubs to add a sportboat start for the second item although we have no direct say in what PHRF classes should be offered. The current broad definition of sportboats in the Chesapeake is not specific enough as it includes some boats such as the new Swan 42 and FARR 40's using asymmetricals as sportboats but fails to include others which common sense would tell us should be included. The problem is the current definition depends only on upwind sail area as defined by the simple triangle rule, not including oversize roaches and does not take into account downwind sail area. Also it does not take into account that higher performance larger boats over 40 feet in length tend to have very high SA/D ratios. The proposed changes to the definition would rectify these problems.

The last major item deals with the question of should every race count for high point. Each class determines which of the CBYRA sanctioned races should be counted towards high point. Currently PHRF has counted any sanctioned race with a PHRF start as a high point race. This has resulted in a situation where there is a race every weekend of the summer and sometimes two competing races with the resulting dilution of racing to the extent that the competitors are either complaining or simply not showing up. All of the cruising one design classes have selected a smaller sub-set of the sanctioned races to be counted for high point although they may have class starts in many other races. The purpose is to ensure that there is good racing with enough boats on the starting line for those races that will be counted towards high point. We had a number of races this past summer where the attendance was low enough that the minimum number of starters to qualify as a high point race (3) was either not met or the club had to combine several classes to get the required number of racers. The delegates need to discuss and determine if they want to continue the current practice of sanctioning every race or if they want to select some subset of sanction races as the high point races. If a decision were made to reduce the number of races counting towards high point, then the method of selection would need to be determined. Among possible approaches to reducing the number of races that count for high point would be: the PHRF executive board could take input from each club and evaluate those that should continue to be on the high point calendar; the Delegates could simply set a minimum number of boats as well as minimum number per class and drop the race for high point in future years if the minimum was not met; or the Delegates could select and vote on which races to retain high point. I want to thank our officers, handicappers, executive secretary, treasurer, and especially our scorer for all their time and effort spent to make our time on the water more enjoyable.

Bruce Bingman

2009 PHRF Financial Report and 2010 Budget

	2009 Budget	ACTUAL thru 11/12/09	2010 Budget
INCOME	\$33,000.00	\$34,727.07	\$36,000.00
Interest (as of Oct 31)		\$82.71	
Deposits (as of Oct 31)		\$34,644.36	
EXPENSES			
EXEC SEC (total)	\$15,600.00	\$16,117.59	\$18,105.00
CERT FEES	\$6,700.00	\$6,743.75	\$7,000.00
TRAVEL	\$450.00	\$133.32	\$200.00
POSTAGE	\$1,800.00	\$3,007.85	\$2,500.00
PRINTING	\$2,100.00	\$2,040.70	\$3,725.00
SUPPLIES	\$400.00	\$651.20	\$550.00
TELEPHONE	\$350.00	\$352.42	\$400.00
WEB FEES	\$400.00	\$379.35	\$380.00
YEARBOOK	\$3,400.00	\$2,809.00	\$2,800.00
MISC			\$550.00
HANDICAPPERS (total)	\$6,300.00	\$4,012.57	\$6,550.00
MTGS NORTH	\$3,000.00	\$2,116.94	\$3,400.00
TRAVEL N	\$300.00		\$100.00
MTGS SOUTH	\$2,000.00	\$1,589.50	\$2,400.00
TRAVEL S	\$300.00		\$100.00
JOINT MTG	\$600.00	\$306.13	\$450.00
TECH COMM	\$100.00		\$100.00
OFFICERS	\$600.00	\$0.00	\$600.00
ANNUAL MEETING	\$1,000.00		\$1,500.00
EXEC COMM	\$200.00		\$200.00
NATIONAL MTGS	\$3,000.00	\$875.74	\$3,000.00
DUES (USSA PHRF)	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$550.00
GREEN BOOK	\$85.00		\$85.00
INSURANCE	\$0.00		\$0.00
High Point RACE RESULTS	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00
TROPHIES North	\$2,500.00		\$2,500.00
TROPHIES South	\$1,500.00		\$1,500.00
MISC	\$465.00	\$117.34	\$210.00
TOTAL	\$33,000.00	\$21,673.24	\$36,000.00
GRANTS (5%) of end of year balance		\$520.00	\$5,000.00
		\$22,193.24	
BANK BALANCES:	Checking	Savings	Money Market
Suntrust (as of Oct 31)	\$18,425.20	\$34,644.36	\$40,349.83
M & T Bank (as of Oct 10)	\$6,599.62	\$42,996.55	
Totals	\$25,024.82	\$77,640.91	\$40,349.83
Total Deposits	\$143,015.56		

