

Ballot for proposed rule changes – Footy Class

It is now a few years since the 2005 Footy Class Rule was adopted as an international rule incorporating parts of the previous similar, USA, NZL and GBR Footy rules. It has been quite successful, helping Footys become one of the fastest-growing classes ever, with true international impact.

Experiences over those years have led to some skippers proposing changes. Some want to loosen restrictions, and some want to tighten perceived loopholes. Voters, please carefully consider the impact of each proposal. **Try to be sure that a change will not result in unforeseen and unintended consequences.** The future of the Footy Class is in your hands.

The following rule changes have been proposed by registered Footy skippers, and reviewed by the Technical Committee. In some instances, proposed changes were revised by the Technical Committee to properly reflect the submitter's intention. The pro and con comments are the Committee's brief summary of the arguments that have been presented, to help voters make an informed decision.

Each rule is quoted in full both with the current wording and with the **proposed changes in red** so that the full implications are evident.

A “yes” vote means you want the rule to be changed as proposed. A “no” vote means you want the rule to remain as currently written.

Footy Class Rule change proposals Part 1 (complete rule clauses in the CR order with **changes within each rule in red**) **Errors & omissions correction and interpretation confirmations**

Proposal 1: Overhanging rudder exception	Yes	No
<p>B. PRIMARY MEASUREMENT RULE The first omission correction is the need for another exception, B.5, to correct a mistake that the requirement to be 'in racing trim' cannot apply to the overhanging rudder! Whilst it is obvious and common sense that when the boat is placed in the measurement box an overhanging rudder going through a slot cannot also turn as if it was sailing, it does need to be made another exception. This will also lead to B1 requiring change. The definition of 'racing trim' is also added to B.1 to remove doubt about the meaning in the context of this rule.</p> <p>Change B.1, and add B.5 as in red</p>	<p>B.1 With the exceptions listed below in B.2, B.3, B.4 and B.5, the boat in racing trim shall be capable of fitting into an open-topped rectangular measurement box of internal dimensions 305mm long, 305mm deep, 153mm wide, with 6.3mm wide slots for projecting spars and rudder, as shown in the diagram. Racing trim means that all components of the boat must be installed and be capable of the full motion used while racing without being restricted by any part of the measurement box.</p> <p>B.5 During measurement, rotation of a rudder extending through the slot is unnecessary.</p>	

<p>Proposal 2: Wind indicator omission/multiple masts</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>The second omission correction is the wind indicator, which should have been included in the rules and shown on the 'rules summary' diagram. With the masts' interpretation of Jan 2007, B.2 is changed as follows:</p> <p>Change B.2 as in red</p>	<p>B.2 The following may project above the top of the measurement box: sail(s), mast(s), spars, rigging, aerial, wind indicator(s), associated fittings.</p>	
<p>Proposal 3a: Definition of 'set' of rig and sail(s)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>This is an important addition, as questions have been asked about what the term 'set' means and the technical team made an emergency interpretation last June. The interpretation requested covered the ground of Proposal 3b below but proposal 3a is necessary to support it. If we are to have restrictions on the number and/or size of rigs, we necessarily require a definition of what a rig is. We very strongly recommend that you vote YES to this definition, unless you favor abandonment ALL control on NUMBERS of rigs. If you do think that ALL such controls should be abandoned, you should vote NO.</p> <p>Please note that, in the event of a patently illogical outcome (e.g. no controls but a definition), the Management Committee will adjust the position to be logically consistent while taking account of what they believe to be members' general feelings as expressed in their votes. Unless we do this, the ballot paper will become incredibly complicated with no significant gain.</p> <p>Add C.3(c)</p>	<p>C.3(c) A set of rig and sail(s) is defined as the combination of rig and sail(s) for use during racing that is presented for inspection at event registration.</p>	
<p>Proposal 3b: Changes of sail area within a rig.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>The effect of a vote on this item is contingent on Proposal 3a being passed and section 6.3 (c) being incorporated in the rule.</p> <p>Rig is not a term used in the ERS as most full sized boats don't have more than one rig. The intention of every version of the class rule (current and proposed) has been to limit sail area indirectly by providing a finite maximum size for the smaller or smallest rig. In other words, the bigger your 'top' rig, the bigger the risk you run of being overpowered or else still having insufficient power from your small rig when the wind increases. This intention is blurred if you are allowed to changes the sizes of sails within a rig be removing them, reefing them, changing them etc.</p> <p>The proposed addition to C.3 (c) disallows changes in the</p>	<p>With the exception of the smallest rig and sail set, reducing the area of the sail(s) during an event is prohibited.</p>	

