



## Academy of Model Aeronautics

5161 East Memorial Drive, Muncie, Indiana 47302  
(765) 287-1256 – Voice • Competitions Fax (765) 286-3303  
[www.modelaircraft.org](http://www.modelaircraft.org)

### RULES CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

Click **SUBMIT** button to send to AMA Headquarters

**A copy will be forwarded to the appropriate Contest Board Chairman. The current issue of Competition Regulations must be referenced.**

From: Charles E. (Chuck) Andraka  
Subject: Rules Change Proposal

#### AMA Competition Regulations Rules Change Proposal Form (electronic)

**Please complete this form and click on the SUBMIT button at the bottom of the page. This will send the proposal to the Competition Department at AMA HQ. A copy will then be sent to the appropriate Contest Board Chairman. The current issue of the Competition Regulations must be referenced.**

Proposal Number: RCP17-03  
Received Date: 03/11/2016  
Revised Date:  
Version Number:

Select Proposal Type (select one from drop-down box):

Basic

Select Applicable Competition Regulations this proposal relates to (select one from drop-down box):

RC Pylon Racing

**Give Brief Summary of the Proposed Change: (Note: You can drag the right bottom corner of the box to enlarge for additional space.)**

Separate the pole one functions such that a cut is reported as a cut regardless of the accuracy of the flag/light. The intent is to help the workers give more accurate timing (light/flag) to the callers, and removing a significant reason for reflies. This is a clarification of the separation of rules 13.1.10 and 13.1.11.

**State exact wording proposed for the Competition Regulations. List paragraph number where applicable. Example: Change "quote present rule book wording" to "exact wording**

**required". (Note: You can drag the right bottom corner of the box to enlarge for additional space.)**

Change 13.1.10, "All aircraft are to be signaled the moment they break the plane ("gate") established by the #1 pylon and the flaggers' position." to "All aircraft are to be signaled as close to the moment they break the plane ("gate") established by the #1 pylon and the flaggers' position as possible. Should the plane suddenly turn short and a light be given, a cut will be assigned. Receiving a light and a cut shall not be grounds for a refly.

**State logic behind proposed change, including alleged shortcoming of the present rule(s). STATE INTENT FOR FUTURE REFERENCE (Note: You can drag the right bottom corner of the box to enlarge for additional space.):**

The Pole 1 flagging position is arguably the hardest position on the course to work. Planes flying at nearly 200 MPH suddenly reverse direction. The judges are aware of "No light and cut on same lap", and the issues that such cause (refly). There are two responses to this case. One, the judge tries to signal as close to the pole as possible, giving the pilot the best possible information. This likely leads to "missed" cuts when the flagger cannot lay off the light upon sudden turn. The second response is to avoid the issue by "making sure" before pressing the light button, resulting in a late light. When both approaches are utilized by different flaggers in a race, the results are not equitable.

I have worked #1 as judge and as flagger. I have CD'd. I have recruited workers. The #1 thing I hear from #1 people is "You would not believe how many planes got away with cuts because the light was hit"

I feel that the best way to get consistent lights in all lanes is to separate the task of flagging and cuts. In fact, the rules separate it now, as flagging is in 13.1.10, and cuts are in 13.1.11. The rule in 13.1.11 CLEARLY states that "If a pylon is cut, the lap shall not be counted". It does not say "Unless the light was given". This discrepancy has been interpreted as a "course worker mistake" leading to a refly. This causes the course worker to be more careful, and we get (I got lights on the way back from 1). In fact, if flagging at the time the plane would have made it to #1 if it had not turned is a course worker mistake, so is "late flagging", as the current rule says the flag/light is given "the moment they break the plane". I dare say I would get laughed off the course if I asked for a refly for late flagging!

There is NO official purpose (judging) for the flagging/lights. They are clearly an aid to the pilot/caller team. The official purposes served include starting, timing, and declaring cuts. A late light (conservative flagging) is no better than no lights, as you would get the same too-late feedback if a cut were not posted. So clearly the lights are an aide to the pilot/caller. The MOST USEFUL information is if the light displays the timing accomplished by the team, early or late on the turn. This information is best given by the flagger timing his button to the point the plane will hit the pole. Should the plane turn suddenly, the timing is still valid. this is not "anticipation", but rather a linear extrapolation of a non-linear event.

By relieving the worker of the fear of light/cut combos, all lanes can focus on accurately-timed lights, providing the best possible feedback to the pilot/caller team. Then rule 13.1.11 can be uniformly enforced, and the signaling to the pilot /caller team is of most valuable use.

**If this proposal is for a new event, include all event test data/information here. Please provide information on what testing of this new event has taken place to include number of participants and number of contests. (Note: You can drag the right bottom corner of the box to enlarge for additional space.)**

N/A

**State effect, if any, on current AMA records:**

Probably none. One could argue that some records may have missed cuts. Alternatively, one could argue that more accurate timing of the lights may lead to faster times as pilot/caller teams have better faith in the timing of the lights. Net impact should be minimal in terms of records.

**Note: The Contest Board Chairman may, in coordination with the submitter of the proposal, at any time prior to submitting a proposal to the contest board for Final Vote, Edit proposal wording to increase clarity and to avoid ambiguity provided, the proposal intent is not changed.**

Proposer: Charles E. (Chuck) Andraka

AMA Number: 1614

Address: 21 Juan Road NE

City: Albuquerque

State: New Mexico

Zip: 87123

Day Telephone: 505-844-8573

Email: [ceandra@comcast.net](mailto:ceandra@comcast.net)

Signature: Charles E. Andraka