



**Executive Meeting**  
**Royal Hamilton Yacht Club**  
**Saturday, October 29, 2005**

**Minutes**

---

1. Called to order at 10:00 am
2. **Acceptance of minutes** - (attached) Motion to accept January 29, 2005 minutes as written with the following correction:  
Item 7. Race Results – Replace “New Assistant Chief to follow up on this” with “Bob Porter to follow up on this”  
*M/S Bob Porter/Andrew Sensicle. Carried*
3. **Financial Review** - Motion to accept Financial Review & 2006 Budget as written including the following changes for presentation at the AGM:
  - Increase 1 years reserve to cover full year of expenses
  - Increase Travel Budget for 2006 by \$1050 for US PHRF representative
  - Change Club Membership Dues to Cdn/US = \$40/35*M/S Ian McKimmie/Bob Porter. Carried*  
Also Noted:
  - Actively pursue Directors Insurance for 2006. *Ian to supply paperwork to Andrew.*
  - Send representative to next US PHRF committee meeting – *Ian or Bob will attend.*
  - Maintain Special Projects amount in budget to continue moving forward with programs/web over the next few years.
4. **BYLAW REVIEW** – Motion to present at the AGM, changes to the PHRF Bylaws as discussed. Including modifications to:  
Section 4.2. Organizational Structure – The Officers  
Section 10. Appeals – As presented including addition of:  
Preliminary review/report by Assistant Chief or delegate.  
*M/S Bob Porter/Brian Thompson*
5. **District Allocations** - Review of District allocations and boundaries.  
Recommended that recommendation be prepared for distribution to members for feedback.  
*Brian Thompson to supply modified version for Colin to approve prior to distribution.*
6. **Initial Assignment Support Documents**- Motion to recommend that Central Council require a “minimum” of the following items for all NEW handicaps set by the districts. To assist in proper decision-making when reviewing or confirming boat handicaps, and for legal reasons.
  - Underwater Profile or Picture

- List of Comparison Boats
  - District Chief summary of decision process
- M/S Colin Alston/Bob Porter. Carried*

7. **Handicap Support Information** – Covered as part of item 6
8. **Guidelines for New Design vs Old Design in Initial Assignment** – Covered as part of item 6
9. **Handicap Formulae** - Covered as part of item 6
10. **Roles & Responsibilities** – Underutilized roles will now have direction:  
**Vice President:** will be responsible for setting up and organizing all Training and Education sessions.  
For 2006:  
Following AGM to cover basics and/or changes to PHRF handicapping system.  
Spring Session (tent. March 25<sup>th</sup>) to cover general Sailing information session with sail makers and boat builders. This to be “Video recorded” for distribution along with “Basics for handicapping” possibly done in PowerPoint presentation.  
**Asst. Chief Handicapper:** will be responsible for replying to appeals (Bob will take on this duty for 1 year). Also, responsible for collection of information when conflict arises between Districts/ Handicappers/ Certificate Holders.
11. **Relations with Governing Bodies** – Motion to improve relations with US PHRF committee, by sending a representative to attend meetings and do networking.  
Also, V.President to conference with CYA representatives regarding issues.  
*M/S Bob Porter/Ian McKimmie. Carred*
12. **Grievance Procedure** – Covered as part of item 4
13. **Education Program** – Covered as part of item 10
14. **Steve Corona’s Perspective** – Following sections to be published as written by author:  
Historical Background  
The PHRF Goal  
Assessing Performance  
*Colin Alston to include summary for inclusion with published information*
15. **Web based certificate proposal** – (attached) Proposal to be presented to membership at AGM.  
*Diana Riley to include modifications as discussed.*
16. **Next Meeting:** TBA
17. Motion to adjourn 2:30 pm. M/S Bob Porter/Ian McKimmie. Carried.



