

NATIONAL SQUIB OWNERS ASSOCIATION

Committee Meeting held on Monday, 13th May 2019 at the Naval Club, 38 Hill Street, London, W1J 5NS, 2 – 6pm

1. Attendance and Apologies

Present: Nigel Grogan (Chairman), Marian Gibson (Secretary) Malcolm Blackburn (Chair, Technical Committee), Pete Richards (Chair, Championship Committee, Colm Dunne (Irish Forum), Lou Bibby, David Biddle, Mike Probert, Paul Studart, Simon Vines, Ian Waite, David Wines.

Apologies: Chris Rickman (outgoing Treasurer), Andrea Holland (outgoing Membership Secretary), Tony Saltonstall (Technical Adviser, Dick Batt, Gerard Dyson, Richard Sullivan.

Part 1: Administration Matters

2. Declarations of Interest:

Nigel Grogan declared that he is a Director of Hyde Sails. Ian Waite declared that his company prints Squibble.

3. Minutes of the 12th November 2018 Meeting

Approved (David Wines proposed, Lou Bibby seconded) Agreed nem con.

4. Matters arising not otherwise on the agenda

None

5. Chairman's Report

Report attached and forms part of these minutes.

NG reported that he is largely in agreement with PY on items raised in his report. Market conditions are currently difficult throughout the marine leisure industry.

Measuring a “bounce” as a result of 2018 activities is not simple. Entry numbers for the Nationals (currently 51) show an increase on Holyhead with no local fleet to boost numbers. Both the Gold Cup and the East Coasts had been well attended with new people taking part as well as the normal attendees. Therefore there are no major concerns on interest.

Regarding the new boat, having sailed it at both the Gold Cup and East Coasts (as well as 2018 Inlands), NG's assessment is that it is as fast in light winds and downwind although it may be slower upwind. If they hadn't been OCS in the first race at the Gold Cup, Team Grogan would have won very comfortably overall. It feels different. SV concurred on performance and felt that overall it is similar to the “golden oldies”. NG commented that a heavy weight crew seemed to get on very well in it. Therefore it is time to stop worrying about performance.

Issues regarding Rondar service:

It was felt that Rondar's customer service can leave a lot to be desired. SV reported on technical issues (coppercoat, asymmetry). Agreed that NG would discuss with PY. PY was thanked for his report.

The different fleet models and how they operate were noted – ease of access for sailing and ease / difficulty of launch and recovery of boats. (Burnham v SCYC (and many other fleets) which affect vibrancy.

PR: What is wanted is close racing in one-design boats.

IW: Time constraints on many, particularly those in work, where the sailing activities need to be “only an afternoon”

Sail Colour:

NG commented that having coloured cloth means, realistically, only one cloth supplier. MB asked whether the volume of cloth for the class is reducing – NG commented that he can only know what Hydes use – and that has not reduced.

PR asked how sails are measured (a number of measurement are checked, and the

processes each sailmaker uses are double checked annually) – and would white cloth make any difference to that process (NG – No!)

Noted that the RYA have to agree the cloth type, even with white cloth it could still be a monopoly.

Sails could be made to look more modern. Agreed that NG would draw up a report on the technical issues and that both Dick Batt and Ian Gray would be asked for their views as well.

The cost and difficulty of arranging measurement is an issue (e.g. dilapidated boat costing more to measure than the original boat cost).

6. Treasurer's Report

No report on accounts.

Richard Sullivan's proposal to use a standard accounting package and to move to Direct Debits for subscriptions was approved, noting that there would be a cost to this but that it would reduce the work load.

It was asked whether it would be possible for Irish members to pay via DD – RS to investigate and respond.

How do we fund the class?

Noted currently it is basically just subscriptions. NG commented that the Lasers use a system "sail buttons" with a fee, paid to the class association, for each sail sold. This does produce a large income to the class.

Youth membership: should there be an incentive to join with a DD?

Agreed that the funding structure of both the NSOA and Championships should be explored. (RS/MG/PR/DW/NG)

7. Membership Report

Reports noted. DW asked about the number of boats shown on the fleet analysis – the membership system is only as good as the information provided. If boats are sold / change ownership / move fleet please tell the Membership Secretary. All Fleet captains have access to their fleet data.

Noting that the rules state that membership is due by 31 March each year, it was agreed that non-renewers from the previous year would be regarded as former members (i.e. not entitled to Squibble or membership benefits). 2018 did see a number of one-off members – joining for the Nationals and sailing borrowed boats. It was noted that a number of people were chased for payments before the East Coasts. Further noted that there are a number of people (including regular participants in the Travellers Series) who have still not upgraded their standing order (subscriptions changed with effect from 1 January 2015). These people have been followed up repeatedly to no effect, other than a large work load.

8. Constitution update

Rule on expulsion (attached and forms part of these minutes): David Biddle explained the background to the proposal. Agreed that this would be incorporated into the constitution when it comes forward to an AGM (note not 2019). Noted that Rule 69 of RRS could be used as well.

