



Jury Chair Report

Introduction and Summary

The 2025 U.S. National Aerobatics Championships were well prepared for and managed, with the volunteers working well to have a successful contest – Many thanks to Shad Coulson for leading so well. There were no significant Jury issues and only three protests were received. The Jury operated smoothly and in accordance with P&P 506, with all members and alternates supporting the team.

The Jury came together over the summer of 2025 as individuals were identified and agreed to sign on. A key aspect of staffing the Jury was to provide the group with a broad level of background in rules knowledge and contest operations. Coordination shortly before start of the contest helped get everyone on the same page with respect to the Jury adherence to the rules and openness. Specific assignments for monitoring the contest activities were made.

Prior to the contest, the Jury was asked if 3 pilots, who were not competing in the main contest, would be allowed to fly the 4-Minute Free Program. The Jury concurred to this request, conditioned on the requirements in P&P 503.10.

Three protests were received, with one denied and two accepted. All decisions were based on careful review of applicable rules and/or P&Ps, to the degree they could be fairly applied to the issue. The dispositioned protests were posted near the Jury Room for anyone to review.

Although not a protest, the Jury investigated reports that one competitor had performed aerobatic maneuvers while in a hold. The Jury found insufficient evidence that this had actually occurred and thus no Jury Penalty was assessed.

The Jury also managed the effort to develop the Free Unknown sequences for the Advanced and Unlimited categories. The Jury facilitated the pilot figure selection meetings, reviewed/approved submitted sequences and posted/communicated to the pilots each step of the process.

There are always areas where improvements would help. Recommendations are:

#1 – Revise P&P 503.10.3 to eliminate the limit of 10 competitors in the 4-Minute Free.

#2 – Revise P&P 503.10 to allow a practice flight, with limitations and as time allows, for 4-Minute Free competitors who have not participated in the Championships.

#3 – Revise the rules to specify when a Chief Judge may direct an interruption and how to proceed after that instruction.

#4 – Revise the grading and Chief Judge Penalty Forms to provide spaces to record lows on a Safety Check figure flown below the Category minimum altitude.

#5 – Revise the rules to clarify that the \$50 late briefing penalty is for being late for the roll call, not for a special individual briefing. Include the requirement for the competitor to be notified that the penalty fee is due.

#6 – Revise the rules to specify how the Presentation Grade is to be assessed when a reflight occurs.

#7 – Revise P&P 503.9.1 to include the CIVA Free Unknown figure restrictions regarding repetition of figures both within a program and from the Free Unknown I to the Free Unknown II program.

#8 – Revise P&P 503.9.2.1 to state that only one sequence may be submitted by each Free Unknown competitor.

Each summarized topic above is discussed in more detail below.

Contest Jury Formation and Operation

Jury Staffing – The Jury Chair identified potential Jury members and alternates. Ideal attributes that were looked for were good knowledge of the IAC rules, contest experience in multiple roles, past participation as a member of a Jury and a personality that exhibits the ability to be carefully consider all aspects of a problem before making a decision. Other aspects to be addressed were familiarity with the Free Unknown process, inclusion of members from all IAC regions, not having too many members expected to also be competitors in the same category, and in general have a team of diverse experience. Numerous individuals were contacted toward filling out the Jury membership. It was fortunate to receive positive responses from most asked. The Board-approved Jury membership is shown below.

Jury Members	
Barrett Hines (Chair)	Southwest Region
Keith Doyne (Alternate Chair)	Northeast Region
Monique Hartmann	Southeast Region
Aaron McCartan	Mid-America Region
Nick Slabakov	South-Central Region
Matthew Smith	Northwest Region
Luke Penner	International Region
Jury Alternates	
Jeff Granger	Southwest Region
Jen Watson	Northeast Region
Craig Gifford	Southeast Region
Gordon Penner	Mid-America Region
Dagmar Kress	South-Central Region
Philip Gragg	Northwest Region
Mike Lents	International Region

Pre-Contest Coordination – A short briefing was prepared and sent to all Jury members and alternates. The purpose was to introduce the members and their contact information, re-iterate the responsibilities of the Jury at a U.S. Nationals contest, emphasize the need for Jury impartiality, plus make some initial assignments for monitoring of contest activities. This briefing is included in the attachments.

Facilities – The Jury was assigned its own room in Hangar 509. The closable room helped the Jury in providing a secure non-public location for deliberations as well as the low-distraction workspace needed to review proposed sequences for the Free Unknown process. The Jury was located near the Contest Director, Scorer and Registration area, making it easy for Jury members to check in regarding Jury needs between performing other contest duties or competition flights. Since the door was usually open, the convenient location also allowed contest participants to stop in with questions for any Jury members then present. The Jury also made ample use of the Volunteer Coordinator's copier and printer to support both the protest and Free Unknown processes.

