

**Minutes of the 2025 J/24 World Council Meeting  
Business Virtual Session November 6, 2025**

- 1) **Call to Order and Overview:** The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. EST. We have a quorum. Dave welcomed everyone, and thank you all for helping the Class thrive!
- 2) **Appoint Secretary:** David Cooper appointed Julie Howell as the secretary. Materials for this meeting are posted in Dropbox: [J24 2025 WC AGM - Dropbox](#)
- 3) **Introductions:** David Cooper (Chair, GBR), Nancy Zangerle (ITC Chair, USA), Ramiro Clemente (Executive Committee, ARG), Aris Pallikaris (Executive Committee, GRE), Mark Usher (Executive Committee, IRL), Dan Busch (Executive Committee, USA), Will Welles (Past Chair, USA), Michael Peters (ITC, GER), Finn Hadlock (ITC, USA), Nick McDonald (ITC, GBR), Hugo Ottaway (AUS), Vince Somoza (CAN), Tim Octon (GBR), Mate Kakas (HUN), Gianni Riccobono (ITA), Monica Persson (SWE), Marcus Rogers (USA), Molly White (USA), Lee Ann Zaretsky (USA), Christopher Howell and Julie Howell (ODAM, USA).
- 4) **Financials:** Chris and Kat Malone, outgoing Finance Chair, prepared the year-end Profit & Loss statement and Balance Sheet for Fiscal Year 2024-2025. The fiscal year ended on 30 September, and as projected, the P&L reflects a positive income this year. Royalty tag sales and memberships came in slightly above budget. The Class is strong financially with over \$95,000 on the Balance Sheet (two times our yearly budget). This is a healthy sign for any non-profit organization. The 2024/25 budget displayed a change in travel and management fees of the Executive Director. This shift of the Championship Event Class Representative duties to regional volunteers and the Technical Committee plus pausing ED travel was financially successful. The IJCA is back in the black and getting ahead again. We hope that this change will help sustain the Class for the future, without a further increase in costs to the membership.

Discussion: Nancy questioned the royalty projection for 2026 with the Worlds in Australia. Chris indicated the proposed budget is in the black so there is some cushion if we are too optimistic about the tags. He explained that the advertising is the newsletter ads (Quantum and North). The measurement expense was primarily the IM Seminar reimbursement for Michael Peters. Hugo said Australia uses two scales...would the Class cover their calibration? Chris told him this could be decided on a case-by-case basis. He added that Tony Parker (USA) has initiated discussion about fundraising for major events...more information to come.

*Nancy Zangerle made a motion to accept the Year-end Financial Statements and 2025-2026 Budget, seconded by David Cooper. The motion passed unanimously.*

- 5) **Elections:** In odd years, the IJCA elects a Finance Chair and annually the Executive Committee:  
Dan Busch USA, Finance Chair  
Molly White USA, Executive Committee  
Keiji Kondo JPN, Executive Committee  
Aris Pallikaris GRE, Executive Committee  
Mark Usher IRL, Executive Committee

Ramiro Clemente, ARG Executive Committee

Thank you to Kat Malone for many years of service as Finance Chair!

*David Cooper made a motion to accept Dan Busch as Finance Chair, seconded by Nancy Zangerle. The nomination passed unanimously.*

*David Cooper made a motion to accept the Executive Committee as presented, seconded by Dan Busch. The slate passed unanimously.*

The Technical Committee is appointed annually. Nominations: Alex Finsterbusch (ARG), Finn Hadlock (USA), Nick McDonald (GBR), Hugo Ottaway (AUS), James Niblock (CAN), Michael Peters (GER), Gianpietro Pollesel (ITA), Timothy Winger (USA), Nancy Zangerle (USA). The Designer's Appointee has been Michael Johnson, to be reconfirmed by Jeff Johnstone and J/Boats.

*Lee Ann Zaretsky made a motion to accept the Technical Committee as presented, seconded by Mark Usher. The motion passed unanimously.*

Nancy Zangerle indicated that the Technical Committee endorsed Michael Peters as the Chair of the Technical Committee for 2026. *Nancy Zangerle made a motion to accept Michael Peters as the Chair of the Technical Committee, seconded by Marcus Rogers. The motion passed unanimously.*

Thank you Nancy for filling the ITC Chair role for one year, and we appreciate her continuing on the Technical Committee.