9. Technical Committee Report

Report attached and forms part of these minutes.

MB commented that some suggested rule changes could be classed as "minor" but others are significant. NG remarked that there are number of different issues and it had been agreed that they should be put to the membership. Following a debate it was agreed that more work is needed on most of the items before an informed decision could be made. Further agreed that the items on advertising, sail windows and headsail furling be finalised and put to a member vote as soon as possible (MB/MG) with the AGM as the target date for completion.

Following the issues at the Gold Cup it was further agreed that the next priority is the item on buoyancy tanks with work to be done on the others through the next few months aiming for the Inlands for completion.

PR wondered whether a fixed position for Barber Haulers was ideal, MB commented that they were a comparative late addition to the rigging.

10. AGM

The draft agenda was noted and will be finalised within a week for publication. MG to chase for nominations and finance reports.

Part 2: Strategy

11. Rondar

Paul Young's report is attached and forms part of these minutes. Note that the debate took place under the Chairman's report.

12. RYA

There is a considerable anti-RYA view among the NSOA membership with three main issues.

1. Lack of communication, noting that Rob Taylor (main class contact) is not good at responding to communications.

2. Measurement issues:

There is an acute shortage of measurers with most in the south-eastern corner of the country.

NG made the point that since almost all sails are now measured in-house by the manufacturer there is no demand for sail measurers. MB commented that the measurer training system has been predicated on starting with sail measurement, then training for full measurement. They were expected to attend courses and recoup costs through measurement fees. With no demand for sail measurement, costs for hull measuring have gone up considerably to the extent that the cost can be as much as a cheap boat. The RYA currently are not advertising any measurer courses at all (and recently have only advertised sail measurers courses).

3. A feeling that the RYA do nothing for the class.

The RYA are the Rules Authority for the class: Noted the extremely slow response to any items for minor corrections to the rules let alone rule changes. It was felt that inaction had not helped when the issues at Parkers arose. Decisions are made by the Technical Officials Group (Technical Committee sub-committee which holds two full meetings a year, with other business being conducted by email. SV commented that all class rules are on much the same template now.

The question is what do the RYA do for us – and us for them.

Noted that the RYA hold the copyright to the Squib and licence the builder and sailmakers. MB commented that they are the ultimate backstop for issues.

There is a view among some sections of the membership that the time has come to break links with the RYA. MB commented that the issue there could be that although currently there is a considerable pool of expertise within the class there is no guarantee that that would continue, particularly if the class decreased in size.

The lack of maintenance measurers is probably the key issue at this point in time. There are a number of experienced Squibbers who are very capable of checking whether maintenance and repairs are within class but are not permitted to do this under the present system.

Agreed that the first stage should be for NG to try to set up a meeting Niall McLeod and follow up with the Chair of TOG to try to progress issues.

Further agreed that NG should start to discuss the possibility of the Squibs ceasing to be a National Class and breaking the direct link with the RYA.

13. **Championship report**

Nationals:

2019 Torquay: DW reported that the organisation is going well. Currently 51 entries but there are a number of notable absentees at this stage. He is hopeful that trailers will be stored on the pier which would make the recovery process simpler. All launch processes will take place on the Saturday with registration (in the Clubhouse) and scrutineering starting at 9am and craning at 10am. It is hoped all boats will be craned out on the Friday. The Plymouth fleet are running scrutineering. Trophies will be stored securely in the Clubhouse and should be left at registration. Six sponsors have been secured and details are being finalised on these (MG to check with DW what follow up is needed). Dick of the Day outfit – MG to try to locate it but it was felt that it is probably a little dated as a concept. Loan boats for Nationals: NG to discuss with PY.

2020 Kinsale: Agreed there would be a Championship sub-committee meeting at Torquay where there will be a detailed discussion.

2021 SCYC

2022/3: Weymouth, Royal Forth (blueprint completed) and Burnham have all expressed interest. Cowes is another one. The possibility of split fleets was mentioned. PR to investigate further.

Nationals Format:

NG remarked that the question is how we should look at Championships noting the success of 2018. The three issues are where, when and what.

Where: Do we need to explore other venues?

When: Should they be in school term time or not? Should we consider alternating? SCYC view is that the Nationals are too early – should they be early September as the culmination of the season?

What: The popularity of the Merlin Salcombe Week was noted – sold out as soon as it is advertised – is that format a possibility. To attract all but the top sailors (30 max) there has to be a holiday element to it. A venue with other attractions would be popular with non-sailing partners.

Agreed that a membership survey should be done (PR/MG) timing and format. In addition a survey of Torquay attendees would be done.

Inlands format and social

Noted the issues with Rutland and whether we should explore different venues.

