

Request for Clarification and Interpretation

By Peter G. Kremlick, AMYA 3442

Stated under EC12 class rules 1.2 and 1.3.

Scope: to all rules where specific materials are mentioned in the fabrication and construction of major boat parts.

Response by Rick West, Class Secretary

November 20, 2007

The request is recognized but will not be specifically addressed due to the scope the request encompasses. To respond to such a large area of the rules and what could be the proliferation of many materials would in essence provide a document of major change to the rules without committee study or presentation to the class members for vote. That would be a large assumption on my part and I choose not to act outside of reasonable process. There is no demonstrated need to do so presently, so the request will not be heard for the intent of clarification and interpretation.

Secondly, an undertaking that would deal without question the clarity and force of the rules, would present a legal document beyond the understanding of many or the need of this hobby. Like the Racing Rules of Sailing and some other AMYA classes the workload for clarification and interpretation would increase immensely. It would also redefine the general attitude and pursuit of members in this class. This is not attractive to me.

However, because Carbon Fiber has been a forbidden material and discussion of it almost such, I will offer in statement my views on the intent of the current rules and the place of such materials in building EC12 boats today. This will be based on history, conversation with those before me and a growing closeness to the rules, as a builder and national competitor.

First some understandings to illuminate the spirit that has brought the class rules forward over three decades. It is recognized to be a "Builder's boat and appeals to hobbyists, has a beauty and grace through the water to be protected and is reasonably affordable in appeal to a broad sector of enthusiasts. The heritage of the model is racing and the class has grown over the years toward organized racing without the legal weight of modern full scale sailing pursuits and endeavors.

The American Model Yachting Association designates the East Coast 12 Meter class model as a one-design. By class rules it is really a restricted one-design. What does this mean?

The class has rules and specifications. Some specifications have parameters and some are specific. The rules restrict the use of building materials and remote radio controls while offering some options in materials and the devices of manual controls. The class is not a pure one-design where all processes of building and materials are specified and/or controlled.

Class Rule 1.2 statement: “Unless the Specifications specifically permit something, manufacturers, builders and owners shall assume it is prohibited.” What does this mean?

This rule has been stated by the public for prohibiting materials other than those stated acceptable by the rules in the building of the EC12. This is not true. It is an assumption and not by the word a rule.

The rules state certain specific materials for the hull, deck, booms, mast and hatch covers but ignore any specifics for the support structures or equipment needed for the model to function as a sailing yacht. This runs up the red flag that if it is not specific, it is not to be assumed. Additionally, the specifics mentioned could be considered those affecting speed and the esthetics of the yacht and while doing so the cost involved.

Mr. Kremlick has not assumed and it is proper to ask with reference to building but to respond in detail to specifics would morph the rules into a legal guide. In asking he makes the question that if a material is allowed where the rules are not specific it would then be allowed for the same reasons in those where the rules are specific. The line of debate breeches the intent of Rule 1.2 and takes on a direction of its own.

The uses of carbon fiber materials, which can be grouped with other composites, have been the main issues over the years seeking entry into the rules. Historically, this has been resisted and will continue to be until there is a documented need for these materials to be added to specific rule sections where specific materials are listed

The reason for the interest is understandable, the flexibility in craftsmanship and a competitive spirit in racing where money is not a deterrent in the

pursuit. Well, money is a deterrent to the present day class by the demographics and compliment of our membership. Without this consideration class organized racing would produce an arms race for the latest and the best. It would be much like that of the America's Cup today and each winter rebuilding or refitting would be required to compete in the top of the fleet for micro-knots thought to be needed for better scores. This administration will not allow or pursue such processes that would create an underground attitude in building, a lack of sharing and openness on our sites and media and a division in the membership between the "Haves and Have not."

The rules are simple and beg little debate that has not already been discussed. Where they are specific it is defined.

Now, having said all this to make the point of what we are about and where we will not go; should a builder wish to spend several hundred dollars for materials in areas not specified, that becomes a preference but provides nothing to the performance of the model over one with lesser expensive and crafted structures. If we think about it along this point, we will find our answers and the common sense to support it.

We have been using carbon fiber composites in parts for the construction of the EC12 for years. They come and they go but generally in the interest of better craftsmanship. Where they have function better than traditional materials they stay like servo extension rods or tubes for the tiller, as an example. Like in other places it does not contribute to performance and if there is a weight consideration it is miniscule when translated to waterline.

Composites are not to be where the specifics say they cannot be. To go beyond this simple reading that anything connected to the specific in the rules, a deck or hull for example, then becomes a part of that specific is creating argument by an assumption. Likewise, if wood ribs can be connected to a hull specific to be of fiberglass makes the hull part wood and hence, outside the rules. If one buys the assumed argument this statement is not silly. So, why would a carbon fiber rib be excluded?

On the other hand, where the rules are specific in relation to construction of a particular part (Rule 9.1 for example stating booms shall be constructed of wood, aluminum and/or fiberglass) does not mean a carbon fiber rod or tube can be sleeved into an aluminum or fiberglass tube. "Constructed of" is clear

and to make the argument that a carbon fiber rib translates to permission to a boom is outside of reason. Would you argue that a stainless steel cable for a shroud is part of the mast?

If, while we are sitting around a circle in the park sipping \$3 Lattes stirring the pot of argument do not be too focused on one thing without placing the same shadow across another. It is one thing to enjoy some silliness in debate and some growth could come of it but to build a point of argument to force legal rule is not in the interests of friends with a common bond to a hobby and recreation like model yachting. Even the fierceness of competition should be toned down.

This has been my opinion and counsel.

Rick West,
EC12 Class Secretary