**Executive Meeting  
Youngstown Yacht Club  
Saturday, January 29, 2005**

**Minutes**

---

Colin Alston (Pres), Brian Thomson (V. Pres), Andrew Sensicle (Sec/Tres), Ian MacKimmie (Chief Handicapper), Bill Crandall (Asst. Chief), Bob Porter (Asst. Chief)

1. Called to order at 9:32 am
2. Minutes of the Dec. 11, 2004 meeting reviewed. Motioned Bill, Seconded Brian minutes be accepted. Passed.
3. **California Girl Appeal** - Discussion held on California Girl continuing appeal to PHRF-US. It was felt to allow the appeal to go forward, we would be operating with two PHRF systems on Lake Ontario. Some concern was expressed Mr. Moores might see a lawyer on this.  
No action taken. Most recent vote was to not allow the appeal to go to PHRF-US. This remains.
4. **US Sailing membership** - Discussion in respect of continuing to pay membership to US Sailing. Decided to go ahead and renew the membership. Motion Bob, Seconded Bill. Passed.

Colin Alston and Bill Crandall noted when PHRF-LO first formed membership with US Sailing and PHRF-US was done. However, the membership was as an Associate only, not in a voting capacity. Over the years without apparent notice by the PHRF-LO Executive the membership was changed by US Sailing to a voting membership. No further action required.

5. **Appeals** - Some discussion on the appeals process. It was suggested the appeals should require when an owner is appealing the handicap of another vessel or vessels the appellant should be required to put the respondent on notice. Ian to include this in the upcoming revisions.
6. **US Sailing representative** - Some discussion on PHRF-LO having a member assigned to US Sailing. Ian is currently having regular contact with US Sailing and PHRF-US, and will continue to do so. If it is felt someone should actually be assigned this role, the Executive will deal with it at a later date.
7. **Race Results** - Bob queried on how to get more Member Clubs to regularly submit their race results. New Assistant Chief to follow-up on this.
8. Meeting adjourned, 10:20 a.m.

## 2005 Year End Forecast and 2006 Budget

As of Oct 25, 2005	<u>Cdn</u>	<u>US</u>	<u>US as Cdn</u>	<u>2005 Actual</u>	<u>2005 Budget</u>	<u>2006 Budget</u>
				1.15 Conversion Rate 2005		
<b>Income</b>						
Certificates - Renewal(1)	22,035	3,955	4,548	26,583	26,652	28,194
Certificates - Rush Fee	150	0	0	150	100	100
Club Dues	3,525	650	748	4,273	4,380	2,403
Other	174	0	0	174		200
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$25,884</b>	<b>\$4,605</b>	<b>\$5,296</b>	<b>\$31,179</b>	<b>\$31,132</b>	<b>\$30,897</b>
<b>Expenses</b>						
Communications	1,771	0	0	1,771	2,000	2,000
Computer Supplies	818	0	0	818	2,000	1,500
General Funds (Misc)	67	14	16	83	1,000	0
Insurance	0		0	0	2,000	2,000
Meetings	629	560	644	1,273		1,300
Membership Dues	220	550	633	853	1,000	900
Office Supplies	931	0	0	931	1,000	1,000
Postage	1,085	0	0	1,085	900	1,000
Printing	1,253	0	0	1,253	2,000	1,500
Publications - US Sail books	0	0	0	0	250	250
Salaries(2)	18,719	0	0	18,719	12,600	14,000
Special Projects (3)	5,350	0	0	5,350	5,000	5,350
Training	0	0	0	0	2,000	1,500
Travel	0		0	0	200	1,250
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$30,843</b>	<b>\$1,124</b>	<b>\$1,292</b>	<b>\$32,135</b>	<b>\$31,950</b>	<b>\$33,550</b>
<b>Net Inc (Exp)</b>				<b>-\$956</b>	<b>-\$818</b>	<b>-\$2,653</b>

As of Oct 25, 2005	US\$	Canadian \$
Current A/c		\$14,490
Can GIC		\$22,225
US Current A/c	\$4,349	\$5,001
US GIC	\$4,000	\$4,600
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$46,316</b>
Current funds		\$46,316
One year expense fund		\$32,000
<b>Funds available</b>		<b>\$14,316</b>

2006		
Rate Proposal	Certificate	Membership
CDN	\$20.00	\$40.00
plus 5 Certificates		\$140.00
US	\$15.00	\$35.00
plus 5 Certificates		\$110.00

Notes

- (1) Total Renewals for 2006
- |              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Can Expected | 1182 |
| US Expected  | 264  |
- (2) Includes 164 hrs for projects not budgeted  
(3) Conversion of Dbase program to Access