It was felt that the sailing side of Rutland, despite the weather, worked well with the Race Officer being briefed on requirements (and the acceptance of the less than perfect course to avoid too much wasted time). However other aspects were less good and it was agreed that an alternative should be sought for the Saturday night dinner. The Friday Fish and Chips and breakfasts worked pretty well. Bar stocking was a major issue. Chris Stonehouse has agreed to research options locally with a preference expressed for Stamford. (CS/MG)

Regional Championships:

East Coasts 2020: Local fleets to discuss and agree. Both Lowestoft and Medway have expressed an interest

Southerns: 2019 is Weymouth.

Noted that if there were to be a change to the timing of the Nationals the timetable for Regionals and Inlands may also need to change.

Sponsorship: Ongoing, but note the success at Torquay and also for the East Coasts.

Entry fees.

Youth entries for Championships: Agreed to explore detailed finance options (RS/MG/PR/DW/NG)

MG commented that Rutland give local members a discount on entry fees for

Championships (NSOA had been unaware of this and it does have a potential impact on finances for the event). PR commented that the Squib norm seems to be the SCYC one where everyone pays the same entry fee, but that locals are in effect subsidising visitors for instance where moorings will be laid specially for an event, but locals pay for a mooring each year.

Endeavour Trophy for keelboats - Burnham 2018 (19): cancelled due to bad weather.

14. Marketing

Squibble: Agreed that the Summer Squibble (skinny version) should go out unfolded.

Noted that although Ricky East is happy to produce the 2019 Squibble she would like to find a successor.

eSquibber: volunteers needed to help, copy always needed.

2019 Dinghy Show: Felt to be successful despite stand position. Portsmouth did sterling work in providing staff for the stand for the second year running.

2020 Dinghy Show: Agreed to book as soon as it becomes available to give best choice of stands.

15. Any other business (please advise the Secretary before the meeting)

Spinnakers: Noted that there remains an issue regarding payment for the cloth. PR/MG/RS to endeavour to resolve this.

16. Date of next meeting: 11 November 2019

NSOA Committee Meeting May 2019 Chairman's Report Spring 2019

Since our last committee meeting in November the important news has been about the Squib class and not Brexit. Sure we have to worry about the economy but meantime things look pretty positive in Squibland.

Plenty of Squib sailors seem to have kept their hands in over the winter months either dinghy sailing in other classes or with active winter series, like the well supported and popular one at Oulton Broad. The follow on from that was the Broadland Regatta at the end of March which attracted 23 entrants (which was won by Robert Coyle and Mark Rawinski and dominated by other RCYC boats) We have then had "suffer" the ridiculously hot Easter Bank Holiday and then the May Day bank holiday which was ridiculously cold. Gerard and Tony won the Scottish and Northern Areas - a popular win and deep down don't we all hope that there is enough life in those old dogs to win the Nationals...Tony has won before as crew but can you imagine the smile on Gerard's face?

Meanwhile the Gold Cup over the same weekend was memorable for plenty of reasons. The first was for the fleet to be decimated by fierce rain squalls with winds that were up to 40knots on the Saturday. Two rudders were broken and two boats were swamped. The morale of the story is check your buoyancy and wear a life jacket. Personally I think it also vindicates the argument for a front buoyancy tank too. The second reason was the closeness of the five races on Sunday....exactly what Squib racing is all about. It was pleasing to note two newcomers to the class who showed great spirit in sinking on Saturday but managing to make the racing on Sunday. A warm welcome to David Pinner and Jonno Baker in 91 and Chris Agar and Lauren Bates in 384 and other new Squibbers!

Away from the water we have some issues with the RYA over the costs and difficulties of measurement. One of the new entrants at Burnham had purchased what can be described as a "project" - a mid numbered boat that weighed 730kg. He had been quoted more than he paid for the boat to have it fully measured.....On the one hand it's great you can get a Squib for a few hundred pounds, but it cannot make sense for the system to be so broken that the cost of measurement ends up as a deterrent. The RYA have done good things for the class, but maybe it is time for us to take control of our own rules and compliance with them? We have huge expertise within the class going back years and we are streetwise enough to come up with means of ensuring compliance. In addition virtually all the sails we use are measured in-house too, so there is no need to have sail measurers anymore, which is one of the reasons there are so few other measurers out there.

Paul Young reports that sales of the Rondar boat are slow. We are getting to grips with 905 and would have won the Gold Cup easily if we had not been OCS in race one- which is hardly Paul's fault! I think we will have a clearer picture after the East Coast Champs (which looks as though it will be very well attended and Haven Ports are doing a fabulous job with their revitalised fleet!) but it seems at present that we are faster than 105 in the light to medium and slower when it's breezy. We have done a lot of adjusting to get the rig settings right and are still experimenting, but we are progressively gaining confidence in the new ship....and not pumping is a joy!