- 6) **Rules Proposals / Regatta Regulations:** See Appendix A. Tim Winger's comments were circulated via e-mail.

Note: any IJCA-approved proposals will then be submitted to World Sailing for their review and anticipated WS approval in Spring 2026.

Submission #1 Discussion: Back stay blocks on the stern pulpit (pushpit) to keep the back stay tensioner lines out of the cockpit. Blocks mounted on lines or otherwise directly to the pushpit will add a load to the pushpit, for which it was not designed. It has been done for years with no known issues. Class Rule C.7.3(a)(11) specifically allows shock cord to be used "across the back of the pushpit to keep the slack backstay from falling into the cockpit area." This would add no significant additional load to the pushpit. *Dan Busch made a motion to accept Submission #1 as presented, seconded by Molly White. The motion to accept passed unanimously.*

Submission #2 Discussion: Rule C.5.2(a)(8) covers removeable step boxes which would include coolers. These portable step box/coolers are not part of the basic 1270 weight. They go on the inventory of required and optional equipment. We need a rule for fixed in place step boxes that would be part of the basic boat weight of 1270, and it needs to include a maximum weight or you will get some incredibly heavy step boxes for the purpose of moving the weight closer to the center of the boat. Nick thinks a step box can be easily checked. Finn clarified this

is really closing a loophole. Tim Octon noted that some Italian boats come with a box (not really a step) with a non-removable lid. Finn speculated about added language, such as "...unless manufactured as part of the boat" or "If removable." The general feeling is that the rule is well written.

*Nancy Zangerle made a motion to accept Submission #2 as presented, seconded by Finn Hadlock. The motion to accept passed, with M. Rogers opposed.*

Submission #3 Discussion: Tim Winger's suggested modification: "Layout 1 may be modified by cutting the forward bulkhead down to floor level as long as the bulkhead remains below floor level, and the floor is extended to the bow as in Layouts 2 and 3. Layout 1 may also be modified by adding holes or cutouts to promote storage of sails and spars as long as the bulkhead remains below floor level and the floor is extended to the bow." Nancy endorsed this submission be returned to the ITC for further data review and possible word tweaking. Will noted that he has been on a boat that did not have that bulkhead, so boats without would have the expense to add. Finn shared the different layout diagrams. The goal is clarity, and Nick thinks the average Class member would be unclear about what conforms.

*Nancy Zangerle made a motion to table Submission #3 as presented, seconded by Hugo Ottoway. The motion to table passed unanimously.*

Will requested that boat owners who made this inquiry be permitted to race while this further review is conducted by the ITC. Perhaps a technical advisory could be shared in the meantime.

Submission #4 Discussion: Tim Winger prefers leaving the existing Rule as it is. The only thing additional that he could support is allowing this modification before the separator actually breaks. An aluminum channel or box section is the simplest, solid fix for this. As a measurer/inspector, Tim has made competitors remove any of these that have been made into bulkheads. Finn explained that many boats have altered the area over time, and reinforcement should be permitted before breaking. What about those boats that have the vertical bulkhead? These were made by a valid manufacturer at some point, so this should be allowed.

*Finn Hadlock made a motion to accept Submission #4 as presented, seconded by Nick McDonald. The motion to accept passed, with M. Rogers opposed.*

Submission #5 Discussion: Nancy is not in favor of the Rule as it does not address all circumstances that may occur between local and major Championships; and the implementation of CR H.2. If a spare spinnaker was added to optional equipment, and a boat loses its primary spinnaker while racing, then deploys its spare, now the weight is incorrect.

*Nick McDonald made a motion to reject Submission #5 as presented, seconded by Dan Busch. The motion to reject passed unanimously.*

Submission #6 Discussion: Finn summarized boats are putting centering devices on the top track where the mast butt sits. The goal of the submission is to create a cap of the weight. We aren't trying to prevent the adjuster, only to state the allowed limit. Are we grandfathering what is already out there? Nick suggested capping the length of the reinforcement, not the height. Chris recommended the ITC come up with the maximum weight before we proceed with this. The Council agrees that we want to clarify the permissibility but be clear about the number and how to weigh/enforce it.