REPORT OF THE 2009 US SAILING MEETING

The 2009 Annual Meeting of US SAILING was held in Houston, Texas from October 21 to October 25, 2009. I attended as the PHRF Chesapeake Bay representative. While there I attended meetings of all IRC, ORR, PHRF, ISAF, Safety at Sea, Offshore Championship committee and Offshore councils. I currently serve as the Vice Chair of the US PHRF committee, as Chair of the National Offshore Council, chair of the Offshore Championship committee, member of the IRC and ORR Committees, and as a member of the House of Delegates of US SAILING as an offshore/handicapping representative. Next year I will be the chair of the US PHRF committee so as well as most of the other tasks so the Chesapeake will be well represented in PHRF and Offshore matters.

The primary action taken at the meeting was to install the new President of USA SAILING, Gary Jobson. He brings both national light and recognition to the organization and a set of fresh ideas including rejuvenating the various committees, adding a requirement to have two new people added to each of the major committees, one under 30 and one under 40.

The total number of PHRF Certificates in the country remained steady or slightly decreasing at over 14,000 in 47 member fleets (we have over 1070 certificates in the Chesapeake). The Offshore Office estimates that at least 20,000 boats are using PHRF based on review of the origins of questions to the US SAILING Offshore office from fleets that are not registered members of US SAILING. Many of these "informal" racers participate in the "Beer can" or weekday evening type racing which continues to be a rapidly growing trend in the US. This makes PHRF the most widely used system in the world with IRC second with 7500 certificates (primarily in the United Kingdom and Atlantic coast of France, but now beginning to spread in the Med and about 650 in the US), ORC club (simplified IMS) second with about 7000 certificates (primarily in Europe), IMS fourth with about 4000 certificates (again primarily in Europe with less than 100 now in the US) and ORR fifth with about 900 certificates (about 700 in the US).

IRC's penetration into all but the Long Island Sound and San Francisco areas of the US is small and not growing very rapidly. This is due to a combination of reasonable satisfaction with PHRF coupled with the cost (around \$4.50/foot yearly plus one time measurement costs) and the "Euro-centric" nature of the IRC. As a result, PHRF continues to be the primary choice for virtually all other areas and still has good classes at Key West although the "Grand Prix" racers are now all IRC. The PHRF national Championships were held at Key West in 2007 and 2008 but not held in 2009 and will likely be held at a different venue in 2010.

The US SAILING PHRF committee continues to expand the concept of a "Median Rating" from the original selected group of about 20 up to 50+ boats listed in 2009. This is in response to the ongoing problems of some very large and unexplained rating differences seen between some areas in the country for the same boats. The object is to try to encourage more uniform ratings from region to region unless some circumstance (i.e. very heavy breeze, all downwind courses, etc.) exists which would bias ratings more than a few second per mile from the median. There has been a lot of VPP research at US SAILING which can be used to help improve PHRF ratings, particularly for "differentials" such as all downwind, sail restrictions, heavy air, etc. These tools are being placed on the US SAILING website for use by members and member organizations. The research continues and is financed primarily through donations. I would recommend that PHRF of the Chesapeake donate \$1000, an amount about equal to \$1 for each of our members to this research (perhaps designated for the "sportboat" area).

Two national handicap appeals were heard during the year one of which was remanded back to the local committee for further data. The other concerned a Mariah 27 which had been assigned a questionable rating and the appeals committee assigned a handicap in line with several of the areas (including the Chesapeake) where these boats have sailed.

During the ISAF meeting the PHRF committee representative instructed our delegates to the ISAF meeting in November to oppose the revision to storm sail requirements for Category 4 and 5 boats as well as opposing very restrictive hatch requirements for these boats. The PHRF committee supported various editorial and minor changes to the ORC safety regulations.

The National Offshore Council met twice during the course of the conference and discussed issues ranging from specific committee items noted above to the overall state of sailing and how to improve participation.

Respectfully submitted,
Bruce Bingman,
PHRF Chesapeake Delegate

Region I-III Chief Handicapper's Report 2009

During this past season the board met monthly and assigned new handicaps or changes to ten or so boats a month and considered appeals as they were brought before us. During our meetings other issues of PHRF racing were discussed, some of which are on the agenda today. With reduced participation in most events, our numbers are down and a couple of meetings were canceled and ratings were assigned by e-mail. While an e-mail discussion sometimes may not be as thorough as meeting discussion all e-mail assigned ratings are brought up again at the next meeting. This helps the organization save a little money and helps with the volunteer board's increasingly busy schedule. The region I-III board of handicappers will continue with the same members for next year. Thank you to all. I would like to give special thanks to Stew Buckler, the Executive Secretary, who works tirelessly to keep this organization organized, and to our President, Bruce Bingman, who provides his time and expertise to so many facets of sailboat racing.