## **PHRF Handicap Analysis on Lake Ontario – A Perspective**

### **Historical Background**

The performance handicapping movement for boat racing actually started on the West Coast over 50 years ago but was organized, as we know it about 25 years ago as a response to the performance, high cost and complexity of measurement handicap systems. It was originally not meant for “Grand Prix” racing events but rather was designed to allow individual clubs to easily and inexpensively rate and race boats of different sizes and shapes within their own organization. Over the years the popularity of the system has expanded (wisely or not) to some of the largest sailing events. PHRF is expected to be a “waterfall” system; handicaps are determined at the lowest level (generally the club or small geographical area) where performance can be continuously observed and handicaps adjusted in response to that performance. Elevation to “higher authority” was necessary only to coordinate handicaps in larger geographical areas for interclub racings. Quantification of boat performance, in the form of “on the water” observations or race data analysis, is implied in both the name and spirit of the system.

The PHRF system was adopted on Lake Ontario about 20 years ago. Prior to that time, a variety of measurement-based systems were used on the Lake. The Lake Ontario Rule (LOR) enjoyed popularity for several years and along with IOR (International Offshore Rule), Measurement Handicap System (MHS), and Midget Ocean Racing Class (MORC). These measurement systems formed the basis for the initial handicap assignments on Lake Ontario. Changes from those initial “borrowed” ratings were generally laboriously made with hand calculations of race performance and subjective judgment of the handicappers. Initially the “rating holes” in the measurement rules provided some boats a distinct advantage but these anomalies were patched over time yielding a performance based rating system that is considered improved over the measurement rules. Another positive outcome of PHRF is that PHRF has allowed an improved range of boat types to be developed which are unconstrained by the hull bumps and funny shapes that provided an advantage in certain measurement systems. Older boats have enjoyed an almost infinite racing life since, at least theoretically, PHRF neutralizes any advantage of newer faster boats.

### **The PHRF Goal**

The fundamental goal of PHRF is to provide a handicap system where equally sailed boats of equal preparation can compete equitably over the long term. While the goal of PHRF is clear, implementation of that goal can be difficult for a number of reasons:

1. It is very difficult to assess the skill level at which a boat is being sailed. Additionally the range of boat performance associated with skill level differences is very large. Graham Moss, one of the initial PHRF-LO handicappers, offered a study that showed that the range of boat performance associated with the “skill level” of crew, and boat preparation on Lake Ontario was approximately 120 sec/mile. This number dwarfs any adjustment one might make to an individual boats rating. Obviously it would be nearly impossible to correctly handicap a boat without somehow considering the skill factor in any handicap adjustment either by subjective assessment or averaging a shear volume of performance data. If there are very few boats of a class being raced and skill level can’t be assessed than the confidence level of the results is

always suspect because of the influence of the skill factor. The subjective judgment of the local handicappers becomes very important in these instances.

2. Individual boat performance varies by sailing conditions and course type. There is no such thing as an equitable race for every boat in a mixed boat type fleet. One or more of the boats will be advantaged or disadvantaged by the particular circumstance of the race. Therefore any attempt to evaluate individual boat performance must be done over many races (perhaps even a season or two).
3. Many races are unsuitable for race analysis. A race is not like a controlled test tank; there are many reasons why a boat can finish ahead of another other than the actual boat speed difference. Wind gradients, current, effects of competition, or other events can drastically increase or decrease a boats performance.
4. Handicappers assessing performance are human and therefore, to an extent, inherently biased. It takes an open minded, observant, and inherently fair individual to be a good handicapper. More important is the handicapper's realization of his or her own limitations and the inherent difficulty in objectively assessing observed performance.
5. There is also a problem comparing performance of boats of widely different construction and intended use. Can a cruising boat's performance really be directly compared to a dry-sailed one-design boat? A one design racing boat enjoys a single purpose and is generally sailed by individuals dedicated to racing not multipurpose boating. One design competition provides a means to optimally tune the performance of a boat to a level not obtainable in a cruising fleet. As an example, it is reasonable to assume that the average J24 is sailed to a higher level of performance than a Beneteau 361 with roller furling and shoal draft keel.

