Official Newsletter of the Southern Ontario Glider Group Inc.

TASK

A Model Aeronautics Association of Canada Chartered Club

OFFICIAL NEWSLETTER - November 1993
Volume 9 - #6

President	F. J. Freeman, Apt 706, 75 Main Street Dundas, ON, L9H 2P9	(905) 627-9090
Vice President	Peter Ashton, 200 Edwin Street, Kitchener, ON, N2H 4P2	(519) 576-6750
Secretary	Keith Armstrong, 219 Governor's Road, Dundas, ON, L9H 3J7	(905) 627-4011
Treasurer	Bud Wallace, 1060 Eastmount Ave., Mississauga, ON, L5E 1Z3	(905) 274-3177
Editor	Rob Campbell, 34 Hopkins Court, Dundas, ON, L9H 5M5	(905) 627-9435

TASK is published bi-monthly.
Any material for inclusion should be sent to the Editor.

CONTENTS

Editorial

First of all, my apologies to Bill Woodward and all other members of SOGGI for my omission of Bill's excellent article on the Scale Contest held in July. I don't know how I managed to forget this! I really appreciate it when someone takes the time to prepare something for the newsletter. All is not lost. You can read Bill's article in THIS issue of *TASK*.

Did you catch the show on Channel 17 (PBS) on the Condor on November 2nd? Anyone interested in gliding couldn't help but be impressed with the gliding capablility of this large bird. Condors from South America and California were profiled.

Adults of these birds weigh in the 23-25 pound range. Wingspan is approximately 10 feet. Judging by the appearance on television, I would say the average chord of the Condor's wing was about 16 inches, making for a total wing area of about 13 square feet! The corresponding wing loading would be about 30 ounces per square foot.

Like other birds, the Condor can change the size and shape of its wing at will, allowing it to handle varying wind conditions. Whenever I see the flying capability of creatures such as this, I am reminded of the relatively primative flight control systems man-made flying machines have. We still have a lot to learn!

SOGGI extends heartfelt sympathy to Keith Armstrong whose mother passed away recently.

Rob Campbell

President's Choice

The Safety Code which we apply at the field comprises a very elementary set of rules, largely based on common sense; it is not meant to be regarded as something "legal" under which law breakers will be sued, fined, or (God forbid) summarily executed for their transgressions. Nor should it be viewed as a means of restricting the right of every member to do his personal thing.

I can't think of any good reason for NOT having some form of comprehensive code of behaviour which applies equally to all members, since without these very basic regulations chaos would reign supreme - transmitters would be switched on indiscriminately - valuable airplanes would be damaged, sometimes beyond repair - damage to private property would result, to say nothing of the fact that the hobby could come into direct conflict with its own professed aims of responsible conduct.

My own feeling is that, whenever we go out to the field to fly we should be sure to practice Frequency Control. However, few flyers may be there - even if there are only two people flying discretion demands that there should be clear several frequencies are in use, and must be strictly observed during the course of a contest, since the C. D. has gone to great lengths to ensure that there will be no danger of conflicting frequencies. The importance of this was demonstrated on the occasion of our September contest when a flier switched on his transmitter without having checked the frequency board, causing serious damage to a contestant's just-launched glider; then, to compound the issue he apparently refused any compensation to the victim.

This brings me to the point of my comment, which is that the decision was made to insert a "liability clause" into the current rules laying down a proper code of ethics to be observed under such circumstances. Many of us have had this happen to us, and the understanding is that it is a Gentlemen's Agreement that the "shooter down" is responsible for any damage caused to the victim's plane and equipment. The difficult part is that there really is no way to make sure that the offender pays up.

See you at the field - don't forget to check the board!

In the meantime, don't forget to

Drift with the Lift

Fred Freeman

1993 Scale Contest

After two postponements, the scale contest finally got underway on July 4. Due to the change in date, the number of entries was down. Expectation was initially that there would be at least six contestants, but on the day of the contest only four took part. The contest was run according to the new MAAC Stand Off Scale rules for Gliders and Sailplanes. Before I describe the happenings of the day, I will attempt a brief overview of the new rules with the hope that I can interest more members to participate in next year's scale event, and also give some colour to my later description of the events of the day. It will have to be brief because a full explanation would probably take the rest of the space in this newsletter. The new rules divide the contest into two parts:

1. Static Judging, (where points are awarded for fidelity to scale, correctness of colour and markings, workmanship, etc.);

2. Flight Judging and Scoring, (more about this, later).

A maximum of 250 points is allocated to the Static score, and 350 points... a maximum for the Flight score. Now more about Flight Judging and Scoring. Flight points are divided into two sections: - Points for length of time of flight, and points for the realism of the flying. A contestant can obtain a maximum of 250 points for time flown and a maximum of 100 points for realistic manoeuvres performed by the model.

One of the problems with judging any scale contest is the difficulty in making allowances for such things as the amount of work a contestant put into the making of his/her model. For instance, a person building from a kit which provides a fibre glass fuse and ready sheeted wings will obviously take a lot less time and effort than a person building from scratch with just a set of plans to work from. The rules overcome this problem by taking the contestant Static points and multiplying the score by a factor to compensate for more or less work. For example, the score of a model made from an ARF kit is multiplied by a factor of 0.40 whilst a model designed and built entirely from scratch receives a factor of 1.00.