*Marcus Rogers made a motion to table Submission #6 as presented, seconded by Nick*

*McDonald. The motion to table passed unanimously.*

Submission #7 Discussion: Finn said we need to match the Rules with the Inventory of Required and Optional Equipment - anchor, chain and rode packaged together under a single weight. Hugo noted that local laws control at events. Chris recommended that we change the optional equipment list to match the Rule, and therefore this proposal is not needed. Nancy endorsed using the term “dry rode.” The ITC will review/update the wording of the Inventory of Required and Optional Equipment to match the Class Rules.

*Marcus Rogers made a motion to reject Submission #7 as presented, seconded by Nancy Zangerle. The motion to reject passed unanimously.*

Submission #8 Discussion: Nancy highlighted the comments from Jeff Johnstone.

*Nick McDonald made a motion to accept Submission #8 including Jeff’s recommendation, seconded by Mark Usher. The motion to accept passed, with M. Rogers opposed. (note typo)*

Submission #9 Discussion: Hugo stressed that this would be optional. Booms usually break because of their age. Note the comment from the Copyright Holder cautioning having it any more than 12:1. Nancy understands that geographic conditions can cause the desire for the additional purchase, but that could be address as a national issue, should not warrant a Rule change. The female racers in this meeting agreed that the 8:1 system has not been a problem. Nick is used to racing in big breeze, and doesn’t see the value to change to 12 (more tension leads to more friction leads to more damage).

*Marcus Rogers made a motion to reject Submission #9 as presented, seconded by Molly White. The motion to reject passed, opposed by H. Ottaway.*

Good feedback during this process, thank you all!

- 7) **2029 World Championship:** To be hosted in North America, but no official proposal at this time.

For 2028 Worlds, the new management at YCCS has confirmed their World Championship hosting at Puerto Cervo.

The 2026 European Championship is planned for Sweden...Monica will advise details. The Europeans NCAs should meet to set a future rotation for continental hosts.

- 8) **Date and format of next meeting:** In past years, we have held a mid-year virtual World Council Meeting in the spring.
- 9) **Closing Remarks:** David thanked everyone for their time devoted to the Class!

Adjourned 1026EST.

## **ATTACHMENT A: Class Rule Change Proposals**

The ITC reviewed proposed new Class Rules. Below, following the proposals are the comments received from the membership. Some comments request additional information or illustrations that have not been prepared. In such instances, the World Council may vote to table any proposal and request additional information before moving forward.

Proposals approved by the World Council must then be forwarded to World Sailing for their approval. If accepted, we might anticipate these new rules being put into play in Spring 2026.

**Submission #1**

**Rule Number:** C.7.3 (a)(TBD) Stern Pulpit Blocks

**Current Rule:** NA

**Proposed Rule:** C.7.3 (a)(TBD) Blocks on stern pulpit to hold backstay line may be used.

**Reason for Change:** To specifically state that blocks on the stern pulpit are allowed. They help keep the backstay out of the cockpit area. These blocks were permitted until the Class Rules conversion when mention of them was missed.

Data
I feel this makes the pushpit a load-bearing system in a way it was not intended, when its intention is for keeping people onboard. I feel a length of bungee tied across the top of the pushpit works in the same way but dows not put load on the pushpit.
Chockcord should also be allowed!
Clarify that bungee chord is also allowed.
You may want to clarify how they should be attached. To they need to be fixed or can the be attached withe shock cord, etc.
The blocks for the backstay are still vague. It does not say where on the stern pulpit where the blocks can be. I would lkie to see this cleaned up to be specific.
I like that it says stern pulpit without getting specific about it being on the top beam or stanchion legs - just let the owner decide which keeps the backstay it out of his head. Is there a need to state that it's a 'single block' through which each side of the backstay line may feed - instead of, say, a double or triple block that offers more/faster leverage?
Ok

## Submission #2

**Rule Number:** C.7.3 (a)(TBD) Fixed Companionway Step Box

**Current Rule:** NA

**Proposed Rule:** C.7.3 (a)(TBD) A fixed companionway step box may be installed and securely fastened to the boat with metallic fasteners. Maximum weight of 14kg, and included in the 1270 Dry Weight, and must be removable for weighing.