Entries for the Torquay Nationals are climbing steadily, we are close to 50 at the time I write this, so achieving 60 seems to be a credible goal. If you have not entered can I really encourage you to support the class and plan to go. It will be a great event on and off the water. The social programme looks brilliant, the town is vibrant and fun in the summer, the sailing waters are benign but challenging and the sponsors have been generous and you will be the beneficiaries....Have a sailing holiday and come!

The Dinghy Show in March was well attended and interesting. David Lloyd's free Squib was on our stand, he did a good job of organising helpers from Portsmouth where he continues to do a wonderful job of encouraging Squib sailing. No-one is a more deserving winner of the boat draw....albeit he has a few Squibs already! However I am aware he is prepared to lend at least one of them out, as are many other owners. So if you know of anyone contemplating having a go in a Squib, encourage them to borrow a boat and try what we know is the best keelboat in the country!

Good Squib sailing.
Nigel NSOA Chairman.

Membership Fleet	As at 7 May 2019			Total	No of boats
	2019	2018	Hons, Life, etc		
Aldeburgh YC Fleet	2	1		3	15
Burnham Fleet	39	3		42	42
Carsington SC	2			2	2
Dart Fleet	10			10	16
Dun Laoghaire Fleet		9		9	29
Felixstowe Ferry SC Fleet	1			1	3
Glandore SC Fleet	2			2	11
Haven Ports YC Fleet	29			29	30
Holyhead SC Fleet	17	1		18	32
Howth YC Fleet	11	2		13	16
Humber Yawl Club Fleet	1	1	1	3	5
Killyleagh YC Fleet	11	1		12	12
Kinsale YC Fleet	10	10		20	31
Lowestoft & Oulton Broad	27	3		30	35
Medway YC Fleet	7			7	9
Newhaven & Seaford SC Fleet	1	1		2	4
Not in a Listed Fleet	20	9	16	45	75
Peninsula Sailing Club	6			6	12
Plymouth Fleet	8	1		9	8
Portsmouth	11	1		12	23
Quoile Yacht Club	2			2	6
Royal Anglesey YC Fleet	4		1	5	10
Royal Forth Yacht Club	3			3	3
Royal Mersey YC Fleet	1		1	2	4
Royal N of Ireland YC Fleet	14	3		17	30
Royal Tay YC Fleet	10	2		12	13
Royal Victoria YC Fleet	31	11		42	39
Royal Yorkshire YC Fleet	5	1	2	8	11
Rutland SC Fleet	6	1	1	8	12
S Caernarvonshire YC Fleet	30	2	1	33	31
Sea View YC Fleet	2			2	1
Stone SC Fleet	6	2		8	4
Waldringfield SC Fleet	16			16	14
West Mersea Fleet	2	1		3	1
Weymouth SC Fleet	18	3		21	25
	365	69	23	457	
Ireland	50	25	0	75	
% Ireland / Total membership	13.70	36.23			
NI	27	4		31	
% NI of Irish total	54	16			
Rol	23	21		44	
% Rol of total membership	6.301	30.43			

HMS REPORT FOR MEETING 13TH MAY 2019

On my behalf, Marian has kindly sent you all a Membership Statistics Spreadsheet but there are a couple points I would like to add.

Subscriptions are due by 31st March and usually we allow one year's grace to unpaid members so that they receive a copy of the Spring and Winter Squibble as well as the eSquibber, before being removed from the current list of members. As last year was a "one off" with the Nationals being held during Cowes week and the Squib Prize Draw, we had a lot of Full and Associate Members joining just to take part in these events who have not rejoined this year. I have, therefore, using my discretion, gone through the database and removed 19 Full Members and 23 Associate Members from this year's list of members in order to save on Squibble printing and postage costs which have, once again, just increased.

I am unsure of the Irish members and am awaiting confirmation from Dun Laoghaire Fleet who will be remaining a member for 2019.

We therefore currently have
336 paid and 15 unpaid Full Members
31 paid and 3 unpaid Associate Members

Donations from odd standing orders ranging from £6.25 to £25 total £411.75 and any member still paying £25 and ignored my communications have been made a Former Member.

RYA rule on expulsion

Conduct of Members

- A. Every member, upon election and thereafter, is deemed to have notice of, and impliedly undertakes to comply with, the National Association Rules.
- B. Any breach of Rule A or any conduct which, in the opinion of the Committee, is either unworthy of a member or otherwise injurious to the interests of the National Association, shall render a member liable to disciplinary action by the Committee, which may include expulsion or non-renewal of membership.
- C. Before taking such disciplinary action against a member, the Committee shall call upon such member for a written explanation of the member's conduct and shall give the member full opportunity of making explanation to the Committee, or of resigning. The Committee may delegate the investigation to a sub-Committee of not less than two people who will report to the Committee.
- D. A Resolution to apply any sanction shall be carried by a simple majority vote by those members of the Committee present and voting on the Resolution.
- ~~E. Appeal against expulsion or non-renewal of membership may be made to the members in general meeting.~~ Royal Yachting Association Formatted: Strikethrough
- F. Upon expulsion the former member shall not be entitled to have any part of the annual membership fee refunded and must return any National Association or external body's trophies held forthwith.