A further problem may have occurred to you while reading this article, regarding the ability of certain types of gliders to fly a prescribed time. A model of a glider from the 1930's could not be expected to perform as well as a model of a modern glass aircraft. Again, the rules address this problem by providing a factor for aircraft of different eras by which the time in seconds is multiplied in order to give the flight time score. For an open frame glider of the pre 1940 era, the factor is 1.00 and to achieve the maximum of 250 points the aircraft must have a total of 250 seconds for two official flights. At the other end of the scale, a modern sailplane of the post 1961 era has a factor of 0.60, which means that to achieve a maximum score of 250 in two official flights, the model must fly for a total of 417 seconds. Note, the time can be spread over two flights. The contestant is allowed two tries at an official flight, the best scoring flight is deemed to be the official flight. Further to the time score, the contestant is judged on five manoeuvres which must be done during the two official flights, plus each take off and landing is judged.

Well, I hope that I have given you some idea of the rules... there are a few details I have omitted, but they are not important to the overall appreciation of the contest.

Now to what happened on July 4. Yours truly CD'ed the contest with the able assistance of your President, Fred Freeman. Static judging for three of the models was carried by the CD whilst Fred did the static judging of my entry. Judging for flight realism was conducted in groups of two by the contestants. Each contestant was judged by two of his peers, and in turn, he would judge the next along with one other contestant. First up to fly, was Fred Freeman. I had flown Fred's Minimoa a few weeks before the contest, and found it to be a delight to fly. I was therefore expecting a good flight from Fred, and since he had obtained top score in the Static, his chance of winning the contest was high.

Alas, it was not to be. The aircraft stalled while in the early stage of launch, hitting the ground hard and badly damaging both wings. The problem had been that Fred had forgotten to put some down trim in the elevator. The moral of the story is... always check your trims before launching. Charlie Rader was next in line to fly but had discovered a bug in his computerized TX. Somehow he lost the program for his TG3... I think you should buy an "Apple", Charlie... Kurt Fritz stepped in to fill the gap whilst Charlie continued to wrestle with the problems of high technology. The big DG-300 was winched from the ground smoothly, and Kurt put in a great flight which gave him 236 points. At this stage, it looked as though Kurt would be the winner: Although he had a low score in the Static due to the new rules regarding the factor (Kurt's aircraft received a factor of 0.65), I knew the performance

of this aircraft was excellent and Kurt's flying ability very good. Charlie's model was an unknown to me, but my machine, I knew, could not match the performance of Kurt's DG-300. Since two attempts were allowed at an official flight and the best of the two flights taken as the score, Kurt naturally decided to take another attempt to try to better his score.

This decision proved to be disastrous. On take off, the DG-300's wing caught the ground and the aircraft rolled over onto its back and into the ground. Damage was not great - a dented canopy, a cracked wing - but Kurt was out of the contest. Charlie was still trying to reprogram his TX, so it was left to yours truly to step up to fly. Full of apprehension because of the two previous incidents, I elected to hand launch the aircraft rather than ground launch. This meant that I would lose five points from a possible ten points for the take off manoeuvre. "Better to lose five points than an aircraft" I reasoned. After a deep breath, my foot went down onto the winch peddle, and off went the aircraft. The aircraft got away well, but it is veering to the left. "Over to the right with the stick" I say to myself. "Help! Nothing is happening. You silly ass, correct with the left stick, not the right... you're flying an aileron machine... rudder is on the left." At last the aircraft straightens out after some wild gyrations and released from the line with reasonable height despite my heavy handedness.

Settling down and trimming the aircraft, I managed to put in a reasonable flight. Previous to the contest, I had lightened the aircraft by dispensing with the retractable tow hook and servo. This seemed to improve the performance. Before the change, it had flown like a lead sled, but now, it was showing some signs of being able to soar. Feeling more confident after a successful flight, I decided to go for a second attempt at an official flight.

Things went smoothly during the second attempt until the down wind leg of the landing pattern. At that time I decided to couple the rudder to aileron. I flicked over the switch and began turning the aircraft into the cross wind leg of the pattern using the right stick. The aircraft started slewing around the sky and almost went into a side slip. I quickly went over to the left stick which will only operate rudder when coupled with aileron, and managed to bring the aircraft around to a safe landing, albeit a rough landing. An immediate check on the set up revealed the aileron was indeed coupled to the rudder, but the aileron was operating in opposition to the rudder. I had checked the operation of the coupling before take off but had not noticed the directions of the control surfaces were opposite to each other. The moral here again seems to be check every thing before a flight, not just in a cursory fashion, but thoroughly two or three times.

