

RI-10-01 (2010-09-09)

REPLACEMENT OF DAMAGED OR DEFECTIVE SAILS

Q1: I bought a sail in September of 2009 and it was damaged beyond repair in April of 2010. Can I replace that sail with a sail delivered in 2010 that does not count against my 2010 tag limit?

A1: Yes with qualifications. The applicable rule, 6.8.1, is shown below. Clause (C) allows one year for delivery of a replacement sail. This is interpreted to mean that a replacement sail can be delivered within one year of the tag date on the sail to be replaced. In this situation the original sail has 09-09 tag date so a direct replacement can be delivered no later than 08-10. This provision of the rules avoids the unfair treatment that would result from a strict calendar year interpretation where, for example, a sail delivered 12-09 could not be replaced by a sail delivered 01-10. The replacement will be noted on the class sail tag list to clarify compliance with the purchase limits. If the replacement sail is delivered more than one year from the date the original sail was delivered, the replacement sail is applied to the sail tags for the current year. Careful attention should be paid to the last sentence of 6.8.1 that excludes normal wear and tear and poor design from the definition of 'defective' or 'damaged.' The decision regarding qualification for replacement is made by the sail maker and the local fleet representative.

The applicable Class Rule:

6.8.1 Any sail that, in the written opinion of the Chief Measurer or the relevant Fleet Measurer, is defective or so substantially damaged that it cannot reasonably be repaired, may be replaced, provided (a) such opinion, the certificate required by rule 6.9 and the sail tag of the defective or damaged sail are all received by the Class Secretary, (b) the registration year of the replacement sail is not newer than the registration year of the sail it replaces, (c) the replacement sail is delivered within one year of the delivery date of any sail being replaced, and (d) a replacement sail does not count against the sail purchase limitations of the first sentence of rule 6.8. A sail is 'defective' for this purpose only if its material or manufacture (rather than its shape) is defective and the sail maker has notified the Class Secretary that it has agreed to replace it and all similarly defective sails without cost to the owners involved.

RI 09-01 (2009-05-06)

10KG TOLERANCE SPECIFICATION IN EXHIBIT 7.3A ITEM F

Q1: Does the 10Kg tolerance specified in Exhibit 7.3A, Item F, mean that my boat meets minimum weight requirements if it weighs more than 3,880 Kg?

A1: There are two answers to this question depending on why the boat has been weighed.

The answer is No when issuing a weight certificate. In this situation the boat must weigh 3,890Kg (8,576Lb) or more to be certified.

The answer is Yes if a previously certified boat is weighed for purposes of inspection that is not part of a certification procedure.

RI 09-02 (2009-05-06)

IMPACT OF NEW WEIGHT CERTIFICATE IN EXHIBIT 7.3B

Q1: Rule 7.3 specifies that the weight certificate specified in Exhibit 7.3B must be on board at all times. The weight certificate has changed since my boat was certified so does this mean that I must have a new certificate?

A1: No. any class certificate that is properly signed by a Measurer that certifies that the

boat weighs more than the specified minimum weight is acceptable. The revised certificate is designed to improve the clerical aspects of issuing a Weight Certificate but does not change the final effect of certification.

RI-08-01 (2008-03-17)

BOAT CHANGE EFFECT ON WEIGHT CERTIFICATE

Q1: The J/105 Weight Certificate is good for the life of the hull unless changes are made that affect the weight. This interpretation of Class Rule 7.3 is intended to clarify procedures for occasions when modifications have been made to a boat. This Rule Interpretation is intended to help guide the minimum requirements for maintaining a boat's weight certificate. Fleet Rules that are more restrictive are not discouraged. This interpretation understands that each J/105 Fleet has varying access to weighing resources and this interpretation defines the minimum method for maintaining a weight certificate in compliance with Class Rules. I have added equipment to my boat. Do I need to be re-weighed?

A1: No, a boat that has a weight certificate does not need to be reweighed if equipment is added to the boat. Rule 7.3 specifies a minimum weight only.

Q2: I want to replace some equipment or remove some equipment. Do I need to be reweighed?

A2: Yes, depending on whether the equipment in question can be weighed separately. In order to minimize the need for weighing the entire boat, the net change in boat weight may be determined by weighing the individual items separately and recording this change on the weight certificate or alternately issuing a new weight certificate with amended weights and documentation. For example, an owner changing from wheel to tiller can weigh the components removed, and the components added, then have his Measurer adjust the weight certificate to reflect the net change. This same method may be applied when equipment is removed from a boat that already has compensating weight added and it is necessary to add additional compensation to maintain class minimum weight. However, if the equipment cannot be easily or accurately weighed, as with replacing a major component such as an engine or a mast, then the entire boat must be reweighed.

Important notes on weighing method:

Items weighed separately from the boat should be weighed on a scale that is proven accurate to within 1% . This can be accomplished by using a scale that has a government certification or by calibrating the weight through the use of known reference weights for comparison. The best way to do this is to use differential weighing so that any scale offset is nullified. In this method a person can first weigh himself and then take a weight while holding the items to be weighed. The two values are subtracted which eliminates the effect of any gross offset in the scale. If using one of the digital "bathroom style" scales it is important that the surface under the scale is level. Each foot has a measurement element, and if one of the feet is not in full contact, the measurement will be inconsistent and erroneous.

Q3: I want to make some major improvements to my boat. Do I need to be reweighed?

A3: Yes, changes caused by major repair that cannot be weighed separately require that the entire boat be reweighed for certification. For example, if an owner has the keel or hull faired (Ref. CR 7.3) or hull core damage repaired there is no alternate way to measure the weight change except weighing the entire boat and the issuance of a new revised weight certificate.

Q4: I need to make relatively small repairs to damage. Do I need to be reweighed?

A4: No, minor repairs, where material is removed and replaced by similar material, such as re-bedding fittings or repairing rail damage from a collision, do not require the boat to be reweighed. The decision should be the best judgment of the measurer whether the repair has materially affected the weight of the boat.

Q5: My boat is heavier than the Class Minimum from Rule 7.3. Can I do anything to reduce weight and if I do must I reweigh the boat?

A5: Yes, because Class Rule 1.3 specifies that a boat "shall comply with standard specifications published by J Boats, Inc.". Class Rule 5.1 further clarifies the specified equipment. Any removal of equipment must comply with this basic tenet of the J/105 Class Rules or some aspect of the Class Rules that specifically permits the removal of an item of equipment. Equipment that was installed as an option, such as wheel steering, extra batteries, stereo systems, etc., are not part of the specification and may be removed from the boat. If equipment is removed to reduce weight, the owner should refer to the other guidelines in this RI to determine how to maintain the Weight Certificate. In most cases the items can be weighed separately to avoid the necessity of reweighing the boat.

RI-07-01 (2007-05-16)

TAKEUP LINES, ETC.

Q1: Is it permissible to rig a system of lines, blocks and/or shock cord as a "take up" for the traveler line?

A1: No. See rule 1.3: "No alterations or modifications are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules." Under rules 1.2 and 1.3, no additional fittings are permitted unless expressly permitted by the rules. Rule 5.3.10 does not expressly reference, and therefore does not permit, additional blocks, hooks, or rings. The foregoing does not prohibit an "endless" traveler line.

RI-07-02 (2007-06-18)

OUTHAUL CLEATING SYSTEMS

Q1: Is it permissible to fit a swiveling cleat with an integrated block in lieu of the standard clam cleat and simple block for the outhaul adjustment? How about a cam cleat instead of the standard clam?

A1: No as to the swiveling cleat, yes as to the cam cleat. Rule 1.3 states "All yachts, competing in one design or class sponsored events, shall comply with standard specifications published by J Boats, Inc. and these class rules. No alterations or modifications are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules." Rule 1.2 states: "Except where variations are specifically permitted by these rules, J/105s shall be alike in ... equipment," None of the express exceptions in the class rules apply.

