

BC Sailing
#195 - 3820 Cessna Drive
Richmond, British Columbia
Canada V7B 0A2



Phone 604 333-3628
Fax 604-333-3626
Email crew@bcsailing.bc.ca
Web www.bcsailing.bc.ca

PHRF BC HANDICAP APPEAL FORM

APPELLANT INFORMATION:

NAME: Neil Anderson YACHT CLUB: MBYC
PHONE: (250) 715-1609 email: andersons.loonacy@gmail.com

Appellant's yacht:

Name: Loonacy Type: Aloha 8.2 Sail #: 80
Current base boat rating: 216

HANDICAP APPEAL INFORMATION:

Yacht being appealed:

Name: Loonacy Type: Aloha 8.2 Sail #: 80
Current base boat rating: 216

REASON FOR APPEAL:

Please provide a succinct outline of the reason for this appeal. Forward the completed Appeal Form to the BC Sailing Offices accompanied by a copy of your current PHRFBC Certificate, any supporting documentation including a list of owners who support your appeal, and a complete list of race results for the relevant season.

I appreciate that handicapping is a difficult and largely thankless job. I also accept that rating changes are necessary over time. I believe that my rating change from 231 to 216 is a bit too aggressive and, I suspect, based on the performance of one boat in our region. I could find no other examples of Aloha 8.2's sailing as well. After much research I find that in fleets where an Aloha 8.2 rates 216, ratings for comparable boats are rated much slower than in our PHRFBC list. See examples in attached notes.

Also, comparing boats that I have raced with in the near past, and whom I considered to be equals or slightly faster, I now find they are rated slower than I. Many of these boats rate faster than an Aloha 8.2 in their fleet phrf lists. See note Accordingly, I believe my base rating should be in, or around, 222

Secondly, I would like to appeal my 3 second penalty, recently awarded for keel and rudder modifications. When I purchased my boat and started refurbishing it and prepping for racing, I noticed that the moulded fiberglass keel was warped sideways along its bottom and that the rudder was badly moulded. As this is the second Aloha 8.2 that I have owned (sail #91), I was astounded at these deficiencies as the previous boat had a nicely moulded keel and rudder. With the understanding of our handicapper at that time, I profiled both keel and rudder, and was assured this was allowed. I also did a transom extension, all above the waterline. I duly reported this work, and received a penalty for the extension, as expected, but not for foil profiling. I have only corrected a builder's error, and not changed the foils or their thickness, rudder shape is unchanged from original, and keel profile is necessarily only lengthened by a couple of inches at the bottom only. Lengthening the chord at the bottom of the keel, as any yacht designer would tell you, only increases tip drag vortices and wetted area drag. It is not a speed enhancing mod. I feel the penalty is in error and lends a lie to my truthfulness and honesty.

Appellant's signature

02-Mar-2023

Date

HANDICAP APPEAL LOONACY

As stated on my handicap appeal form, I understand what a difficult job handicapping is. Rod Martin, our club's handicapper is doing an excellent job, and I have commended him in the past.

After searching several PHRF fleet databases (Lake Erie, SLVYRA, Sail NS, US Sailing) I came to the conclusion that a 216 rating for an Aloha 8.2/27 is a little aggressive relative to PHRFBC fleet list. In Nova Scotia, an Aloha 8.2 rates 213 outboard 219 inboard, a C&C 27 mk3 rates 195, a Catalina 27 rates 219, a CS 27 rates 207, and a Tanzer 26 rates 207. In PHRF Lake Erie an Aloha 8.2 rates 222, C&C 27 mk3 195, Catalina 27 inboard 207, CS 27 204, Tanzer 26 outboard 222, (Inboard 228 I assume). SLVYRA rates Aloha 8.2 at 219 inboard, C&C 27 mk3 186, Catalina 27 218, CS 27 207. By comparison, in PHRFBC an Aloha 8.2 now rates 216, a C&C 27 mk3 198, a Catalina 27 IB rates 224, a CS 27 at 218, and a Tanzer 26 IB at 219. In comparing these ratings, an Aloha 8.2 should rate somewhere around 222 to 224 in BC.

In the past I have found that a well sailed San Juan 24 (now rated 222BC) to be an equal match to my boat. They were a little faster in light winds and I a little faster in the heavier stuff. I suspect a well sailed Tanzer (219 BC) or Catalina 27 (224BC) might be equals, as both are cruising boats. A CS 27(218BC) should be a bit faster with a slimmer hull and deeper keel. A C&C 26 (231BC), having very similar numbers as an Aloha 8.2, but a foot beamier, would be a bit slower. Till last summer, in 20+knot winds, I had never bested a Haida 26(241BC) and have never yet managed to best a certain Sun 27(227BC), that had been my goal. Again, I feel a 222 to 224 rating more appropriate in our area, especially as winds in general, and definitely in Maple Bay, are tending to be lighter.