Above is the RYA rule on expulsion adapted by Lou and me to what we think might be appropriate. It will obviously have to be incorporated in the Constitution with a different number.

The main point is that the Committee should have power to expel a member and since we have no idea how this might arise it is probably better for it not to be hedged about by too many restrictions. The alterations from the RYA draft are:

- 1 To make it clear that the investigation can be conducted by a sub-Committee. A tiresome member could insist that the entire Committee meet which would present lots of problems.
- 2 To give a right of Appeal to the RYA. It has to be preferable to a members vote.

NSOA Committee May 2019 Technical sub committee report.

1) Rules and the RYA.

There has been no progress with the RYA since the last meeting and all communications have been largely ignored.

However I have discovered that I have been misinformed about the management structure of the RYA technical department. Bas Edmonds position was eventually filled by **Niall McLeod CEng MRINA**, (Racing Services Manager, Royal Yachting Association, T: 02380 604202 | M: +44(0) 7917 880595 E: niall.mcleod@rya.org.uk Skype: nialljmcleod)

Rob Taylor is in reality still the first line of contact as RYA technical manager, but at least now we have someone higher to complain to. To that end now I do have an E-mail reply from Rob Taylor saying "after the Bank Holiday we should be able to finalize".

Of particular issue are:

- a. C7.1 (h) Components detailed in D7 and D8 may be replaced with a GRP foam sandwich equivalent produced by the licensed manufacturer.
D7 is actually the thwarts, and it should read D5 which is the buoyancy tanks.
- b. The minimum weight rules in the ERS have changed such that boats are weighed without sails. We need the rules to specify sails are included in the weight.
- c. The Backstay being a part of the standing rigging currently the wording precludes adjustment whilst racing. The wording of previous rules editions needs adding to allow adjustment.

2) The list of potential Rule changes.

After the last meeting I sent a detailed document to all the committee members and Tech sub committee with suggestions of wording for the various rule amendments and requested clarification as to members position following the committee meeting discussions, which due to time pressures were very brief and lacked clear detail. (see below as a reminder).

I had 2 responses from committee members who in the main were negative to most of the change ideas, and the rest of committee never bothered to comment at all. The Technical sub committee, as I reported at the November meeting, are rather negative towards the changes, and the responses to my after meeting suggestions confirmed that their views had not changed.

Thus due to total lack of feedback from NSOA committee I have done nothing to progress these rule changes any further.

I am prepared to spend time coordinating and detailing and working with the RYA as necessary which is my commitment in my role on committee, but I am not prepared to push these things through on my own, without committee taking ownership, especially as many of the changes my personal view is that they would be extremely damaging and divisive to the class.

Thus if the committee do want to pursue these changes further as we only have 15 minutes allocated by the agenda for technical matters, it is very important that I receive input from members before the meeting.

Malcolm Blackburn

From: Malcolm & Fran Blackburn [<mailto:bryncethin@btinternet.com>]

Sent: 13 November 2018 16:27

To: 'Andrea Holland'; 'Chris Rickman'; 'Colm Dunne'; 'David Biddle'; 'David Hall'; 'David Wines'; 'Dick Batt'; 'Duncan Grindley'; 'Gerard Dyson'; 'Ian Waite'; 'Lou Bibby'; 'Mike Probert'; 'Nigel Grogan'; 'Paul Studart'; 'Pete Richards'; 'Peter Wallace'; 'Richard Sullivan'; 'Simon Vines'; 'Tony Gibson'; 'Tony Saltonstall'; Marian Elsdon (marianelsden11@gmail.com)

Subject: Rule changes

To avoid perpetuating the image said to be of the Squib class of "old men arguing about the rules", we need to detail exactly what is being proposed, so that there is no ambiguity and a rule can be worded precisely.

So I need consideration from you all of the following.

- 1) **Advertising.** Looking through the correspondence from the RYA they suggested the following.

"The wording of C.4 should be amended as follows:

"Advertising as chosen by the person in charge may be displayed on the spinnaker only. The Notice of Race and/or Sailing Instructions may place further limitations on the advertising which may be displayed."

The Class should then draft some careful wording for the Nationals NoR that limits advertising on spinnakers to the AQL advertising only. We can help with this if required, just let me know when the NoR is likely to be published and we can make sure the appropriate wording is in place and included."

I did query the "chosen by the person in charge" and received the following reply

"Competitors DO choose to display the advertising by choosing to use the spinnaker as part of the entry requirements. Whether or not they would choose AQL sponsorship is irrelevant, they are choosing to display it by using that sail."

My suggested wording WILL resolve the problem for the class advertising on spinnakers at the Nationals. What you do if the class choose not to accept advertising is something to consider next."