In prior interpretations, the TC has established the principle that standard equipment can be replaced with functionally similar equipment made by other manufacturers at a similar cost. See RI 00-03 (Spinlock mainsheet cleat instead of standard is legal), 02-15 (spectra outhaul shackle instead of standard stainless is not legal). A swiveling cleat like the Ronstan "Headbanger" (or a similar cleat such as those made by Spinlock or Harken), although "functionally similar" to the standard clam cleat and block setup and modest in price, would cost a multiple of the standard setup. In addition, the general principle that replacement of equipment with functionally similar equipment of similar cost is permissible only goes so far: In light of rule 1.2's

mandate that all J105s have to be "alike" in "equipment", the TC should not permit modifications that constitute a significant change from the standard setup. There are obviously many ways in which the outhaul mechanism can be rigged, the standard clam and block and the swiveling cleat being just two possible variations. The point is that JBoats chose to rig the outhaul a certain way and all boats should have a similar setup. It is certainly permissible to change the make of the block and clam cleat, but the overall nature of the setup cannot be changed. Consequently, a swiveling cleat is not permissible. Replacing the standard clam cleat with a cam mounted in line with the boom (like the standard clam) is a legal modification since it preserves the standard setup of the outhaul and in light of RI 00-03.

RI-07-03 (2007-10-01)

SAILS FOR CHARTERED BOATS

Q1: Increasingly, charter arrangements include agreements where the charterer pays for one or more new sails for the chartered boat as part of the charter fee. The intention of these arrangements is that the sails count against the sail allotment of the owner of the chartered boat, rather than that of the charterer. Is this permissible?

A1: Yes, but subject to certain conditions. First, the owner of the chartered boat must be entitled to purchase the sails under the 3/2/3 rule of rule 6.8. Second, the sails must be truly owned by the owner of the chartered boat. In the view of the TC, this is only the case if the owner of the chartered boat, rather than the charterer, bears the risk of loss of those sails. Anything else indicates that the charterer is merely renting the owner's "sail card", which is contrary to the clear intention of rule 6.8. For example, any arrangement whereby the sails get sold after the charter and the charterer makes the owner of the chartered boat whole for all or any part of the difference between the new price and the amount realized on sale of the sails would indicate that the charterer, rather than the owner of the chartered boat, is the owner of the sails. In that case, those sails would count against the sail allotment of the charterer.

Q2: If an owner has two boats, is the owner permitted to "charter" one boat to himself so he can use the sails of the other boat on the "chartered" boat?

A2: No. Since the owner already owns the "chartered" boat, it's obviously not a charter. RI 02-08 clearly prohibits the transfer of sails or sail purchase allotments between the two boats. This includes any arrangement to achieve the "transfer" result, by "charter" or otherwise.

RI-06-01 (2006-10-06)

LIPTON CUP SAILS; USED SAIL PURCHASES; USE OF "REPLACED" SAILS; SALE OF SAILS

Q1: Is an untagged sail that has been used in the Lipton Cup or other special events a used sail within the meaning of class rule 6.8?

A1: No, for several reasons. First, Lipton Cup sails or sails used in other special events have not been used as the primary sail of a boat for the requisite "six months of sailing use". Note that RI 02-18 defines "six months of sailing use" as a full racing season as the primary sail of that type, but not less than 12 racing days. Typical special events last a few days, not the requisite full season. Second, as stated in RI 05-04, an untagged sail is never a "used" sail since only time the sail is used in class racing (i.e. while it is tagged) counts for purposes of the "six months sailing use" test set forth in rule 6.8 as interpreted in RI 02-18. For that reason, a Lipton Cup sail does not become "used" until it has been used as the primary sail of that type of a boat for a full racing season (but not less than 12 racing days) after the date on which it was tagged and the required sail certificate was delivered to the class

secretary/treasurer, as required by rule 6.9. Any use prior to that date does not count against the full racing season test.

Q2: Does the purchase of a "used" sail count against the 3/2/3 sail purchase limitations under rule 6.8?

A2: Yes, except if one of the following three circumstances applies:

1. The sail is purchased for a new boat under the second sentence of rule 6.8, which permits the purchase of 3 used sails in the year a new boat is first used by the owner.

2. The sail is purchased by the new owner of a used boat under the second sentence of rule 6.11, which permits the purchase of a used chute/jib in the year a used boat is first used by the new owner, provided certain conditions are satisfied.

3. The sail is purchased as a replacement for a used sail that was destroyed or damaged under the last sentence of rule 6.8. See RI 02-18.

Except in one of these three situations, the purchase of a used sail counts against the 3/2/3 rule exactly the same as the purchase of a new sail.

Q3: If a sail is replaced under the last sentence of rule 6.8, for example because it is heavily damaged, can that sail still be used for class racing if it is repaired?

A3: No. If a sail is replaced, it is the owners responsibility to destroy or return the sail tag to the class secretary/treasurer. Thus, the "damaged" sail can no longer be used in class racing. However, if the sail is repaired, a new sail tag is issued for it in compliance with the 3/2/3 rule and the requisite sail certificate (reflecting any changes to the sails measurements) is delivered to the class secretary/treasurer, the sail can again be used for class racing.

Q4: If a class sail is sold, what does the new owner have to do before the owner can use the sail in class racing?

A4: The sail purchase must be reflected on the class website in order to ensure that the new owner is complying with the 3/2/3 rule for sail purchases. Ordinarily, an email to the class secretary/treasurer providing the new owners name, boat no/name and sail tag number is sufficient for this purpose.

RI-05-01 (2005-03-22)

COMPETITOR ELIGIBILITY [superseded by changes to Rule 3.5 in 2007]

RI-05-02 (2005-03-22)

RUDDER ADJUSTMENT

Q1: Is it permissible to adjust or modify the rudder to bring it up closer to the hull?

A1: No. Rule 1.3 states that "no modifications or alterations are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules." There is nothing in our rules that permits such an adjustment or modification. Based on measurements of a number of boats that have not been modified, it seems to be normal that there be a space of 5 to 10 mm between the rudder and the hull, measured at the aftmost point of the rudder bearing and the center line of the hull with the rudder centered. Therefore, a minimum of 5 mm of space is required for a boat to be class legal.

RI-05-03 (2005-03-22)

CLOTH WEIGHT FOR CHUTES [revised 10/31/06]

Q1: Rule 6.6.1 requires that our chutes have a ply weight of not less than 44 g/m². What does this weight refer to?

A1: Only sail cloths whose published specifications for the finished weight of the cloth, available on the website of the manufacturer, meet the 44 g/m² minimum are legal for use in J105 chutes.

RI-05-04 (2005-04-25)

INITIALLY UNTAGGED SAILS

Q1: A class sail is purchased after October 1, 2001 and initially used for non-class racing. Is it permissible later to put a sail tag onto that sail and use it as a legal sail for class racing? If so, what is the "date of delivery" for purposes of class rule 6.9 and the sail certificate required by that rule?

A1: Yes. It is permissible to put a sail tag onto a sail after initial delivery of the sail to the owner, provided the sail otherwise meets the requirements of part 6 of our rules (i.e. size, material etc) and the sail certificate required by Section 6.9 is delivered to the class secretary.

When our class rules refer to "delivery" of a sail, they refer to the delivery of a class legal, fully tagged sail. In addition, under the first sentence of the sail purchase limitations of class rule 6.8 (the "3/2/3" rule), sail purchase rights not used in a particular year are lost and cannot be carried forward. It should not be possible to evade that general rule by purchasing sails untagged and later tagging them "retroactively." Hence, a sail counts as having been purchased in the year when it is tagged or the year when it is delivered to the owner, whichever is later. The "date of delivery" of an initially untagged sail is the date on which the sail is redelivered to an owner, after a sail tag is applied to it by a certified sailmaker. Note that such a sail is not class legal until the rule 6.9 sail certificate is received by the class secretary.

Q2: Can an untagged sail be purchased as a "used" sail under the second sentence of section 6.8?