The second part of my appeal concerns the 3 second penalty assessed recently, for keel and rudder foil profiling. As I mentioned in my Appeal Form, I found that my newly purchased (2012) 1980 boat had a deformed fiberglass keel, with the bottom aft end of the keel curved slightly to port. This was very evident when profiling templates were placed on the keel. These boats were moulded in a vertically split mould and I suspect that after 80 or so boats, the keel portion of the mould warped or was misaligned when prepping for moulding the hull. My previous Aloha 8.2, sail #91 (actually the boat in the Aloha 8.2 Sailboatdata website) had a perfectly moulded hull and rudder, all aligned correctly. Probably a new mould, as production was ramping up.

I attempted to grind off most of the warpage but found the keel skin was getting dangerously thin. The only solution was to laminate a slight extension of the port side, around 3 inches after the grind back. The picture of the port side of the keel shows the slightly wavy grind back, under the epoxy/ glass work. The actual lengthening of the bottom of the keel is probably only around two inches. To re-establish the correct profile on the starboard side, laminate was built up with epoxy resin, 18 oz roving and 1.5 oz matt. See the picture of the starboard side of the keel prior to fairing. A thin layer of fairing compound was long-boarded on both sides (see faired picture). As max foil thickness is about 30% aft of front of foil, you can see that foil thickness was not changed. As a student of yacht design (at one point I wanted to become a naval architect) I was aware that lengthening the bottom of the keel might increase tip vortices drag and would incur more wetted surface drag. I felt the gain in symmetrical performance of the boat was more important as regards race tuning. This keel correction was highly unlikely to increase speed. Apparently PHRFNW agreed.

The rudder skins were a bit uneven and slightly rippled prior to profiling the foil. Some grind back of high spots were necessary. A picture of the template foils on the starboard side shows how close the

template is to the skin, no shadows. The technique to achieve accurate foils involves filling the space between the template and the rudder skin with epoxy thickened with colloidal silica, making a hard "rib" once the template is removed. Epoxy fairing compound is then applied to the surface and spread, or screed, over the surface by a metal bar, riding on the surfaces of the templated "ribs". After curing, the surface is long boarded (hand sanded with a long sanding board). The picture of the port side of the rudder shows the sanded filler and the "ribs". As can be seen, the ribs appear transparent, only possible if less than 1/16" thick, and the brown fairing filler is also nearly see through. This is proof that the foil shape hasn't been thickened, and filler applied only to correct surface irregularities and bring the foil to it's correct NACA 0012-34 shape.

I have been competitively racing Solings, Sharks, and cruising boats, both at Nationals and club races at several Yacht Clubs in Ontario. I won my first trophy at age 15 (RCYC Junior Fleet) and have continued winning, as crew and skipper in the 52 years since. I am a retired marine services technician, with a passing understanding of yacht design and aerodynamics. My boat is well prepared for racing with a smooth bottom, brushed before each race, and still good (7 years old) sails. As I mostly sail single handed, I can attest to a well-trained crew, sailing on a boat well set up for single handing. I have taken both the North U Trim Course and North U Tactics/Smart Courses in the past.

I am normally a very modest person, however I feel the reason I do so well with my Aloha 8.2 is that I sail a well prepared boat very well. Sailing is a passion with me and when I race, I am fully involved. Also, as I have raced in Maple Bay for 11 years now, I now know all the currents, shoreline winds and wave conditions there. This may account for some of my success there. When I race elsewhere I don't do nearly so well, managing middle to low end at Cow Bay and Vendee Saltspring. As Fleet Captain at MBYC, I understand the importance of promoting racing with a balanced competitive fleet, and will try not to win as often as I have in the past. However, I don't want to be saddled with too fast a rating when racing out of the club.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Neil Anderson

SV Loonacy

Alterations to standard class boat Aloha 8.2 "Loonacy"

Hull- A 22 inch (1.83') transom extension, extending aft of original transom and following hull lines, of moulded epoxy resin, fiberglass foam composite to provide an aft swim, boarding deck, and aft opening propane and fuel lockers. Total weight of moulding is approx 60 lb, and all of it is above original and designed waterline. The original outboard motor and sliding bracket (140 lbs) were removed, and an inboard 10 hp electric hybrid saildrive with lithium battery installed. Prop is a two blade folding Flex-o-Fold, standard, not racing prop.

Keel- A 3 inch extension aft of the bottom of the keel, tapering up to 0 inch at the top, to correct a moulded in twist in the keel moulding. The starboard side foil of the keel was built up to match the port side in epoxy, fiberglass, and fairing compound. No ballast was added.

Rudder- Poor moulding quality by builder resulted in differing foil shapes on either side of the rudder. Starboard side of rudder foil corrected to match port side via epoxy fairing compound. A 3/4 inch gap where the rudder top meets the hull was reduced to 1/4 inch, also by epoxy fairing. Rudder profile and area not changed.

Sincerely,

Neil Anderson.