At last, Charlie had reprogrammed his TX. It had been the longest piece of sandbagging I have witnessed at a competition - must get myself a computerized TX and try the tactic at the next competition. Charlie had no trouble taking the TG3 off from the deck. This aircraft not only takes off easily but flies beautifully as well as looking very realistic in flight. There was a minor incident in Charlie's second attempt at an official flight. The canopy of the glider fell off during the launch, but the aircraft flew well without it and Charlie landed safely. The rest of the contest went without further incident. Charlie put in two more good flights and I managed two flights with better time performances. When all the points had been added up, Charlie came out the winner - see the list below. Congratulations, Charlie.

The contest lasted longer than I had anticipated, mainly because we were working with new rules. In spite of the two crashes, I think the contest went well and I hope was enjoyed by all. The new rules seem to be fair and reasonable but a few minor changes could be made to make them easier to administer. My hope is that next year we have more participants in scale. So reader, make one of your upcoming winter projects a scale ship. There is nothing more satisfying to the eye and soothing to the soul than to see a model of a real sailplane flying majestically on a fine summer's afternoon. That's my opinion... I hope you agree.

Bill Woodward

Place	Name	Aircraft	Static Points	Flight Points	Total Points
1	Charlie Rader	TG3	183.5	338.0	521.5
2	Bill Woodward	T53B	176.5	309.0	485.5
3	Kurt Fritz	DG-300	152.0	236.0	388.0
4	Fred Freeman	Minimoa	234.5	0	234.5

Footnote: Fred has restored his Minimoa to mint condition... flies as good as ever.

Minutes

October Meeting

Minutes of meeting held at Beverly Town Hall, October 17th, 1993:

Meeting was called to order at 13:15 Hrs. with 20 members in attendance. The President welcomed all present and offered apologies on behalf of Keith Armstrong and Tom Fiddes who were unable to attend, and also on behalf of our incorporating lawyer, Clyde Halford, who had intended to be present in order to pass BY-LAW No. 1 of our incorporation.

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING:

Due to the absence of the Secretary, the President asked the meeting to allow him to review the proceedings of the September 26th meeting, explaining the terms and location of the new field for the benefit of those who were not present at that meeting, and that negotiations were well in hand; also discussed was the proposed addition of a "liability" clause to the existing Field Rules by virtue of which anyone guilty of shooting down another flier by switching on a transmitter without first checking that the frequency was clear, would be expected to cover the cost of any necessary repairs to the victim's airplane and any equipment damaged as a result of the incident.

On another matter, the President informed the meeting that the draw for the ELECTRA kit and the strip spruce sold at the last meeting realised a combined total of $18.00 which would be assigned to the Club Funds.

Our thanks to Rob Campbell for purchasing the kit and to Charlie Raider who was responsible for providing the spruce.

There being no errors or omissions a motion to pass the minutes as read was called for; Proposed by Stewart Watson, Seconded by Al Hilborn.

BUSINESS ARISING FROM READING OF MINUTES:

FIELD:

In response to a query, the President enlarged on the arrangements for the rental of the field from Fairlawn Sod Nursery Ltd. and informed the meeting that further details would be forthcoming at a later date, when the arrangements had been finalized.

CONTEST CALENDAR, 1994:

A preliminary contest calendar was set as shown on Page 6.

Kurt Fritz introduced advertising matter from a new Canadian Company set up by ETIENNE DORIG under the name ICARE SAILPLANES. The company, based in Quebec, will be manufacturing Scale kits and components at very competitive prices. The Price List will be copied on request.

There being no further business, the President called for a motion to declare the meeting closed; Proposed by Kurt Fritz, Seconded by Wally Wheten - 13:50 Hrs.

NEXT MEETING - NOVEMBER 14TH, SAME TIME, SAME PLACE

After the meeting's business was completed, Charlie Raider presented a program of slides taken by himself and Doug Wilkins during a recent trip to Harris Hill in New York State. He entertained those present with views of the hilltop site taken around and above the flying field. The air-to-ground shots were very intriguing and gave us a good idea of the activities on the site, which was really the birthplace of soaring flight in the U.S. in the early thirties.

Our thanks to both Charlie and Doug for their joint effort in setting up the show.

On the agenda for the next meeting is the passing of our by-laws by Clyde Halford, and what should be an interesting presentation by Paul Schmidt on "Slope Soaring Sites In and Around Southern Ontario."

Fred Freeman

MEETINGS

Balance of '93:

November 14:

Note:
The next executive meeting will be before the next club meeting November 14 at 12:00n.

December 12: Annual General Meeting

1994 Contest Calendar

DAY	DATE	CLUB	EVENT	TIME	C-D
SUN	JUNE 12	SOGGI	SCALE: SILENT FLIGHT FUN-FLY		
SUN	JUNE 19	GNATS	8 MINUTE DURATION		
SUN	JULY 24	GNATS	2 METER		
SUN	AUG 7	SOGGI	OPEN DURATION		
SUN	AUG 21	GNATS	MAN-ON-MAN		
SUN	SEPT 4	SOGGI	BIG BIRD BASH		

* Entry Restricted to SOGGI Members Only.

Rev. November 2, 1993

Above is a provisional schedule and may be subject to review pending the arrangement of a SUPER CONTEST sponsored by COGG, GNATS and SOGGI.