A2: No. The second sentence of section 6.8 permits an owner of a new boat to purchase a set of "used" sails in addition to a set of new sails. The term "used" is defined as one full season of sailing use as the primary sail of that type. Section 6.8; RI 02-18. In this context, our rules must be read to refer to use for class racing. Racing that is not governed by our class rules (i.e. racing in regattas where the sails are not required to be tagged) should not count as "sailing use as the primary sail" of the boat. This means that a sail that is acquired without a tag is considered a new sail at the time of tagging. It cannot become a "used sail" except through use as the primary sail of a boat for class racing after the sail has been tagged and become a class legal sail.

RI-05-05 (2005-12-13)

BARBERHAULING

Q1: On January 1, 2006, rules 5.3.8 and 5.3.10 about permissible barberhauling of the jib sheet are changing in relevant part as follows: "trimming the lazy windward jib sheet, but no additional equipment or running rigging for barberhauling the jib inboard is permitted." What is now permissible under these rules?

A1: The only barberhauling that is permissible involves trimming the windward jibsheet

in its usual position for upwind sailing. In other words, the lazy sheet must go from the clew around and forward of the mast to the jib sheet block on the windward deck and from there back to one of the windward winches (directly or through the windward jib/spin sheet foot block), without any intermediate turns or leads. Any other arrangement would not involve "trimming the windward sheet" and, therefore, would be prohibited, including arrangements that go through the handrails. Note the rationale for the rules change, as stated in the Discussion portion of submission 3 in the 2004 rules proposals: "This submission would clarify what is permitted for barberhauling the jib outboard and would prohibit separate concoctions to barberhaul the jib inboard. The Executive Committee believes that the various barberhauling arrangements in use by some boats complicate the boat unnecessarily and are therefore inconsistent with rule 1.1."

RI-04-01 (2004-10-05)

WHEN MAY THE SPRIT BE DEPLOYED?

Q1: When a boat approaches the windward mark and is overstanding, may it pull out the sprit before reaching the mark? May the sprit be pulled if there has been a windshift so that boats are now approaching the

A1: The sprit may not be pulled out unless the spinnaker is fully hoisted before the boat is about to round the windward mark.

Rule 7.2 reads in relevant part: " When not in the process of setting, flying or taking down the spinnaker, the bowsprit shall be retracted so that the tip of the sprit is aft of the forwardmost point on the bow. Approaching a windward mark without the spinnaker set, the bowsprit shall not be extended until the bow of the boat has passed the mark. " The first sentence of the rule suggests that if a boat is "in the process" of setting the chute, the sprit does not have to be retracted □ in other words, it can be pulled out. However, that sentence needs to be read together with the second sentence of the rule. That sentence prohibits pulling the sprit before the bow is at the mark unless the spinnaker is "set" when the boat is approaching the mark. In the view of the TC, a boat is "approaching" a mark if it is within the zone where RRS 18 applies (i.e. when the boat is "about to round" the mark). Only if the boat manages to hoist the chute before it reaches the RRS 18 zone, does the second sentence not apply. Thus, the chute has to be "set" (hoisted) before the boat enters that zone if the pole is out. A boat that pulls the sprit while "in the zone" where RRS 18 applies, always violates rule 7.2. Also, a boat that pulls the sprit and does not immediately hoist the chute violates the rule unless the bow has passed the mark when the sprit is pulled.

Q2: If there is an offset mark, where can the sprit be pulled out?

A2: When the bow passes the windward mark. The offset is not a windward mark for purposes of the rule.

RI-04-02 (2004-11-19)

REPLACEMENT PROPELLERS

Q1: Is it permissible to use a prop other than the standard 15 inch Martec non-g geared folding prop?

A1: Yes, certain other 15 inch props are permissible.

Class Rule 1.2 states that " Except where variations are specifically permitted by these rules, J/105s shall be alike in hull,□. keel, rudder □ . Similarly, Class Rule 1.3 states that "All vachts competing in one design or class sponsored events. shall

comply with standard specifications published by J/Boats, Inc. and these class rules. No alterations or modifications are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules". On the other hand, it has been a long-standing view of the TC that the intent of the rules is not to legislate hardware brands. If the piece of equipment functions as intended, then it is permitted provided it does not provide an undue advantage over standard equipment. See RI 00-03, RI 02-15.

The J105 has always been delivered with a 15 inch Martec folding prop. The TC has analyzed whether the following replacement props are permissible (all 15 inch):

- Flex-O-Fold Standard and Racing versions (geared)
- Gori Standard and Racing versions (geared)
- Martec (geared)
- Max Prop (feathering)

Most of these props are "geared" props, which means that the blades are connected and open up in unison. Arguably, this feature provides an advantage over the non-geared Martec since with the Martec, particularly in light air and choppy conditions, a single blade could potentially open up. On the other hand, owners of standard Martec non-geared props are of course free to rubber band their props although in cold or polluted waters this may not be an alternative in practice.

Flex-O-Fold claims on its website that its product has somewhat less drag than the standard Martec. They reference a Cruising World test report from 1995 to back up their claim, although the test involved an earlier version of the Flex-O-Fold prop with smaller blades and, presumably, less drag. Another independent test report they reference from 1997 indicates that the Flex-O-Fold and the Gori folding props have approximately the same drag, which coupled with the Cruising World report would indicate that the Gori, as well, may have less drag than the Martec. Both these test reports indicate that the Maxprop has significantly more drag than the Martec, Flex-O-Fold or Gori. Notwithstanding these reports, Martec claims that its standard prop is the lowest drag sailboat propeller anywhere, but Martec does not provide any independent test results to back up that claim. It is unclear which versions of the Martec were tested in these test reports. It is important to note that the prop on the J105 is angled to the flow of water along the hull, thereby exposing the blades to the flow to a much greater extent than if the flow were parallel to the shaft the way the props were positioned in the tests. These issues make the foregoing test reports of dubitable validity for our purposes.

The Technical Committee obtained samples of each of the Flex-O-Fold, Gori, Martec geared and Martec non-geared props in order to resolve the conflicting test results and manufacturer claims. In side-by-side comparison it was clear that the standard non-geared Martec presented a significantly smaller "bulk" to the flow of water than the geared Martec or any of the Flex-O-Fold or Gori options, largely because the geared props have much larger hub diameters (to accommodate their gears) than the standard non-geared Martec. Hence, the resistance of the geared Martec, Flex-O-Fold and Gori props will be somewhat greater than that of the standard Martec. In conversations with the top US representatives of Martec, Flex-O-Fold, and Gori, each of them confirmed that for a J/105 application, the most significant drag factor among the folding props being evaluated was the size of the hub, and that their respective geared hub props would have more drag than a comparable size non-geared Martec prop.

The TC has therefore concluded that all these geared blade props are legal substitutes for the standard Martec prop provided they have a diameter of at least 15 inches. In addition, based upon the above test reports, the TC is of the view that the Maxprop feathering prop also has somewhat more drag than a standard Martec

of the same diameter and, therefore, is a class legal prop for the J105 as long as its diameter is at least 15 inches. The TC expresses no view on props other than those listed above.

RI-03-01 (2003-04-28)

REPLACEMENT OF DESTROYED SAILS

Q1: May a "backup" chute or other older sail be replaced under the third sentence of rule 6.8 without counting the replacement against the 3/2/3 allotment?

A1: No.