Then a further query:- and the reply.

'Person in charge' is used throughout the Advertising Code and is defined in RRS 46 and referenced to RRS 75 which relates to conditions of entry into a race. Its use in class rules is entirely consistent with every other set of rules governing the running of races. I strongly suggest you stick with the wording I drafted for you. Why would any Class association let another organization dictate what advertising may be displayed on their boats? It is absolutely the right of the Class to specify what may or may not be carried aboard whilst racing, why give up this right in class rules when you may not always have the luxury of being your own organizing authority?

The Squib Class first need to approve a change to the Class rules to permit any advertising at all, then worry about limiting or restricting what may be displayed via the NoR. Until the class rules are changed, there will not be any advertising on display, regardless of who chose it or who permits it.

So as you can read, its not going to be easy.

So just to be clear,

What we agreed at the meeting is

- a) that the boat owner cannot display any advertising obtained on an individual basis.
- b) He can display advertising as provided by an event organizer.

Answers please.

- 2) **Sail windows.**

Currently the mainsail and headsail can have a window 0.25M2 at least 150mm from the edge.

My reading of the meeting is we want :

- a. To increase this to 2 safety windows
- b. Add a jib tell tail window.

Thus I suggest the wording should read.

G.3.4 Mainsail

Up to 2 Windows each Max 0.25M².

Window to sail edge 150mm minimum

G.4.3 Foresail

Up to 2 windows each Max 0.25M²

Additional telltale window 0.02M²

Window to sail edge 150mm minimum.

Answer please.

- 3) Headsail furling. Simply delete rule C.10.4 (a) use
(2) The jib shall not be furled around the forestay whilst racing.

Answer please.

- 4) Outboard weight included in the weight of the boat.
The current rules on correctors state
C.6 Boat
C.6.2 Corrector weights
 - a. Corrector weights of metal shall be permanently fastened to the underside of the cockpit seats when the boat weight is less than the minimum requirements.
 - b. The total weight of such corrector weights shall not exceed 30Kg

So we want to amend this to read:-

C.6 Boat

C.6.2 Corrector weights

- a. when the boat weight is less than the minimum requirements, Corrector weights (which may include the weight of an outboard motor) of metal shall be permanently fastened to the underside of the cockpit seats.
- b. The total weight of such corrector weights (including the outboard motor if used) shall not exceed 30Kg.
- c. The certificate shall note the weight of the outboard motor so used.

Answer please.

- 5) Boat weight increased to 700Kg

The current class rule states

C.6.1 Weight

- a) The weight of the boat680Kg Minimum.

We want it to say

- a) The weight of the boat700Kg Minimum.

Just to bore you with a calculation. Take a 100mm high sleeping policeman at 20MPH and assume the trailer suspension takes out 75% of the height of the bump the G forces involved are 7.5. The 25Kg of lead now under the seat becomes 187Kg. That 1 ½ inch timber support at the front of the seat fixed on with a 6mm bolt will snap. We will all arrive at the champs with the seat sliding about in the bottom of the boat. Or worse still it will not be there at all because on the next corner it will have smashed through the side of the boat and escaped.

- 6) Delete Mace.
The current rule for mainsail and Foresail says.
G.3.2 Material.

- a. The ply fibres shall consist of 5.2oz impregnated polyester (eg Polypreg). The Colour shall be "mace" or similar and the cloth manufacturer shall be approved by the RYA.

Mace is also mentioned in reinforcing later. We simply want to delete the "colour shall be mace or similar"?

Answer please.

1) Barber haulers can be adjusted in 2 planes.

This is not so straight forward. The world typically works in 3 planes. In the case of a barber hauler we can have "in out" up, down, forward back. So by limiting to 2 planes one of the 3 cannot be adjusted.

The current rule states.

C.9.8 Running rigging (b) Use

(2) Barber Haulers I.e. A freely floating block or eye on each sheet between the clew of the headsail and the fairlead as defined in rule D.8.1 (6) each with a single control line which when being adjusted shall effect a modification to the sheeting angle in one direction only are permitted.

We discussed increasing this to 2 planes. So first question.

typically today we all adjust what I refer to as in and out. By including a second plane are we

- a) Allowing up and down or back and forth?
- b) Are we bothered?
- c) Are we sure we want to limit to 2? As it would be very simple to make a second control line do forward and back and up and down.

One thing for certain if we are not careful we will see all sorts of contraptions invented by the sad old men that like to argue about the rules.

The alternative could be to allow the "single" control line to pass through a fairlead mounted on a track running approximately fore and aft. The fairlead position may be adjusted whilst racing.

This is just a suggestion, but by being very specific as this is it limits options. It still allows the in out that we have today, but allows the clew to be brought back or forward to adjust the sheeting angle of the foresail, which is I think what we are wanting. In fact just like we had when the boat was first designed.

So can I have answers to a), b), c) and to my suggestion.