**Reason for Change:** Currently, if a step box is part of the optional equipment, the maximum weight is 14kg. If it is attached as part of the boats all up weight, there is no listed weight requirement. Teams could have installed step boxes weighing in excess of 14kg in an effort to circumvent the corrector weight locations. The goal of this rule is to close this loophole, similar to rule C.7.3 (a)(15) for the built-in music/entertainment system.

Data
14kg seems an awful lot for a step box, I thought it used to be 9kg max
I Would not support this change if it means I can no longer use my ice chest as a step box.
how do you solve the problem of the already permanently installed step box? Do you make them remove it to weigh?
I like the idea but some of the us watercraft step boxes weigh more than the 14kg. I'd suggest the proposed rule change with a slightly higher max step box weight.
I would say securely fastened and eliminate metallic fasteners. If you use a cooler for a step box like most people you will ruin it with metallic fasteners.
C.7.3(15) How do you remove permanently mounted speakers or hard wired equipment? How will this be enforced? Will the stepbox have to be unbolted from the boat and weighted?
This could require many boats to have to do construction to rebuild an already built in step-box. I'm not sure that adding weight to the boat by installing a fixed heavier step box is a sufficient performance enhancement vs where corrector weights are located to warrant making it harder for older boats to compete. Could this be a 'grandfathered' rule? For any boat measured before (Rochester Worlds) with a fixed step box, it is grandfathered. For any boat measured at/after Rochester Worlds, a fixed step box may no longer be added to the boat and it must comply with "removable for weighing".
Do not see the need for this rule.... If it is bolted down, then it can be part of the 1270 weight. Do not want to have to remove this to weigh it... Bigger issues then this.

**Submission #3**

**Rule Number:** D.2.2 TBD) Bow Bulkhead

**Current Rule:** NA

**Proposed Rule:** C.7.1 (d) Interior Layout #1 shows a bow bulkhead. Layout 2 and 3 depict no bow bulkhead but the floor extends to the bow. For Layout 1, bulkhead must remain below floor level, but the upper portion of the bulkhead may be cut down to floor level., or holes/ cutouts may be added to promote storage of spars.

**Reason for Change:** Currently it is ambiguous if this type of modification is allowed because under D2.2. "(a) Interiors may be modified or rebuilt to conform to any of the three interior layouts shown in diagram below. Individual features of these layouts may be mixed in a single interior." Interior Layout II does not show a bulkhead above the berth, so altering an existing bulkhead so that less of it exists should be allowed. This would formalize allowing a modification that has long been accepted to help with the storage of spars.

Data
A bulkhead should be considered differently in the standard internal layouts. The bulkhead is structural, whereas changing lockers/sinks etc is not. Cutting down a bulkhead is weakening the overall structural integrity of the boat.
Concern this may be abused to consolidate weight closer to the keel sump to circumvent the corrector weight locations.
can you attach the interior layouts? I don't see them. Probably would approve once I saw the proposal
Not clear without drawings.
Ok

#### Submission #4

**Rule Number:** D.2.2 (i) Narrow Separators between bunk boards

**Current Rule:** The narrow separators between the bunk boards of the quarter berths that support those bunk boards are prone to breakage. When cracked or broken, they may be repaired and reinforced with fiberglass/wood/metal structures not exceeding 30mm in thickness including the original material.

**Proposed Rule:** The narrow separators between the bunk boards of the quarter berths that support those bunk boards are prone to breakage. The Separators may be repaired and reinforced with fiberglass/wood/metal structures not exceeding 30mm in thickness including the original material and/or with a marine plywood bulkhead of maximum 12mm thickness, connected to the hull.

**Reason for Change:** Currently, it is worded that you can only repair the bunk boards when it has been cracked or broken. Many of the boats racing are old, and we should allow this area to be supported prior to it breaking or cracking. Many older boats have had this repair where it is supported to the hull. This rule change formalizes how these can be supported and that it can be done before it breaks.

#### Data

Concern this may be abused to consolidate weight closer to the keel sump to circumvent the corrector weight locations.