The portions of Rule 6.8 relevant to this question read as follows: " For purposes of class racing, sail purchases shall not exceed (a) two sails in any calendar year, plus (b) one additional sail during any period of two consecutive calendar years. □ Further, any sail that, in the written opinion of the Chief Measurer or any Fleet Measurer, is destroyed or so substantially damaged that it cannot reasonably be repaired, may be replaced, provided such opinion and the certificate required by rule 6.9 are received by the Class Secretary." (emphasis added)

The highlighted sentence (which is the third sentence of rule 6.8) permits an owner to replace a destroyed or heavily damaged sail even if the first sentence of rule 6.8 would not permit another sail to be purchased during the year. One purpose of this rule is to provide relief to an owner whose sail has been destroyed and who cannot purchase another sail under the 3/2/3 rule during that year. Another purpose is to prevent an owner who still has room in his 3/2/3 allotment when the sail is destroyed or damaged from being at a competitive disadvantage by having to use his allotment to replace a destroyed or damaged sail. Neither purpose would be served by permitting the replacement of a chute with a new chute if the boat has a more recent chute in its inventory. In that situation, the owner can keep using the newer chute. Thus, in the view of the TC, the third sentence of rule 6.8 only permits the replacement with a new sail of the most recently purchased ("primary") jib, main or spinnaker of the boat. On the other hand, an owner could be at a disadvantage as well if the boat's "backup" chute (i.e. not the primary chute) is destroyed or damaged beyond repair. For that reason, the rule also permits the replacement of a backup chute in this situation, but only with a "used" spinnaker (as the term "used" is defined in rule 6.8 and RI 02-18.) Since there is no concept of "backup" jib or mainsail in our rules, the third sentence of rule 6.8 does not permit the replacement of a jib or main that is not the primary sail. For example, if an owner has a 2002 and a 2003 chute, the third sentence of rule 6.8 would permit the replacement of the 2003 chute with a new chute and the replacement of the 2002 chute with a "used" chute □ assuming in either case that the conditions of the sentence are otherwise satisfied. (Compare RI 02-18, which states that the third sentence of rule 6.8 does not permit the replacement of a "used" sail with a new sail.)

In late 2002, a number of owners of boats from fleets that used the 77m2 chute purchased two new full sized 89m2 in preparation for the effectiveness of the new 89m2 rule on January 1, 2003 or for the 2002 North American Championships (which were sailed under the new rule). Any owner in that situation may replace either chute (but not both) with a new chute under the third sentence of rule 6.8, but only until such time as he or she purchases a new chute in 2003 or later.

Note also that the replacement sail is counted in subsequent periods against the sail purchase limitations. In other words, if an owner purchases two sails in 2003 and replaces one of those sails in 2003 under the third sentence, the owner has purchased 3 sails during 2003 for purposes of the first sentence of rule 6.8. Hence, 2004 will be a two sail year. See clause (b) of the first sentence of rule 6.8.

RI-03-02 (2003-04-28)

MEANING OF RULE 6.6.4 REGARDING 89 SQUARE METER CHUTE PURCHASES

Q1: If a boat had one full sized, class legal 89 square meter chute on January 1, 2003, may the owner purchase another 89 m2 under rule 6.6.4?

A1: No. Rule 6.6.4 permits no purchases of chutes for a boat that had one or more 89s at the beginning of 2003.

Rule 6.6.4 reads as follows: "If a boat does not have at least two full sized, legal 89 m2 spinnaker on January 1, 2003, one or two 89 m2 spinnakers, as applicable, may be purchased before December 31, 2004 to make up the deficiency. If an additional spinnaker may be purchased under rule 6.8 on January 1, 2003, the number of sails that may be purchased under this rule 6.6.4 will be reduced by one."

The second sentence of 6.6.4 reduces the number of sails that may be purchased under rule 6.6.4 by one. This is because, under rule 6.8 as it was in effect on that day (and still is), an owner was permitted to purchase at least two sails during 2003, one or both of which could be spinnakers. (The second sentence of rule 6.6.4 is phrased the way it is because when 6.6.4 was adopted as part of the 2002 rules changes, it was unclear whether new rule 6.8 the calendar year system would pass. If it had not passed, an owner would not have been able to purchase a new chute until 12 months from his last purchase had expired (which was the old rule). Thus, it was possible that an owner could not have purchased a chute under 6.8 on January 1, 2003 and rule 6.6.4 would have made up for this by permitting an owner to purchase one more chute under 6.6.4.)

If a boat had no 89 m2 at the beginning of 2003, the "deficiency" referred to in rule 6.6.4's first sentence would be two chutes and the second sentence would reduce the number of chutes that may be purchased under rule 6.6.4 to one. If, on the other hand, a boat had one 89 m2 at the beginning of 2003, the "deficiency" referred to in rule 6.6.4's first sentence would be one chute and the second sentence would reduce the number of chutes that may be purchased under rule 6.6.4 to zero.

In certain fleets, 89 m2 chutes were in use before 2003, which had luff length significantly shorter than what is permitted under the current rule. The TC believes that those chute are not competitive with chutes made according to the current rule. For that reason, those chutes do not constitute "full sized, legal 89 m2 spinnakers" within the meaning of rule 6.6.4.

RI-03-03 (2003-04-28)

WHEN MAY A BACKUP CHUTE BE FLOWN? [Revised 9/4/04]

Q1: Now that the class chute is 89 m2, when can a backup 89 or 77 m2 be flown? If a backup is flown, when can the backup be replaced with the primary chute?

A1: Rule 6.3 reads: "...and two class asymmetrical spinnakers; provided that the second spinnaker shall only be used if the first or primary spinnaker is damaged or, if due to extreme wind conditions, the boat owner reasonably believes that such primary spinnaker will be substantially damaged or destroyed. If a second spinnaker is deployed, the primary spinnaker shall not thereafter be used in the same race." This rule permits an owner to fly a backup chute if the owner has the requisite reasonable belief that due to "extreme wind conditions" the primary chute will be "substantially damaged or destroyed." The backup could be a class legal 89 m2 under current rule 6.6 or could be a 77 m2 chute that was class legal under the pre-2003 rules (which would typically measure in under the current rule as well). The TC believes that this exception to our "three sail" rule has to be narrowly read to avoid boats getting an unfair advantage from deploying spinnakers of different cuts depending on the wind

conditions. Moreover, the J105 chute at 44 g/m², weight is effectively a storm chute and most boats do not carry backup chutes of heavier weight. Thus, the backup is usually no less likely to rip in a blow than the primary. Thus, the burden for deployment of the backup should be a high one.

Rule 6.3 makes the owner the primary arbiter of the conditions, as long as the owner's belief is "reasonable." Whether it is reasonable depends on the circumstances: On a tight reach the limit would be reached earlier than on a broad run. Crew and driver experience are also factors: an inexperienced crew or driver that is more likely to broach or flog the sail would be able to use the backup sail at lesser wind speeds. Furthermore, strong and repeated gusts may justify going to the backup at lower sustained wind speeds than otherwise.

The TC believes that it would generally not be reasonable for an experienced crew to use a backup chute on a windward/leeward course unless the true wind speed equals or exceeds 20 kn on a sustained basis. A mere expectation □ for example derived from a weather forecast - that the wind speed may or will increase to above this minimum is insufficient to support a "reasonable" belief that the primary chute "will be destroyed or substantially damaged," as required by rule 6.3. In light of the strength of our chutes, it is not reasonable to believe that the primary will be destroyed or substantially damaged unless the wind, when the windward mark is reached, is at or above the minimum or it is likely that it will increase to that minimum during the downwind leg. This likelihood could be established, for example, by the stronger wind already showing on the surface to windward or if the wind during the prior upwind leg was in excess of the minimum.

Once a backup chute has been used, the primary chute may not be used "in the same race." Thus, a boat may not switch back and forth between chute during a race. On the other hand, if there are additional races as part of the same regatta (whether or not on the same day), the primary chute may be used again in those races.

This ruling supersedes RI 00-01, which was issued for the 77 m2 chute.

RI-02-01 (2002-02-12)

TRAVELLER STROPS

Q1: An owner has experienced difficulty with the traveler car getting jammed and believes that jamming would be avoided if a stop were installed between the car and the block. Is it permissible to add such a stop?

A1: No. Rule 1.3 states that "no modifications or alterations are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules." The Technical Committee does not believe that this modification is necessary or desirable. The Committee is also concerned about the potential that self-made strops break and injure crew members. On all boats, jamming of the car can occur if the swivel base is permitted to rotate beyond a 180 degree arc so that the base can hit the car, for example in a jibe. Jamming is not related to the block that attaches to the top of the car. One has to make sure that the stoppers in the swivel base are adjusted so that the swivel base can only rotate over a 180 degree arc. If an owner feels the need to bring the block up higher above the car, the owner may install a long "D" shackle to attach the block to the car. For example, Wichard # 1414 should fit the car.