area of a rig presented for an event. This means that a high-tech boat cannot use clever and possibly complex devices to reef sails. It also means that a 'character' gaff cutter cannot change topsails, take off some of its multiple jibs etc. Beware: there is such a thing as a high-tech gaff cutter.

Please note also that this proposal does NOT disallow changes to the smallest rig. In the words of one member of the Technical Team, "there is no reason why the small sail(s) could not be cut down to suit the most extreme conditions, just to be able to sail and survive. Many sailors have had to use the scissors in such emergencies!"

Add to clause C.3(c) (if extant)

Proposal 4: Radio Control operation

C. Conditions for Racing

The fourth rule on which there was a Jan 2007 interpretation that could be worded better is C.1. There was no intent to restrict control to '2 channel radio sets'. A simple change of words would make this clear:

Change C.1 as in red

Yes

No

C.1 Radio control is restricted to the use of no more than 2 channels.

Proposal 5: Ballast

E. HULL APPENDAGES

The fifth rule proposal concerns ballast density. As there is no proposal to change the density this is included in Part 1. The only change is the materials to be used within the maximum density limit. The use of composite materials will be welcomed by those that regard lead as a dangerous substance. Alternatives may remove a problem with educational establishments that are unable to handle lead. This has already scuppered one scheme for hundreds of Footy boats. The problem of enforcement is no different from that in all the other International rules.

Change E.4 as in red

Yes

No

E.4 The density of composite materials for ballast shall not exceed that of lead (11.3g/cm³). Composite materials are defined as a mixture of materials brought to form a single component.

Footy Class Rule change proposals Part 2 (complete rule clauses in the **CR** order with **changes within each rule in red**)

Changes to the important working of the class rule

Proposal 6: Batteries	Yes	No
<p>C. Conditions for Racing</p> <p>The current 2005 rule restricting batteries to 4x AA was originally set to be the lowest cost with use with the standard battery clip that comes with a basic RC set or in a pack. In terms of mAh this still appears to be the least expensive battery type.</p> <p>Proponents of the change argue that other battery types are cheap, readily available, and lighter weight, allowing a less-experienced builder to more easily build a light boat. They also argue that the AA rule restricts innovation in what is intended to be an open class. The wide range of weight for AA batteries also promotes a single brand of lithium nonchargeable battery for serious racing. The most important effect of lighter batteries is a better performance for all boats, both lighter displacement with a lower center of gravity and therefore more stability.</p> <p>Opponents of the change argue that the 4 AA restriction presents an interesting design and building challenge that is important to the class. They also point out that it serves as an equalizer that keeps boats within a reasonable displacement range. An experienced builder with lighter hull construction would still have a greater stability advantage over weightier hulls because the lighter hull would have a bigger effect on the lowering the center of gravity, than with heavier AA batteries.</p> <p>Change C.2 as in red</p>		<p>C.2 Batteries are to be placed within the hull.</p>

Differing change proposals regarding multiple rudders are proposed. **Read both 7a and 7b carefully before voting.**

Proposal 7a: Rudder Proposals	Yes	No
<p>E. Hull Appendages This combination of changes retains the restriction of a single aft-projecting rudder of 6.3mm thickness, but it permits any number of rudders of any thickness provided they fit within the box. This would allow such things as canards, t-foil rudders, etc, within the box.</p> <p>Proponents argue that multiple rudders should be permitted, providing they are within the measurement box, and that the current rule unnecessarily restricts innovation.</p> <p>Opponents argue that multiple rudders add complexity without enhancing performance, so one rudder is adequate and maintains simplicity within the class. Allowing multiple rudders means they are, in effect, movable hull appendages. As a result, this rule may become more confusing.</p> <p>Change E.1, E.2, and E.3 as shown in red:</p>		<p>E.1 The overhang of a rudder is restricted to 51mm aft of the measurement box.</p> <p>E.2 Except for rudder(s), the following are prohibited: retractable and or movable hull appendages.</p> <p>E.3 The thickness of any rudder extending aft of the measurement box shall not exceed 6.3mm.”</p>
Proposal 7b (only if you voted No for 7a)	Yes	No
<p>This addition would clarify the current rule and confirms the January 2007 interpretation.</p> <p>Proponents argue that multiple rudders add complexity without enhancing performance, so one rudder is adequate, but this change is needed to eliminate ambiguity in the current rule.</p> <p>Opponents argue that multiple rudders should be permitted, providing they are within the measurement box.</p> <p>Add E.5.</p>		<p>E.5 More than one rudder is prohibited.</p>