There are other materials (plastics) that could be used for bunk boards that would last for decades and not affect the boat's performance. This rule requires more flexibility.

Older hulls like USA 85 have no separators as built. Could the separators be removed? The separators complicate storage of an outboard under a port or starboard setee.

No metal may be used...

Ok

**Submission #5**

**Rule Number:** H.2 (tbd) Spare Spinnaker Optional Equipment

**Current Rule:** NA

**Proposed Rule:** Spare spinnaker may be weighed in as part of the optional equipment.

**Reason for Change:** It is unclear whether the spare spinnaker can be weighed in as part of a boat's optional equipment list. This clarifies that it can be.

Data
Obviously this is on the assumption that the original spinnaker must continue to be carried for the purposes of the all up weight?
I think this should also include a bag for the spinnaker to be specified.
As long as it's not required to weigh the spare spinnaker, putting an additional burden on race organizers and race committees, I support this rule change because of the word "may".
If it is to be weighted in there should also be requirements for the spinnaker to be dry at weight in and that both spinnakers are aboard while racing.
Does this clarify that a spare spinnaker will be allowed for all regattas J.2 Class rule C.10.2 may be changed per RRS 87 to allow a boat to carry a spare class spinnaker on board while racing for a specific event subject to the following: (a) The spare spinnaker must be so designated at measurement, and may be marked by a special event limitation mark by the event inspectors.
Required Equipment: i'd recommend changing the "Outboard Engine/Motor (weight is empty of fuel)" to "Outboard Engine/Motor or Battery (weight is empty of fuel)" I'd suggest getting rid of the waterproof flashlight - it's a silly item that ends up corroding in the boat over time. Everyone carries a cellphone and VHF. Any race where we are requiring the Optional Equipment List does not happen overnight - and if it did, then that organizer should have it's own supplemental safety requirements in their NOR.
Ok

**Submission #6**

**Rule Number:** F.3.3 (b)(td) Fittings – Mast Beam

**Current Rule:** NA

**Proposed Rule:** Optional material may be attached to mast bearing beam to allow for mast to be centered, and to attach hardware for adjusting mast position.

**Reason for Change:** The bearing beams on many boats are corroded, not centered, or have been damaged. This formalizes the accepted practice of adding a plate to the top of the beam.

Notes:

Put the rule in the repairs section because that is really what is happening - the mast beam is being repaired. Possibly include the mast butt adjusters as part of this.

Aluminum = .0975 Pounds per cubic inch

¼” Plate x 3” wide x 24” long x .0975 = 1.755 lbs

1.755 Lbs to kg = 0.79 kgs + attachment hardware = less than 1 kg.

Add kg for mast butt adjuster.

Data
I wouldn't put a restriction, or heavy restriction on the weight or construction of the mast butt adjuster.
Needs to be very clear on maximum weight for this modification, with a feasible means of checking this.
Moving to repairs section makes sense
Adding in "...and securing." I use a G10 backing plate on each side of the ibeam because of mistakes made drilling the initial holes to fix the mast plate to the ibeam. Optional material may be attached to mast bearing beam to allow for mast to be centered, to attach hardware for adjusting mast position, and securing the mast position in a static position while racing.
Add some cushion into the max weight of the parts/mast butt adjuster to account for pre-existing modifications that were made prior to this rule and a max weight added. Assume that owners were not trying to use heavier parts for the sake of eliminating corrector weights but simply because that is what they were able to find to get the job done.
Most boats are not centered over mast hole and I-beam
Can Derlin be mounted to the beam to facilitate a mast adjuster or is the only thing available Aluminum = .0975 Pounds per cubic inch ¼” Plate x 3” wide x 24” long x .0975 = 1.755 lbs 1.755 Lbs to kg = 0.79 kgs + attachment hardware = less than 1 kg. Add kg for mast butt adjuster. This may be a great thing to consider as this might make the class more versatile.
Not sure why the knowledge about the aluminum needs to be added... Add kg for mast butt adjuster?

## Submission #7

### Rule Number: C.5.1 (a) (2)

**Current Rule:** One anchor with optional chain. The anchor and its chain shall weight not less than 6kg nor more than 12kg. Any line not less than 40m and with a minimum of 8mm in diameter shall be attached to the anchor or chain. The anchor shall be secured against movement in the event of capsize.