RI-02-02 (2002-02-12)

PADEYES FOR SPIN SHEETS

Q1: Can pad eyes be added along the rail to be used for spinnaker sheets? Some owners

want the standard spinnaker block location farther forward and then be able to shackle a ratchet block to a pad eye forward of the standard double cheek block. This means a trimmer can trim straight from a ratchet in lighter winds and there is no need for twings.

- A1:** Rule 1.3 states that "no modifications or alterations are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules. The Technical Committee believes that the standard equipment installed on every J/105, together with the optional twings permitted by rule 5.3.9, works just fine for all chute designs. Thus, neither of these modifications is permissible.

RI-02-03 (2002-02-12)

DISCRETION TO CHANGE ISAF GROUP STATUS

Q1: Under class rule 3.5, the ExCom is the "final authority" in determining a competitor's status "within the spirit of the class rules," notwithstanding an ISAF ruling. Is this "final authority" intended to permit the ExCom to determine that a competitor who has been categorized by ISAF as Group 2 or 3 for purposes of J/105 class racing is a Group 1 or 2 instead?

- A1:** It is the primary intention of this ExCom authority to permit, in appropriate cases, reclassification of persons who are categorized by ISAF as Group 1 or 2 as Group 2 or 3 instead, rather than to relax ISAF determinations. Thus, the ExCom's authority under the rule is primarily intended to catch people who slip through the ISAF "net," not to make exceptions for people who are clearly pros and whom ISAF determines to be such.

RI-02-04 (2002-02-12)

FORWARD AND BACKWARD COMPATIBILITY TO STANDARD SPECS

Q1: Rules 1.3 and 5.1 refer to "standard specifications published by J Boats, Inc." and "standard factory supplied furnishings and equipment" and generally prohibit any change unless otherwise permitted by the class rules.

(1) If specifications or standard furnishings or equipment change after a boat is originally launched, is it permissible to make the same changes to the boat?

(2) Is it permissible to change a boat from its standard specs in a manner that makes it conform to specifications in effect for boats that were launched previously? For example, is it permissible to change cleats on the bow and stern such that they conform to the cleat arrangements on earlier boats (early boats had no stern cleats and only one bow cleat)?

- A1:** The "standard specifications" and "standard factory supplied furnishings and equipment" referred to in the class rules are generally those in effect at the time a particular boat is launched. On the other hand, the Technical Committee has in the past permitted the jib tracks on the early boats (build nos 1-72) to be moved to the location at which they are installed on all later boats. See RI 99-14. This was done to further the one design nature of the class and to rectify an error in the production process. The Technical Committee believes it is desirable to permit owners to upgrade furnishings and equipment in order to maintain the value of their boats as TPI makes production changes. For example, if owners want to replace the old-style pulpit with the newer, safer model, they should be permitted to do so. Therefore, the answer to Question (1) is YES. On the other hand, the Technical Committee sees no reason why owners would want to go back to prior specifications — other than to achieve a perceived performance advantage. It does not seem consistent with the recreational nature of the boat to permit such a modification. Therefore, the answer to question (2) is NO.

RI-02-05 (2002-02-12)

DEFINITION OF SAIL PURCHASE DATE [revised 10/31/06]

Q1: What is the date of purchase of a sail for purposes of Rule 6.8?

A1: The date of delivery to the Owner is considered the date of purchase of any sail. This date should be shown on the sail tag certificate (see rule 6.9).

RI-02-06 (2002-02-12)

RECUTTING/ALTERING SAILS

Q1: Is it permissible to recut or alter a sail?

A1: Generally yes. However, if a sail is recut or altered in any manner that changes its dimensions, a new sail tag certificate listing the new measurements is required or an appropriate notation to the existing certificate should be made by the sail maker. The new or annotated certificate must be delivered to the class secretary. If a sail is recut or altered in such a manner that 10% or more of the material is replaced, the recut or altered sail is considered a new sail for purposes of Rule 6.8. Thus, it counts against the sail purchase limitations of that rule and a new sail tag is required (in addition to a new sail tag certificate). However, the 10% rule does not apply if the replaced material was ripped or otherwise severely damaged (beyond ordinary stretch).

RI-02-07 (2002-02-12)

SAIL TAG CERTIFICATE FILING

Q1: What is the consequence if the sail tag certificate required by rule 6.9 is not delivered to the class secretary/treasurer for a sail manufactured or delivered after January 1, 2001?

A1: The sail is not class legal and cannot be used in class racing until the certificate is provided.

RI-02-08 (2002-02-12)

SAIL PURCHASE RIGHTS

Q1: If an owner has two boats, may sails and sail purchase rights be transferred between the boats?

A1: No. Sails and sail purchase rights are linked to each particular boat.

RI-02-09 (2002-02-12)

RUNNING RIGGING REQUIREMENTS [amended July 7, 2004]

Q1: Is it permissible to modify the jib, main and spinnaker halyard setup or to modify other running rigging (such as sheets) by

- (1) using lines of a different manufacturer than supplied by JBoats?
- (2) using "higher tech" line than what comes with the boat?
- (3) using a smaller diameter line or stripping the cover of the existing halyards?
- (4) using a 2:1 purchase system for jib or main halyard?

A1: Rules 1.3 and 5.1 refer to "standard specifications published by J Boats, Inc." and "standard factory supplied furnishings and equipment" and generally prohibit any change unless otherwise permitted by the class rules. Currently, JBoats does not publish standard sizes for halyards in its specifications for the J105, but specifies that the standard line package includes "Aracom T Main and Jib Halyards, . . . polyester . . . spin halvard." In the past, JBoats has changed running rigging sizes and types

frequently, yet the published specifications of the boat did not consistently include the details on running rigging. Thus, the Technical Committee believes that the class rules generally are not intended to restrict the size or type of running rigging used on our boats. Note, however, that class rule 5.4.4. specifically prohibits the use of "light air" spinnaker sheets (meaning additional spin sheets used only in light air).

Thus, the answer to questions (1), (2) and (3) is YES. Note, however, that it is not recommended to strip covers of halyards where they go over the sheaves at the top of the mast.

Adding a 2:1 purchase to the halyards would typically require the addition of a block to the head of the jib or main, as applicable. There is nothing in the class rules that would permit this addition. Even if no additional block is added, a 2:1 purchase is inconsistent with the standard setup of the J105. Hence, in either case, the answer to question (4) is No.

RI-02-10 (2002-02-12)

KELP WINDOWS

- Q1:** Is it permissible to add windows at the bottom of the hull to observe the accumulation of kelp at the front of the keel or rudder? Some owners in Southern California have installed those windows on their boats.
- A1:** Generally kelp windows are NOT permissible for class racing. Rule 1.3 states that "no modifications or alterations are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules" and kelp windows are not expressly authorized. However, our class rules do not address the use of those windows for PHRF racing, for example, and fleets where kelp is an issue may want to adopt a local rule that would permit their use. If a boat with installed windows wants to race in class events using the national class rules, the windows must be disabled, for example by taping them up.

RI-02-11 (2002-02-12)

ZINC REQUIREMENT

- Q1:** Is it permissible to remove the zinc on the propeller shaft?
- A1:** Zincs are not part of the boat's standard specifications published by JBoats. However, zincs have been installed by TPI on all new boats since 1991. They are essential in preventing electrolytic damage to the prop. Rule 1.1 states that the class rules are there to preserve the J/105's "equality of performance" and Rule 1.2 states in relevant part that "J/105s shall be alike in equipment" In light of these considerations, all boats must have zincs for class racing. It is permissible to use "low drag" zincs, however, and the accidental loss of a zinc is not a grounds for protest unless the loss was discovered before racing.