2) Front buoyancy tank. I think that we all agreed that this should be a sealed chamber forming a buoyancy chamber, no control lines etc. ?

Answer please.

There is another issue to consider and that is the hybrid boat. If the Rondar front tank is holed the foam core hull will offer buoyancy. However the hybrid will not and after a big front tank holing the boat will float, but transom up and the bow underwater. This we do need to look into, and maybe specify additional buoyancy as the full height back tank.

Now this is going to take careful consideration so that whatever the class vote on the RYA will approve. After all the history we have to show that the Squib needs the additional buoyancy for safety reasons. However if we over egg the need it becomes a real safety issue and the RYA would be negligent to not make it mandatory.

Bear with me here with a load of numbers.

The Squib as originally designed had a front tank of 413Kg buoyancy, and an aft tank of 187Kg (600Kg) . The plywood in the structure equates to about a further 100kg. So at 680kg it just floats.

With a crew of 2 x 12 stone blokes the boat needs 840Kg buoyancy.

With the bow bags we add an extra 158kg, which makes 858kg, so we need pretty much all we have got to keep this lot afloat.. So the boat floats with the stern tank totally submerged and the buoyancy bags totally submerged. If we look at the fore and aft then the reality is that with a crew by section 6 (ie normal position) and helm in normal position the boat has not enough at the back thus the back is underwater. I can vouch that this is the situation.

The parker boats have additionally floor tank of 168Kg, and a full height aft tank of 420Kg (+233kg), however all of this aft tank is not going to be used as the top should be above the water level.

For the boat to float level fore aft we need we need rough number 350Kg front and 350kg aft. Add the crew in the middle this makes +40 front +40 back, the helm needs 80kg back. So the front of the boat needs 390Kg and the back 470Kg.

The Parker boat has 638kg at the back, so has 168 to spare so the reality is that the water should be about 3/4 up the back full height tank. Great!!!

The front needs 390kg and has 580kg so that's OK also. Pop the bags its now only 423kg. and the boat floats bow down and is impossible to tow.

So from this the conclusion is that the Squib currently (Parker that is) is safe. However reliant upon bags to stay safe and towable. Older models not so, however it's the back that needs the work on older boats. (better keep quiet on this one).

So our argument with the RYA is that a bulkhead forming a buoyancy tank will be better than bags and contain more buoyancy especially low down as bags cannot be held by straps as low as ideal. The counter argument that will come back is that if holed the tank will fail, where as bags will stay up, or at least some will.

With this in mind I am sure the RYA will insist if a bulkhead is fitted some form of buoyancy will have to be fitted just like the back full height tank.

Our argument revolves around the better reliability of a fitted buoyancy chamber rather than bags. In my case the bags survived, and the tanks leaked, so my experience does not support this (better keep stum on this one also).

Now to avoid the "old farts arguing about the rules" we had better be specific about where the tank is fitted. Traditionally the few boats that did had them fitted up against the aftmost deck beam. Logic, but reduces storage space especially for an outboard, which is why Rondar did not fit it there, but further forward where the cuddy meets the flat foredeck. This also allows the jib Cunningham to run along the deck and into the boat as the cuddy rises. There would be good argument in a one design environment to stipulate the bulkhead goes exactly where the Rondar is. We could probably also get Rondar to use the inner moulding mould to make a piece for us to fit into old boats.

So have a think on this one, and let me have your thoughts on what we should submit to members.

- 3) Draft stripes and loose foot mainsail I think we all understand and I do not need to elaborate.
- 4) Last item is the Spinnaker pole sheave box. Looking at the rules I think this refers to the pole uphaul. The rules mention as a mandatory fitting "A spinnaker pole lift block and attachment". Its mandatory so we must have one. The reality is that we have a sheave and lead the control line into the mast. As an optional fitting we can have a spinnaker pole fitting, but no sheave for the pole uphaul.

I think this is a simple rule change and will take this up with the RYA. I would suggest that we change to : "A spinnaker pole lift block and attachment, or sheave".

Cheers

Malcolm

BUILDER REPORT FOR SQUIB COMMITTEE MAY 2019

Current business is fairly quiet, we have not built any since the free prize draw boat, number 906. We are "hybridising" an older boat for Harvey Worden, but there are no new Squibs in prospect except for one potential newcomer to the fleet, who is planning to buy a boat to keep at Dartmouth. He is the kind of customer that I expected we would pick up, comes out of an RS something, had a variety of other boats over the years, just wants a "ready to go" package, on a trailer with minimal future maintenance required.

If one analyses why there are no orders, there are three major reasons;

1/ One part of the picture is the general lack of confidence prevailing at the moment, with most people using Brexit uncertainty as a good excuse to put off making any major purchase decisions, and all uk sales are down slightly.

2/ We are in a post 50th year where last year people made a lot of effort to attend meetings particularly the 100 boats at Cowes week, and to do their bit to win a Squib, and this year we are seeing a touch of post 50th year antipathy, which is understandable.