**Proposed Rule:** One anchor and rode, with optional chain. The anchor, rode and its optional chain shall weight not less than 9kg nor more than 12kg. The Rode shall be at least 40m and with a minimum of 8mm in diameter and shall be attached to the anchor or chain. The anchor shall be secured against movement in the event of capsize.

**Reason for Change:** Have the rules match the inventory of required and optional equipment lists, which includes the rode as part of the weight and has the range between 9kg and 12 kg

Data
I would change: "The anchor shall be secured against movement in the event of capsize." to say: "The anchor, rode and optional chain shall be secured against movement in the event of capsize."
The intent of this change is not clear
I'd like to see the weight raised to 14kg or 15kg. This way I don't have to have two different systems for racing and cruising.
I see no benefit in adding an arbitrary 3kg mass to the anchor and chain. It would serve only to make it more difficult to deploy in the event of an emergency and recover when required. J24s have no bow roller or anchoring equipment. In practice this rule would just see most teams shackling an extra 3kg of chain onto existing equipment, which would then continue not to be used. I would be open to further reasoning.
We have a anchor + chain at 6 kg and our 40 meter line is 4 kg. Total for us is 10 kg. So a minimum of 9 kg sounds right.
When/why was the rode included in the optional inventory weight maximum but not the rule? Rode is often continuously wet when stowed in the boat, making it very difficult to get an accurate dry weight. I suggest revising the max weight by finding an Anchor/Chain/rode combination that weighs 12kg when the rode is dry, then wetting the rode and weigh that. Set that wet combined weight as the max weight.
Anchor and Chain: A traditional danforth anchor weighing 13lbs is less than the minimum 5.89. 15 feet of chain = 11.25 lbs/5.10kg and a rode of approx 150 ft 5.25lbs/2.38kg brings the weight to 29.5 lbs putting the total weight at 13.38 kg. If you move to an 8lbs anchor =3.63 kg same chain and anchor = 24.50lbs/11.11KG. Since an anchor is a safety item and depending on the area sailed, I think I might consider a slightly different weight of 7.5 KG to 14ka just because if you are using an anchor most likely this is in a situation to save the

**Submission #8**

**Rule Number:** D.2.2 (tbd)

**Current Rule:** NA

**Proposed Rule:** Core replacement immediately under any fastener under any fastener or chainplate shall be of like material or high-density foam core material.

**Reason for Change:** Class Builders have used other core materials besides balsa under stanchions, gudgeons, etc. to prohibit rot. This rule clarifies that when replacing the core under items like a stanchion, other materials may be used. In addition to aligning the rules with how class builders have built the boats, it also makes the boats easier to repair with available materials.

Data
"Core replacement immediately under any fastener under any fastener or chainplate....." - "under any fastener" is said twice. Does this put a restriction on over-drilling holes where fittings are and filling with epoxy to eliminate the chance of water ingress into the core should the fitting leak?
Consider modifying rule to use material other than balsa core in general deck repair, with minimum weight/density requirement (i.e. must be at least as heavy as balsa).
This is really the only way to repair damage to the deck and by now most boats have seen some repairs.
Balsa or glass only.
You'll want to edit this.....it's repetitiv.... under any fastener under any fastener"
Ok

Comments from Jeff Johnstone: Submission #8 - would suggest including chainplates on this one. Also these days the most suitable core replacement is high density foam, so might be better to say "...under any fastener or chainplate shall be of like material or high-density foam core."

## Submission #9

**Rule Number:** C.9.8 Running Rigging (A) For use while racing mandatory.

**Current Rule:** (4) The Kicking Strap (Vang) shall be led from a fitting on the mast spar to a fitting on the boom spar and shall not exceed purchase of 8:1.

**Proposed Rule:** (4) The kicking strap (Vang) shall be led from a fitting on the mast spar to a fitting on the boom spar with NO restriction on the purchase.

**Reason for Change:** The Kicking strap (Vang) is underpowered and requires a lot of strength to pull on and adjust whilst racing particularly in top end Genoa and Jib conditions. The kicking strap ( Vang ) is an important performance device which is adjusted multiple times through out every race.