RI-02-12 (2002-04-02)

BATTENS CANNOT SUPPORT THE FOOT

- Q1:** Is it permissible for the jib to have battens that extend from the leech all the way to the foot of the sail?
- A1:** No. Rule 6.5 (as amended effective 2/15/02) states that the battens have to be "on the leech". If a batten extends to the foot, it's effectively a batten "on the foot", which isn't permitted. Similarly, if the batten extends from the leech to a point below the direct line from the tack to the clew of the jib, it effectively supports the foot (rather than the leech) and, consequently, is not permitted.

RI-02-13 (2002-04-03)
DELETED [superseded by 5.3.8 as of January 2006]

RI-02-14 (2002-05-13)
RATCHET BLOCKS

Q1: Is it permissible to fit ratchet blocks in the place of the spinnaker turning blocks at the stern of the boat?

A1: No. Rule 1.3 states "All yachts, competing in one design or class sponsored events, shall comply with standard specifications published by J Boats, Inc. and these class rules. No alterations or modifications are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules." Rule 1.2 is to the same effect. None of the express exceptions in the class rules apply. In prior interpretations, the TC has established the principle that standard equipment can be replaced for functionally similar equipment made by other manufacturers. See RI 00-03. This principle does not apply to equipment that serves a different function from the standard turning block. A ratchet block would permit trimming the spin sheet by hand in conditions where other boats would have to use their winches. Consequently, the ratchet block is not permissible.

RI-02-15 (2002-05-13)
SPECTRA SHACKLES

Q1: Is it permissible to use spectra shackles in the place of stainless steel shackles, for example at the outhaul of the main?

A1: No. Rule 1.2 states: " Except where variations are specifically permitted by these rules, J/105s shall be alike in hull, deck, keel, rudder and spar construction, weight and weight distribution, sail plan, equipment, and interior furnishings." (emphasis added) Likewise, Rule 1.3 states "All yachts, competing in one design or class sponsored events, shall comply with standard specifications published by J Boats, Inc. and these class rules. No alterations or modifications are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules." (emphasis added) None of the express exceptions in the class rules apply.

In prior interpretations, the TC has established the principle that standard equipment can be replaced for functionally similar equipment made by other manufacturers. See RI 00-03. Although spectra shackles may be functionally similar to stainless shackles, replacing stainless with spectra would provide a potentially significant weight advantage aloft. In addition, the cost, at least at current prices for spectra fittings, would be substantial. Thus, the advantage and cost of spectra, in the TC's view, would be inconsistent with Rule 1.1: "These rules are to preserve J/105's recreational features, including ease of handling, low cost of ownership, safety, comfort, and equality of performance while maximizing participation at J/105 events." (emphasis added).

Note: This ruling has been superseded, in part, by the specification change of October 2003. This change allows a spectra shackle for the main halyard and outhaul. For all other applications, spectra or any material other than stainless steel is illegal.

RI-02-16 (2002-05-29)
FAIRING AND OTHER MODIFICATIONS OF KEEL & RUDDER [Revised 8/9/03 and 3/15/04]

Q1: What are the limitations on fairing the keel and rudder, such as changing the shape, changing the location, and adding/removing material? Can the keel bulb be modified

in any way?

A1: Class Rule 1.2 states that " Except where variations are specifically permitted by these rules, J/105s shall be alike in hull, . . . keel, rudder Similarly, Class Rule 1.3 states that "All yachts competing in one design or class sponsored events, shall comply with standard specifications published by J/Boats, Inc. and these class rules. No alterations or modifications are permitted unless explicitly permitted by these rules". Further, rule 5.4.3 states: " NOT PERMITTED while racing: . . . 5.4.3 Altering Rudder or Keel Profile or exceeding tolerances in Official Offsets." The "Official Offsets" establish (i) the foil shape of the keel and rudder; (ii) the minimum thickness of the keel and the rudder at specific horizontal planes (referred to as "Sections") located as described in the document; (iii) the maximum chord length of the keel and rudder at those Sections; and (iv) the shape of the bulb.

The Official Offsets are in essence excerpts from the design specifications and drawings of the J/105. For horizontal Sections of the deep keel above the bulb, of the shoal keel above Section 3 and between Sections "Bulb Axis" and 4, and of the rudder not included in the Official Offsets, the minimum thickness and maximum chord lengths are arrived at by linear interpolation between the published Sections.

Attached to this ruling are revised Official Offsets prepared by JBoats, which clarify and provide additional detail. These will replace the current Offsets located on the website and will form an appendix to our class rules which can be found on the official website <http://www.j105.org/j105rules.html#q8>. See below for an explanation of the Official Offsets tables and drawings and some notes about chord length.

As contemplated by rule 5.4.3, surface fairing of the keel and rudder is permissible, provided that the minimum thickness, maximum chord length and foil shapes established by the Official Offsets are complied with. Subject to these limitations, permissible "surface fairing" includes smoothing out irregularities in the keel and rudder profile as well as filling in "low points" and removing "high points" on the side of a factory-supplied keel and rudder. However, any buildup of fairing material not required for surface fairing or for conforming the two sides of the keel, and any altering of the profile of the rudder or keel, are prohibited. For example, any fairing (by the buildup of fairing material or otherwise) that would move the maximum thickness of the keel or rudder profile to a place other than that established by the Official Offsets, or would alter that profile in any way, is not permissible.

Under rules 1.2 and 1.3, it is not permissible to move the keel, redistribute lead in the keel or except as indicated below, add material to its leading edge or cut material off its trailing edge. Doing so, would fall under "altering rudder or keel profile" which is prohibited by rule 5.4.3. Likewise, changing the angle the leading or trailing edges form with the bottom of the hull is prohibited. On the other hand, it is permissible to add nominal amounts of fairing material to the leading edge as necessary to achieve a smooth nose radius or straight leading edge. In addition, for the purposes of bringing the trailing edge thickness close to the minimum, it is permissible to add a nominal amount of fairing material to the trailing edge of the keel or rudder, provided the maximum chord length is not exceeded. Also, reducing the cord length of the keel to the maximum permitted by the table is permissible.

Angle-cutting the trailing edge of a foil (keel or rudder) by up to 30 degrees to reduce vibration of these foils while the boat planes is also permitted. In other words, the standard 90 degree angle formed between the trailing edge of the foil and the centerline of the foil can be changed up to 30 degrees - so that the angle of the trailing edge is no greater than 120 degrees to a line parallel to the centerline, or 30 degrees to a line perpendicular to the center line. If angled, the trailing edge must

be at a consistent angle, on a single plane. Thus, it is not permissible to cut two angles into the trailing edge to effectively create a v-shaped trailing edge. On the other hand, if the angled plane does not cut across the entire trailing edge of the foil, the angle may be larger than 30 degrees as long as the angle does not shorten one side of the foil by more than if a 30 degree angle were applied across the entire trailing edge of the foil (Max Depth of Cut). All or any part of the area bounded by the red triangle in the diagram may be removed by a single cut. For a minimum thickness trailing edge, the Max Depth works out to approximately 3 mm at Section A and approximately 2 mm at Sections B, C and D of the keel and at the rudder. For purposes of the Official Offsets, the thickness of any foil with an angled trailing edge will still be measured perpendicular to centerline.

Section A (Section 1 for a shoal keel) is located at the intersection of the molded keel sump of the hull and the lead keel casting. In the manufacturing process, the builder adds several layers of fiberglass wrap at this keel to hull joint. As a result, almost all J/105s built easily exceed the minimum offsets at this Section. While hollows and indentations on the molded keel sump as supplied by the builder may be filled in order to achieve a fair surface, removal of gelcoat (or laminate) on the boat is generally prohibited, except for light sanding of the gelcoat in preparation for the application of an overcoat material. Note that removal of gelcoat or glass from the sump area may also invalidate the builder's structural warranty. Rules 1.2 and 1.3 also prohibit any modification of the trailing edge above Section A (or Section 1, in the case of a shoal keel), other than by adding a "nominal amount of fairing material" as referenced above, as this area is part of the molded keel sump.