3/ Lastly there is still uncertainty regarding the new boat, because after all the hype and misinformation surrounding the original project, half the potential buyers were expecting it to be a rocket ship, and are disappointed that it isn't, and the other half are still inherently of the belief that there is nothing wrong with it, but are waiting to see what happens in terms of results. Therefore there is a need for the boat to prove it has top end of the fleet speed potential, before we see any real sales from existing owners. We are optimistic that Nigel and Jack will get 905 winning, David Lloyd will get his new one going well and I have offered mine to the Bailey's for the Nationals.

New owners, are potentially out there, and the positive publicity that the class garnered from Cowes is certainly helping the positive image of the class, but the fundamental issues remain, that as a racing boat, the class is perceived as being old fashioned, but unfortunately without the benefit of being a heritage class, such as the Dragon or the XOD. Of course the Squib is considerably cheaper to own, but that does not seem to be a key factor.

In car terms, the Squib is the equivalent of a British Leyland produced MGB, mass produced, practical and offering most of the enjoyment of the other two, without the big bills, whereas the Dragon and the XOD have the appeal of an E-type and the bills to match. Somehow we need to get that message across, ie "most of the fun without the costs."

At ground level, the whole future of the class remains very closely linked to regional club fleets, which is a problem, if those fleets are not well managed. We can see at Portsmouth, RVYC, and Burnham how a keen and enthusiastic class attracts others into itself, and we get local growth, whereas at other fleets, without the enthusiastic sparkplugs keeping it happening, the gradual decline is hard to stop. The class should take a view of really actively supporting the strongest fleet in each area as the others live off the back of the main ones.

What is positive is that the boat and all the general NSOA activity is raising the potential value of good older boats, which is also a necessary part of the fleet getting back to a healthy ratio of new boats sales, as if the gap between used and new is too wide, no one will buy new. For the fleet to survive in future, it really needs to replace the sailors it loses each year due to natural wastage, and it also needs 10/12 new boats coming in to the fleet, in order to keep the supply chain churning over down the fleet, liberating used boats all the way down the price bands. Without this, there are simply not enough boats available to allow people to come in to the fleet from outside. It is no accident that the best period of Squib class growth was when the supply of new boats in the Hunter era was fairly prolific.

The biggest reason that I get given for people outside the class, not getting into Squibs remains the sail colour, which simply works against all attempts to improve the image of the class to outsiders. It is around 2 out of 3 people who cite this. I have also had two yacht clubs tell me that their members wouldn't entertain a club boat with brown sails. Once you buy into the Squib and the class, the colour stops being an issue, because you just get used to it, and stop caring but it remains the thing that is

most apparent to outsiders, and for many, they simply don't bother to look past the sail colour to see the advantages of the boat. We all know the arguments for the photogenic advantages of mace, but can the class really afford to continue to lose the potential sailors at ground level, for the sake of tradition? We should grasp the nettle, tell the owners it needs to be done, and get on with it.

The other principle reason people give me, is that if you buy a Squib, the racing is all in April/May and with the Nationals in June then there is nothing for the rest of the year, apart from Rutland in October which, as a venue is way past its sell by date. If you are lucky enough to have a good fleet to race in locally, or a summer sailing week at your club, then you are ok, but, as I have personally found, if you do not, there is very little racing on offer. If we want to maintain and grow the fleet we need a better balanced program in terms of timing, with more aspirational venues.

The notable thing to me about the 50th year was the enthusiasm of the younger end of the fleet, and the amount of new people doing the Nationals, because it was in August. We wish to encourage the wider group of owners, then we do need to un the class in a way that attracts them. Whilst reviewing the need for a better program, we currently run the class program pretty much to suit the current owners, but what we need to do is to run the class to encourage growth, or youth, or female participation or any other objectives that we have. It was obvious that last years Nationals was a success in attracting fresh faces, many of them younger faces, simply because it was held at a major sailing event in the holiday season. Doing the Nationals at a sailing event such as Cowes, or Abersoch week also shows off the boat to others. The 50th year celebrations helped, as did the free spinnaker, but still there are many folks who would consider the Nationals, if it wasn't so early, was somewhere attractive as a holiday destination, and there was a mix of social events for all groups. The classic Squib Nationals in late June, usually somewhere less than obvious as a family holiday venue, so it inevitably becomes male dominated, and only really attracts the more serious racers. My view is that if you really do want the class to be more vibrant, and have a wider participation, then we have to start making decisions to run the class in a way that might actually achieve those goals. That in turn means looking hard at everything the class does, and re evaluating it. There should be no sacred cows or mental laziness, of just accepting things because it is "too hard" to change them. Having said that, there is no point throwing away the things that work well, either, so it will require an unemotional review and some positive action.

Paul Young.
Director, Rondar Raceboats Ltd.