

# 1999 IC Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

1999 IC NATIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ANNUAL MEETING  
APRIL 17, 1999  
ANNAPOLIS, MD

Meeting organized & chaired by Tom Stout of the Annapolis fleet.

TC Members in attendance:

Dan Ronan (Larchmont)  
John Pratt (Winthrop)  
Don Lovelace (Indian Harbor)  
Pedro Lorson (Manhasset)  
Neal Fowler (Hyannis)  
Scituate Fleet (Via Proxy to Tom Stout)

Guest speakers in attendance:

Jaime Brickell (Annapolis)  
Jonathan Foote (Annapolis)  
Lars Guck (Builder)

Ten agenda items were up for consideration by the TC as outlined on 4/3/99 by Tom Stout of the Annapolis fleet including the authors of each amendment. Dan Ronan brought forth an informal discussion of the JC strap being used by some & what was the legality of such, how the TC would vote.

1. Allow the Dwyer mast section as another alternative.
2. Remove the bow tip weight rule & replace it with a set corrector weight placement. Location to be determined.
3. Carbon fiber blades be allowed.
4. Allowing longer battons/up to 24 inches.
5. Change hull weight from 250 LBS to hull + crew weight of 565 LBS, minimum hull weight of 230 LBS.
6. We adopt the position that the Technical Committee Chair each year be the Technical Committee Member representing the fleet hosting the Nationals.
7. Propose an amendment or deletion of class rule #2.1.1 to allow the construction of wood IC's again as it is the original S&S design.
8. Propose IC class rules to override RRS 49.1 which doesn't allow hiking assist line. Rule to be framed as: A line may be added to the boat to assist the crew in hiking. The line may be attached to the floor, thwart, aft section of the mast step or the opposite rail; i.e., the deck led vang system.
9. Clarification of the adjustable vang system being used by some - is it legal & is there any further regulations needed.
10. S&S does not have a full scale centerboard print. That we adopt the centerboard print that Neal Fowler had reproduced from the blue prints supplied by S&S as the standard for IC centerboard blueprints.
11. Referendum on the legality of the JC strap.

The following is a brief summary of each item above:

1. There was two schools of thought on this. 1st, that without testing that this would be unwise to consider. If someone wanted to fund & construct the mast section, then test it & allow other fleets to test it, then we could vote on data as opposed to theory. 2nd, was the thought that we already have 2 sections allowed, 1 more than some thought was needed, why would we need another. The vote was 7 NO 0 YES, AMENDMENT DEFEATED.
2. That without another means of regulating moments of inertia that the current bow tip rule although not perfect is the best means that we have to regulate how weight is carried on the IC. The vote was 7 NO 0 YES, AMENDMENT DEFEATED.
3. Jonathan Foote (Guest) spoke to this amendment because he was very much concerned about the cost being prohibitive and that IC's were not a performance dinghy and one of the attributes of this class is that you could be competitive without the burden of hi-tech costs. After considerable discussion about this amendment specifically cost effectiveness plus input from Lars Guck (builder) and his thoughts that there really was no cost prohibitive factor here & that once a mold was made cost would be very much the same as fiberglass boards but would be considerably stronger. The vote was 5 NO 2 YES, AMENDMENT DEFEATED.

4. The general consensus was that if a sailmaker or more than one sailmaker could build a sail for testing purposes with a batten length of 24" and then allow the sail to be sailed by competitors of different fleets to gain some data of how the sail performed that would be acceptable. But again it was felt that further study is necessary to gain the data. The vote was 7 NO 0 YES, AMENDMENT DEFEATED.

5. Jamie Brickell proposed this amendment and spoke very eloquently on his behalf on why he thought this would be an equalizer specifically for heavy crews. By combining hull plus crew weight he felt that it equalized the playing field. After some very constructive discussion this idea was not voted out of hand, to the contrary, it was very much entertained from the idea that we could standardize 230 lb boats for heavier crews. The overriding factor here was that heavier boats would then be compromised & either forced to buy a lighter weight boat or find ways of striping out weight from the current 250 lb. limit. There was also the school of thought that this rule could be abused by people who would strip out there boats for no other reason than to be able to provide themselves with heavier crews for hiking purposes much like the Star class, which was deemed to be a great advantage. The position was taken that if specific fleets would like to further study this by adopting this type of rule that it could be considered at a later date once some data had been obtained but that for now the national rule should stay consistent with the current specifications. The vote was 7 NO 0 YES, AMENDMENT DEFEATED.

6. There was quick discussion in reference to having the TC member of the hosting Nationals Fleet chair all TC meetings. The vote was 0 NO 7 YES, AMENDMENT PASSES.

7. Although there was some sentiment for building some wood IC's the overwhelming consensus was that there are enough wooden boats to be had for re-conditioning. The vote was 7 NO 0 YES, AMENDMENT DEFEATED.

8. The discussion on this issue was essentially combined with Amendment #9 to determine the legality of #8 because #9's Amendment is addressed within #8's rule change. It was determined that a hiking assist line would be legal within the IC class within the confines of the proposed amendment. The vote was 1 NO 6 YES, AMENDMENT PASSES.

9. As a result of the discussion of Amendment #8 and clarification from John Pratt that he wrote the rule for vang systems to be vague on purpose. The adjustable vang system being used by some ICer's is legal & can be used as a hiking assist line as well. The vote was 0 NO 7 YES, AMENDMENT PASSES.

10. When the carbon fiber amendment was proposed, the builder informed the TC chair that there was a full size rudder blue print but that there was not a full size centerboard blueprint. After further discussion, it was suggested that Neal Fowler's reproduce S&S print be used as the standard for further centerboard construction. John Pratt having reproduced his own centerboard print objected. John then suggested that he could combine his print along with Neal's to produce a standard IC centerboard blueprint which he felt he could do by 9/1/99 and that would be presented at the 2000 TC meeting. The vote was 0 NO 7 YES FOR THE ABOVE AMENDMENT.

11. At the conclusion of the TC meeting, Dan Ronan brought up the use of the JC strap being used by some because he was getting questions from his fleet regarding the legality of this. An informal poll was taken and on a voice vote there was absolutely no objection to the use of the JC strap and the only reason for not amending the rules was that there was not the proper 30 day notice needed. It was the TC's position that this was not objectionable.

All in all the TC had a large number of amendments to deal with which I believe were properly reviewed and discussed in depth so that the IC fleet could continue to prosper and grow. I wish to thank all the members for there time because it became a lengthy meeting due to the # of amendments and while our cohorts were enjoying there 1st beers we continued to do our duty as SSA's clubhouse. My thanks to all and it was my privilege to host the 1999 TC meeting.

Thank you.  
Tom Stout

---

[Return to the IC Home Page](#)