Respectfully submitted,
Eric Crawford,
Chief Handicapper, regions I-III

Region IV Chief Handicappers Report for 2009

PHRF Southern Chesapeake Bay did not have any large volume of boats to discuss. Lessons learned from attempts of adding a cruising class to SBRW failed to get more boats interested to racing. Only certain races (for cruisers) attracted many cruisers. Several boats in region IV are well maintained with crews known bay wide. However most of these boats would qualify for the Corinthian class if it would be introduced. In that case the remaining classes would be thinned out and we could lose boats all together. With about 30 boats on average in the Hampton area we seemed to have found a healthy competition within A, B, C and NS classes. Occasionally PHRF A fleet can be split into A1 and A2 and NS likewise. Other areas in PHRF Region IV have less than 30 boats on average. A sport boat class has not been attempted here because lake conditions are less applicable in this region and boat owners rarely consider Cat. 5 type boats. The few sport boats in PHRF Region IV are in different classes over 100 sec/mi apart. Class splits have been agreed upon after lengthy discussions and voted on about a year ago. It is not the same split throughout Region IV to accommodate the best classes in size (volume) and proximity of their rating. In view of the low numbers in persistent racing crews, southern bay prefers to employ the KISS method to preserve what is there. However all racers are very encouraged to keep coming up with ideas to add any interesting twist to promote our sport. Maybe exchange of skippers between boats or double the length of laps (= less mark roundings and more tactical sailing in varying currents and winds). Maybe our races are too much railroaded. We seem to find more interest in medium distance races, which seem to give different crews an edge and mix up standings. Ask your sailing friends what appeals to them. PHRF is no Olympic committee with inflexible perceptions about racing.

2010 handicappers: Alan Bomar, Rusty Burshell, Mike Dale, Mayo Tabb, Mark Hinman, Chris Johnson, Dwight Timm, Justin Morris (new)

Respectfully,
Christian Schaumloffel,
2009 Chief Handicapper, Region IV
Southern Chesapeake Bay

Executive Secretary Report, 2009

Valid Certificates Issued by Year

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Region 1	124	138	126	125	125	123	116	123	134	128
Region 2	119	115	119	120	115	115	114	108	102	88
Region 3	542	585	637	656	648	622	592	588	552	578
Region 4	<u>242</u>	<u>261</u>	<u>279</u>	<u>276</u>	<u>275</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>275</u>	<u>269</u>	<u>280</u>	<u>284</u>
Total:	1027	1099	1161	1177	1163	1137	1097	1088	1068	1078
Certificate & Member Renewal:			966	1012	1019	984	953	951	941	951
New Certificate & Member:			195	165	144	153	144	137	127	127
SE Certificate:			3	12	0	2	1	1	0	0
Member Only/No Certificate:			0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2
Associate Member:			<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Member/Certificate Types:			1166	1191	1166	1141	1102	1089	1070	1080
<u>Prop Credits:</u>			156	166	156	153	145	129	124	152
<u>RF Credits:</u>			385	412	402	395	380	378	366	365
<u>EC= 6:</u>			24	38	29	25	16	21	0	17
<u>New BRTGs:</u>									37	38
<u>RTG Appeals:</u>									29	29

2009 Certificates/Membership by Class/Region

Class:	<u>A0</u>	<u>A1</u>	<u>A2</u>	<u>A3</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Region 1					32	39	31	26	128
Region 2					29	18	27	14	88
Region 3	22	56	106	64	248	121	127	82	578
Region 4	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>45</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>130</u>	<u> </u>	<u>284</u>
2009 Total:	22	56	106	64	354	287	315	122	1078
2008 Total:	21	51	108	60	356	316	306	90	1068

Web Site (home page... www.phrfchesbay.com)

Valid List On-line Updated Weekly During Racing Season
 Status of current year rating appeals available on-line
 Application package On-line
 Schedule of board of handicapper meetings available on-line
 Special Regulations for Safety Requirements on-line
 Rating/member application form available on-line

PHRF data base

- .. 2010 PHRF application forms will be updated on website soon, please do not use older forms
- .. 2010 valid certificate similar to 2009 w/any changes as necessary from this meeting
- .. 2010 renewals will be mailed out after 1 January 2010 to those with 2009 certificates
- .. Members need to keep addresses/phone numbers up to date
- .. Applications for new boats need to be sent in early, for verification and rating process
- .. Data on applications must be complete and accurate, owners responsibility