Rules 1.2, 1.3 and 5.4.3 also govern modifications of the bulb. Again, surface fairing is permissible; however, any extension or shortening of the bulb, removing any of the lead (except as part of surface fairing, as discussed above), adding to the lead, any buildup of fairing material not required for fairing and any altering of the profile of the bulb are all prohibited.

The Technical Committee understands that severe grounding of a boat may lead to a dislocation of the keel or a need to replace the keel. In any such case, it is recommended that the owner contact his or her local fleet measurer or the Technical Committee prior to having repairs effected or a replacement keel installed.

Explanation of the Offset Table:

The J105 Class Deep Keel, Shoal Keel and Rudder Offset tables establish the shape and minimum thickness of each foil and the shape of the bulb on specific planes that are parallel to the waterline of the boat (referred to as "Sections"). Understanding of these tables is greatly enhanced by the accompanying drawings.

The upper table in the Offsets indicates the vertical location ("Location Below Hull" or "Location Below #1"), maximum chord length measured along the center line of the boat of the Section ("Maximum Chord Length"), and the minimum leading edge radius ("Leading Edge Radius") for each Section of the keel and rudder and for the Section located on the tip of the bulb ("Bulb Axis").

The left part of the lower table in the Offsets is populated with a series of minimum half-widths of each of the Sections ("Minimum Section Half Width") that define one half of a symmetrical foil at each Section. Across to the left of the table is a listing of "Stations." These are located aft from the leading edge of each Section at a percentage of each maximum chord length, measured along the centerline of the boat (for example, the ".10" Station of Section A of the deep keel with maximum chord length of 1,320 mm is located 10% or 132mm aft of the leading edge). All Stations are aligned perpendicular to centerline. The minimum Section half-width for

each Station of a particular Section is shown across from the relevant Station in the column for the relevant Station. (For example, the minimum Section half-width for the ".10" Station of Section A of the deep keel is 49.9 mm.) To create the foil shape for each Section, a fair line is drawn through all plotted minimum Section half-width points and faired into a point tangent to the leading edge radius.

The right part of the lower table shows the designed vertical half-widths of the bulb below the Bulb Axis at the various Stations ("Vertical Tip Offset Below Axis"). The Notes below the tables spell out the shape of the bulb at the various Stations above the Bulb Axis (for the deep keel) and below the Bulb Axis (for both keels). For the shape of the bulb of the shoal keel above the Bulb Axis, see the drawing.

The Notes also indicate, among other things, how to properly locate and align each foil Section. The location of Sections at the trailing edge of the keel is established by measuring vertically down from a plane parallel to the lowest point of the hull to the trailing edge of the keel. Sections on the deep keel are located on a plane that forms an 82 degree (or 77.8 degrees, in the case of the shoal keel) angle with the trailing edge and intersects with the point at the trailing edge established by the trailing edge measurement. The location of Sections at the trailing edge of the rudder is established by measuring down from the top of the rudder along the trailing edge of the rudder. Sections on the rudder are located on a plane parallel to the bottom of the rudder intersecting with the measurement point at the trailing edge.

Tolerances for Chord Length

The Technical Committee is in the process of measuring the keels and rudders of a significant number of boats to determine the as-built variation in chord length. Once a sufficient cross section of boats has been measured, the Technical Committee will propose permissible tolerances (as originally contemplated by the rules) for the purpose of establishing minimum and maximum chord measurements. Those changes to the Official Offsets will be proposed as changes to our class rules.

Other Developments

The Technical Committee has developed and distributed to all fleets a set of jigs to more easily locate the keel Sections and to verify foil shape, minimum half-width and maximum chord length at each Section, and the shape of the bulb. This simplifies measurement in the field and, among other things, reduces the error factor of trying to measure around the keel fillet and project an 82 degree angle (or 77.8 degree angle, in the case of the shoal keel), which was previously the process for location the top Section.

RI-02-17 (2002-12-19)

DEFINITION OF "LONG-TERM SHIPMATE AND FRIEND"

Q1: What is the meaning of "long-term shipmate and friend" in rule 3.4?

A1: It has often been said that the J/105 class is an "owner/driver" class, and most J/105s are in fact driven by their owners. However, Rule 3.4 establishes two exceptions to an owner/driver requirement. It provides that the driver of a J/105 must be either an Owner (as defined) or a Group 1 competitor who is either (a) a member of an Owner's immediate family or (b) "a long term shipmate and friend" of an Owner. Note that for either of the exceptions in clauses (a) and (b) to apply the driver must be group 1 competitor. Note also rule 1.1: "These rules are to preserve J/105's recreational features . . . while maximizing participation at J/105 events." In light of the foregoing, in the view of the TC, the exception for a "long term shipmate and friend" must be narrowly interpreted. In particular, it seems inconsistent with

the language of the exception and rule 1.1 to permit owners to hand the helm of their boat to a casual friend and "ringer" □ a person who is on board to assist in the owner's plan of winning a particular regatta, but not because he or she has been sailing with the owner for a long time and is a good friend of the owner. Based on the foregoing, the TC believes that an individual who is a friend of the Owner meets the "long term shipmate and friend" requirement for a regatta if (i) during the immediately preceding 12 months, the person sailed with the owner on at least 6 race days and (ii) during the immediately preceding 24 months, the person sailed with the owner in at least 50% of all races in which the owner competed. Given the focus of the language of rule 3.4(b) on relationship with the owner, it is not necessary that the racing referenced in clauses (i) and (ii) took place on a J/105. Thus, a long-term crew of an owner new to the J105 class can qualify under this ruling, provided the foregoing conditions are satisfied.

While the foregoing applies to regional or national level regattas, the TC believes that for local fleet racing and to encourage local fleet building, it may be desirable for a local fleet rule to interpret the "long-term shipmate and friend" requirement more flexibly on the fleet level, as long as the fundamental purposes of the requirement are satisfied.

RI-02-18 (2002-12-19)

RESTRICTIONS ON USED SAILS AND REPLACEMENT OF DESTROYED SAILS

Q1: What are the restrictions on the purchase of "used" sails? May "used" sails be replaced with "new" sails if they are destroyed?

A1: The first two sentences of rule 6.8 provide: "For purposes of class racing, sail purchases shall not exceed (a) two sails in any calendar year, plus (b) one additional sail during any period of two consecutive calendar years. In addition, during the calendar year in which a new boat is first used ("year one"), one used mainsail, one used jib and one used spinnaker ("used" defined as at least 6 months of sailing use) may be purchased."

The second sentence of rule 6.8 permits the purchase of a "used" suit of class sails for a new boat. However, it does not permit a purchaser of a used boat to purchase additional "used" sails that don't come with the boat. Further, this sentence does not permit the purchase of additional used sails in subsequent years (see below, however). The intention of the rule is to level the playing field between buyers of factory new boats and owners who have owned the boat for at least a year or purchase a used boat and therefore own some sails from prior seasons.

What is meant by "6 months of sailing use"? In the view of the TC, this language is a proxy for a full season of racing use as the primary class sails of the selling owner. Thus, six months of use of sails for demonstration or testing purposes by a sail loft or dealer ordinarily does not qualify. Also, the owner's use of the sails is less than what would occur under ordinary circumstances in a full racing season, the sails will not qualify as "used." For example, less than six weekends (12 days) of racing use would typically not qualify.

The third sentence of rule 6.8 permits the replacement of a sail if is "destroyed" or "so substantially damaged that it cannot reasonably be repaired" (subject to certain conditions). This sentence is intended to apply to "new" sails that are purchased as part of the normal 2/3/2 sequence under the first sentence of rule 6.8. It is not intended to permit the replacement with a new sail of a used sail that was purchased pursuant to the second sentence of rule 6.8 or was purchased together with a used boat. However, this sentence would permit the purchase of a "used" sail to replace a "used" sail that is destroyed or cannot be repaired in subsequent years.

RI-02-19 (2002-12-19)

DEFINITION OF "EVENT"

Q1: What is the meaning of "event" in rule 6.3?