## Assessing Performance

In the early stages of PHRF-LO it was recognized that data collected from as many races and from as many individual clubs as possible would be very helpful in setting and adjusting handicaps. However, initial attempts to determine performance level from actual race data was disappointing. By trial and error it was found that culling the race results of suspicious or spurious data improved the ability to predict boat performance (actually it was the only way it was possible). This concept was reduced to simple criteria built into the analysis program. The analysis algorithm automatically extracts only the race data and individual boat performances that meet a "data quality" criteria. For example: since it is assumed that the inherent residual handicap uncertainty of any boat is 6 to 12 seconds a mile, boats that exhibit a performance level over a set limit from the other boats in the race (i.e. 50 sec/mile) are extracted from the analysis. The underlying assumption is that such a large difference in performance is due to factors other than any handicap rating error which might be present. Also boats that exhibit drastic performance improvement chronologically (as determined by regression analysis), are similarly extracted since it's not possible to evaluate performance when the boat and crew are on a steep learning curve. Only relatively stable performance can be used to evaluate boat performance.

Individual races that exhibit a wide range of corrected time are also suspect and removed since the conditions on the course, for what ever reason, may have provided an advantage to one or more boats independent of the boats performance potential. Because of this data removal it is quite possible that some good races are discarded, but that is infinitely better than leaving suspect races in the final data set. Since the data removal is automatic, any handicapper bias for data acceptance is negated.

It was never expected that the PHRF-LO performance analysis of race results would be the sole method to set handicaps. Rather the performance analysis was to be used as one, among many, tools to evaluate performance level of a boat class. Handicapper interpretation of the data is still required to validate a change. An “Alert” of a particular boat is just an indication that further analysis and consideration is required. Factors such as crew and preparation level, other analysis, and comparison to the rating in other geographical areas must also be considered. Perhaps passing the “Alert” list information down to the affected clubs and regions for consideration might be a preferred way to handle a potential rating adjustment. When in doubt it is best “to do no harm”, taking a conservative approach to the handicapping process, with the only caveat being that the fleet should never be compromised by a gross handicap error of an individual boat. Any potential gross rating error should favor the fleet not an individual boat.

## Web Based Certificate Proposal

With the increased use of the World Wide Web, we have opened the door to improvements in how we are able to conduct business. I am proposing that over the next 3 years that we utilize this to reduce the workload in this office during the busiest time of the year.

### 2006 Set up basics for moving forward

- Continue work on the PHRF-LO Data Management System to ensure that certificates and race results are being handled.
- Consult with programmer regarding future of web based certificates (quote rec'd)
- Issue (print) all certificates without an expiry date. Referenced to check "Valid List" on the web.
- Vote to remove "Opt out" option for membership in PHRF-LO.
- Vote to "remove requirement that owner sign application form"  
\*\*as needed in 2007.

### 2007 Get some information on-line

- Place data on-line for viewing certificate "information". This would include: Certificate number, Valid Season (new term), Last Name, First Name, Boat Name, Class (visible to handicappers only), Club, FS-ASP, FS-TOT, NFS-ASP, NFS-TOT, PHRF Code (visible to handicappers only), Club, District.
- Include forms for searching based on criteria(s).  
Criteria to include: Certificate number  
Last Name  
Boat Name  
Club  
Class (restricted for handicappers only)
- Valid Season (Expiry Date) of Certificate as referenced on Web .
- Allow handicappers to do renewals for club on-line without office support
- Include certificate application/change form on web to submit to office  
\*\*This would include removal of requirement that owner sign application form..
- Office continues to enter "new and changed" information and issue paper certificates for these only.
- All above based on Membership Dues being paid for the season and would require the use of individual passwords.

### 2008 Discontinue issuing paper certificates

- Printable copies of certificates are uploaded to web. Office no longer issues/mails paper certificates.
- Security issues need to be looked at. Handicappers would have to have individual passwords and would be limited based on the password.
- Office continues to enter new and changed information. This creates a check and balance system.

- All certificates are Valid Season as indicated on web site “Valid List”

#### Future Possibilities

- Have Member individual “Mail Box” sections on web for retrieval of information such as:
  - Membership Dues invoice (with payment by Visa option and/or notice of payment when received)
  - Requests from Admin office
  - Notices
  - Club Race Analysis results and notices when processed or not received
- Race results submission forms/import functions allowing handicappers to submit results in necessary format for processing

Diana Riley  
Executive Assistant PHRF-LO  
November 1, 2005