This disadvantages crews with less strength to adjust it. Moving towards the next generation of J 24 sailors where we encourage female and youth crews, this change would only level out the playing field and make the J24 easier to sail for all.

Data
Very wise suggestion. Similar could be said about the jib cunningham, with increasing the purchase in the system from the class-restricted 6:1
I'm not sure on this one. Booms break with monotonous regularity (?6+ this week at the Worlds), surely this will just make the problem even worse
I fear we will get a lot of broken booms
Not sure why it's needed. The boom tends to break as it is with 8 to 1.
Brilliant idea. Fully agree.
I say yes but I have struggled with the issue of boom breakage. I feel that this one might need reviewing in the future.
Very good proposal!
Then we get a lot of booms who will brake!
Other entries

From Jeff Johnstone: Submission #9 - I remember very well the bend we could put in our J/24 boom with an 8:1 vang if we weren't careful. I'd caution having it any more than 12:1 which is the max on a J/80 and J/88.

From Nancy Zangerle: There was a suggestion that we approach a hardware manufacturer/outfitter for suggestions; that there may be something to address the situation other than just increasing the purchase.

## J/24 Class Rules Changes - Tim Winger comments

**Submission 1** - Back stay blocks on the stern pulpit (pushpit) to keep the back stay tensioner lines out of the cockpit. Blocks mounted on lines or otherwise directly to the pushpit will add a load to the pushpit, for which it was not designed. That being said, it has been done for years with no known issues that I have heard of. Class rule C.7.3(a)(11) specifically allows shock cord to be used “across the back of the pushpit to keep the slack backstay from falling into the cockpit area” This would add no significant additional load to the pushpit. Since so many boats already have the blocks, I would support this rule.

**Submission 2** - Fixed step box. Rule C.5.2(a)(8) covers removeable step boxes which would include your coolers. These portable step box/coolers are not part of the basic 1270 weight. They go on the inventory of required and optional equipment. We need a rule for fixed in place step boxes that would be part of the basic boat weight of 1270, and it needs to include a maximum weight or you will get some incredibly heavy step boxes for the purpose of moving the weight closer to the center of the boat. This rule is well written and serves that purpose. I support this rule as written

**Submission 3** - Potential to remove part of the most forward bulkhead to facilitate storage of sails and spars. Rule D2.2(a) would seem to allow this already, but with a slight modification, this change would make it clear that the floor must be extended to the bow if the bulkhead is cut down. That extra requirement would help make it neutral in weight distribution. I don't think strength is a real issue here. Suggested modification: “Layout 1 may be modified by cutting the forward bulkhead down to floor level as long as the bulkhead remains below floor level, and the floor is extended to the bow as in Layouts 2 and 3. Layout 1 may also be modified by adding holes or cutouts to promote storage of sails and spars as long as the bulkhead remains below floor level and the floor is extended to the bow.” I support this rule in general, but please consider adding the language that requires continuing the floor to the bow.

**Submission 4** - Support for the narrow separators between the bunk boards. I prefer leaving the existing rule as it is. The only thing additional that I could support is allowing this modification before the separator actually breaks. An aluminum channel or box section is the simplest, solid fix for this. As a measurer/inspector, I have made competitors remove any of these that have been made into bulkheads.

**Submission 5** - Spare spinnaker may be weighed in and added to Optional Equipment list. This would only apply if a spar spinnaker is allowed under the H.2 requirements. I agree with this addition to H.2 as written.

**Submission 6** -Mast beam adjustments/reinforcements. This rule makes sense as it is written but should include a weight limit. The weight limit should be monitored by a measurer during the modification process for a new certificate that would clearly describe the approved modifications in the notes section.

**Submission 7** - Anchor, chain and rode packaged together under a single weight. Agreed with the addition of “Rode must be dry when weighed for maximum weight.”

**Submission 8** - Core replacement in high stress areas. I agree with Jeff J's comments. A slight modification and we are on the right track.

**Submission 9** - Vang purchase change to no restriction. I have seen broken booms with 8:1 vang purchase, and guess where they broke. Please do not mess with this rule as it is currently, restricted to 8:1 vang purchase.