Differing change proposals regarding rig restrictions are proposed. **Read 8a, 8b, 8c and 8d carefully before voting.**

Changes to the rules regarding rigs need to be considered with caution, as there may be some danger of “throwing the baby out with the bathwater” with these proposals.

The current rule does not restrict the number of rigs that you can experiment with, but for racing it requires choosing a rig to ensure that one can get round the course safely in the quickest time. The current rule is working well in the UK.

A proposal for a 3 rig limit might be a solution that could help the US problem of light airs and allow riskier rigs to be ‘safer’ for racing.

If all restrictions are removed there may be rig wars, which high-tech builders might love, but others could be put off by their inability to compete.

Proposal 8a: 3 sets of rig/sails.	Yes	No
<p>C. Conditions for Racing Proponents argue that it may be a solution to the problem of those who sail mainly in light airs. It would allow riskier rigs to be ‘safer’ for racing, by allowing a mid-size rig as an alternative if the wind increases during a race.. However all the Footy Class rules so far have had a direct or indirect limit on sail area and to maintain this and to keep a lid on the biggest sizes the middle rig would be restricted to 406mm (16”).</p> <p>Opponents argue that against this is the extra cost and complication. If this class is to be a simple RC entry class to attract newcomers and encourage the young it will attract families. if Mum, Dad and 2 kids want to race that will be 12 rigs, not the current 8.</p> <p>Change C.3(b) to read:</p>	C.3(b) no more than 3 sets of rig and sail(s) shall be used.	
Proposal 8b: 3 sets with limits. (Only if Yes on 8a)	Yes	No
Change C.3(c) to read:		C.3(c) the smallest and middle rig and sail set shall not project more than 305mm and 406mm respectively above the top of the measurement box.
Proposal 8c: 2 rigs but the removal of the 305mm limit (Only if No on 8a)	Yes	No
<p>This change eliminates the 305mm (12”) restriction of the small rig, but keeps the limit of 2 rigs used in an event or regatta.</p> <p>Proponents argue that the 305mm (12”) rig is useless except in strong wind conditions, which many sailors (particularly in the USA) encounter infrequently. They feel that any two rigs should be permitted regardless of size, permitting two useful choices in a light-air race.</p>	C.3(c)...delete the clause	

Opponents argue that the restriction of the small rig keeps skippers from building outrageously large rigs, because if the wind overpowers the big rig, they only have the 305mm (12") rig to use instead. Removing this limit would allow the 'safe' use of much bigger rigs.

**Proposal 8d: Unrestricted rig choice
(Only if No on 8a and Yes on 8c)**

By removing references to rig number and size, this change together with 3c above allows an unlimited number of rigs of any size to be used in any regatta.

Proponents of this change to eliminate all rig restrictions argue from the point of view of sailing mostly in light airs that the 305mm (12") small rig is useless except in strong winds. As a result, the current rule restricts the useful number of rigs to one. Since building rigs is easy and inexpensive, they feel that it is practical to have any number of rigs available and to change them as needed to meet changing wind conditions in an event or regatta.

Opponents point out that the 305mm (12") height restriction of the small rig and just 2 rigs keeps skippers from racing with very large rigs, because if the wind overpowers the big rig, they only have the small rig to use instead. Also, the current restriction on the number of rigs to two discourages proliferation of rigs and the escalating costs of competition.

[\(Please note that C.3\(c\) has already been voted on.\)](#)

Yes

No

C.3(b) ...delete the clause