A1: Rule 6.3 provides in relevant part: " Sails carried aboard, or used during a class event shall be limited to one mainsail, one jib and two spinnakers" This rule is designed to prevent the use of "light air" and "heavy air" jibs and mainsails by requiring that only one each be used during any series of races that is scored as one regatta. Therefore, in the view of the TC, "event" ordinarily must be interpreted to include each day of a multi-day regatta, even if there is a lay day. On the other hand, if a regatta spans more than one weekend, each weekend should be considered a separate event. In addition, for purposes of a regatta series that spans all or part of a season (such as a traditional "fleet championship"), each part of that series that is scored separately by the organizing authority is considered an "event" (subject to the "multiple weekends" exception).

RI-01-01 (2001-02-16)

DELETED [Superseded by Rule 6.2 as of 7/1/02.]

RI-01-02 (2001-03-21)

FOUR PART MAINSHEET FINE TUNE

Q1: Is it permitted to have the four part mainsheet fine tune be double ended and cleated port and starboard?

A1: No. You must retain the harken block and cleat that is furnished with the boat or a similar block and cleat from an other manufacturer that performs the same function.

RI-01-03 (2001-04-30)

DELETED [Superseded by Rule 7.3 of 2/15/02]

RI-01-04 (2001-11-06)

MOVING PRIMARY WINCHES

Q1: Is it permissible to move the primary winches from their factory positions?

A1: No. Rule 5.1 states that "[s]tandard factory supplied furnishings and equipment shall not be relocated or removed when racing." None of the exceptions stated in Rule 5.3 are applicable.

RI-00-01 (2000-06-09)

DELETED [Superseded by RI-03-03 of 4/28/03]

RI-00-02 (2000-06-09)

2nd JIB HALYARD

Q1: Can you use a second jib halyard to rake the mast forward while saling downwind?

A1: No, the second halyard is optional equipment not available to all sailors.

RI-00-03 (2000-06-09)

SPINLOCK PX CLEAT

Q1: Can I use a Spinlock PX Cleat instead of a the standard Harken?

A1: Yes. The intent of the rules is not to legislate hardware brands. If the piece of equipment functions as intended (in this case as a cleat), then it is permitted.

RI-00-04(R) (2000-06-09)

HEADSTAY LENGTH MEASUREMENT

Q1: How should the headstay length be measured under #7.4?

A1: One should measure from the center of the headstay pin on the mast, to the top of the furler drum (measurement A), then measure the height of the furler drum (measurement B), then from the underside of the furler drum to the intersection of the stem and sheer line (measurement C). The overall headstay length = A+B+C. [Revised 4/10/01] Click here for [diagram](#).

RI-00-05 (2000-06-09)

DELETED [Superseded by Rule 7.1 as of March 2001]

RI-00-06 (2000-10-18)

HALYARD STOPPERS

Q1: Can extra halyard stoppers be installed in tandem to prevent halyard slippage?

A1: No. There are a number of solutions to this problem which are legal, including jacketing the halyards or maintaining/improving the existing single stoppers. The installation of additional stoppers complicates the rigging of the boat and can be perceived as an advantage in adjusting tension of the halyards.

RI-99-01 (1999-04-28)

TEMPORARY CLEATING OF SPINNAKER HALYARD

Q1: Can I use a cam cleat on mast for temporary cleating of spinnaker halyard?

A1: No. While the committee understands this feature may be good for short-handed sailing and light air areas, it changes the fundamental way of handling the boat, and no cam cleat on the market will safely hold the spinnaker halyard in moderate to heavy wind, making it potentially dangerous.

RI-99-02 (1999-04-28)

SELF-TAILER UNIT REMOVAL

Q1: Can I remove the self-tailer units on my primary winches?

A1: No. The self-tailing winches have been a standard feature since hull #1.

RI-99-03 (1999-04-28)

TILLER SHORTENING

Q1: On a tiller boat it is very difficult for the helmsman to pass between the tiller and the traveler. May I shorten the tiller and move the mainsheet cleating base to the front side of the traveler?

A1: Yes, the tiller length can be trimmed, and the mainsheet swivel cam/base may be moved forward of the traveler on both tiller and wheel boats. This will improve safety on tiller boats.

RI-99-04 (1999-04-28)

DELETED [This ruling has been superseded by RI-99-14.]

RI-99-05 (1999-04-28)

ADJUSTABLE JIB LEADS

Q1: I just bought a used J/105 that has Harken adjustable jib leads. How do I become class legal?

A1: The adjuster must be disabled and a plunger type car added so that the lead can't be adjusted under load. If your track has no holes, then you should drill holes in the track to allow a plunger car to operate.

RI-99-06 (1999-04-28)

BACKSTAY SHOCKCORD

Q1: In an old newsletter, there was a picture of a shockcord hooked to the backstay handle with an adjuster line led forward. Is this legal?

A1: No. The committee agreed this was an innovative idea, but is not specifically permitted in the rules and changes the handling of the boat.

RI-99-07 (1999-04-28)

RERIGGING MAINSHEET

Q1: Can I rig my mainsheet fine-tune to the cabin sole and double-end it like a J/35?

A1: No. This is not specifically permitted in the rules and provides a perceived handling advantage and clutters the cockpit with more gear.

RI-99-08 (1999-04-28)

PURCHASE RESTRICTION ON THE MAINSHEET FINE-TUNE

Q1: Please clarify the purchase restriction on the mainsheet fine-tune.

A1: The 24:1 purchase is a maximum purchase. There is no restriction on reducing or disabling the fine-tune.

RI-99-09 (1999-04-28)

TILLER REPLACEMENT

Q1: Can I use a tiller other than factory standard?

A1: Yes, provided the stock tiller head is used, and that the new tiller is the same weight or heavier as the standard tiller.

RI-99-10 (1999-04-28)

DELETED [Superseded by rule 7.9 as of 2/1/03]

RI-99-11 (1999-04-28)

0.5 OZ SPINNAKER CLOTH

Q1: My sailmaker told me about a 0.5 oz spinnaker cloth, that when coated actually weighs 0.75 oz. Is this legal to use?

A1: No. Almost all 0.5 oz spinnakers weigh about .75 when complete, just as most 0.75 oz kites actually weigh 1.0 - 1.1 oz per square yard when finished. The intent of the rules is to use Nvlon that's commonly marketed as 0.75 oz (manufacturer's quoted

ply weight- uncoated). This equates to a minimum finished weight of approx. 42 grams per sq. meter (the same minimum weight spec in the J/24 class rules). To eliminate any confusion, the minimum finished cloth weight will be published in the rules during the next review. [Note: See also revised Rule 6.6 which addresses this issue.]

RI-99-12 (1999-04-28)

REPEALED

RI-99-13 (1999-04-28)

DELETED [Implemented by Rule 5.4.4 in the March 2000 revision.]

RI-99-14 (1999-10-28)

MOVING JIB TRACKS

Q1: I have an older model J/105. May I move my jib tracks inboard to the newer location?

A1: Yes. This reverses an earlier decision not to allow any relocation of tracks. In 1993, when redoing the deck splashes for the J/105, the builder unintentionally templated the jib track holes from the marks for an optional adjustable lead system, which was parallel and slightly inboard of the old standard. Since then, all boats have been the same. There has been no evidence that one position is faster than the other, especially considering that owners may inboard or outboard sheet. For J/105 hulls #1- #72 only, owners may relocate their jib tracks inboard to the new location, provided they conform with the following:

- 1) Only one set of jib tracks is permitted to be installed at one time.
- 2) The center of the front edge of the relocated track shall measure no greater than 13' 9 1/8" and no less than 13' 8 5/8" from the center of the edge of the deck molding at the bow (just aft of the stemhead fitting).
- 3) The center of the front edge of the relocated track shall be no less than 6mm and no greater than 9mm outboard of the nonskid seam adjacent to the coach roof.
- 4) The center of the aft end of the track shall be no less than 6mm and no greater than 9mm outboard of the nonskid seam adjacent to the coach roof.

[Note: This ruling supersedes RI-99-4.]