Contest Monitoring – One of the Jury's responsibilities per P&P 506 is to monitor contest operations. To that end a matrix of member assignments was generated to cover the various operations – See below for the original matrix. These details evolved as the contest progressed.

Jury Member	Saturday		Sunday	Monday				Tuesday				Wednesday		Thursday		Friday	
	ORDER	UNL FU1	UNL	SPT/PRI	ADV	INT/PG	UNL FU2	UNL	SPT/PRI	ADV FU2	ADV	INT/PG	INT/PG	UNL	SPT/PRI	ADV	4-Min.
Barrett Hines	Order	FU	SO FU	SO	Flying	SO	FU	SO FL	SO FU	FU	Flying	SO FU	SO FU	SO FL	SO	Flying	SO JL
Keith Doyne		FU	W	W	W SO	W	FU	W JL	W	FU		W SO	W FU	W JL	W JL	W SO	W
Monique Hartmann			FL	FL		JL					JL			JL			FL
Aaron McCartan	Order	FU	Flying		JL		FU	Flying	FL			FL		Flying			Flying
Nick Slabakov	Order		Judge		Judge	FL		Judge	JL		Judge	JL	FL	Judge		Judge	Judge
Matthew Smith			JL	Judge	FL	Judge			Judge			Judge	Judge		Judge	JL	
Luke Penner	Order	FU	Flying	JL			FU	Flying			FL			Flying	FL		Flying

Colors:
Sportsman / Primary Program Flights
Intermediate / Primary Glider Program Flights
Advanced Program Flights
Unlimited Program Flights
Free Unknown Figures Meeting
Flying in this Category
Judge for this Category

Codes:
Order = ADV & UNL Flight Order Draws
FL = Flight/Starter Line (Incl. Pilot Briefing)
W = Weather
SO = Scoring Office
JL = Judges Line
FU = Free Unknown Figures Meeting
FU = Free Unknown Sequences Check

The Jury did not continuously monitor every activity listed in the matrix since P&P 506 does not make that mandatory. Our aim was to cover each area in response to how that element actually performed. Some activities were almost constantly attended, often via concurrent non-Jury duties, while other areas were only visited lightly because they were found to be operating well. Throughout this event, no significant issues were noted, most likely as a result of the good planning, staffing and management of the contest as a whole. Note that it would have been difficult to provide thorough monitoring of all activities with the Jury staffing available, considering that most members had other contest-related duties to cover as well.

4-Minute Free Competitors

Approximately 10 days prior to the start of the contest, the Jury was notified that three pilots wanted to enter the 4-Minute Free Program even though they were not competing in the earlier championships. P&P 503.10.2 allows for this situation but requires the Contest Jury to agree with the Contest Director.

The Jury members were consulted via email. The competitor qualifications and eligibility were found to be compliant to the Contest Rules. The Jury agreed to allow participation of all three pilots, on the condition that the P&P 503.10.2 requirements were to be maintained that give preference to those who flew the other programs of the contest if time or resources constrained participation. The Contest Director was subsequently notified.

One of those pilots arrived late in the Contest week and asked if he could do a short flight to orient himself to the box surroundings. The Contest Director discussed this with the Jury (a competing 4-Minute Free Juror recused himself) and we determined that:

- Safety is enhanced if the competitor has recent awareness of the box. Other competitors in the 4-Minute Free program had been flying in the box all week and thus had that knowledge.
- This program is effectively a separate competition. Thus, a practice flight is acceptable since the competitor was not involved in the other programs.
- The rules allowing a flight after repairs should apply, since these are also focused on safety.
- The flight would only be allowed if the schedule provided time.

The Jury agreed to allow the orientation flight, if time allowed, but set a maximum of three aerobatic figures that could be performed. We also required members of the Contest Jury to witness the flight. The practice was later flown at the end of a contest day, right before sunset. The Jury confirmed that the stated conditions were followed during this flight.

Protests

The Jury attempted to meet and determine a disposition of all protests as quickly as possible after each was received. This was challenging to implement because the members were competing and/or on the judging line, but we were able to address items satisfactorily.

Once a decision was made, a copy of the dispositioned protest form was posted on the wall outside of the Jury office for anyone interested to review. We saw that many contest participants did look through these. The Scorer was provided the result and the protester was informed of the decision. Copies of the protests were provided to the Contest Director following the contest.

Summaries of the three protests follow. Copies of the protest forms are also attached.

Protest #1 – On September 29 the Jury received a protest from the Chief Judge of the Advanced Known Program. He had called one competitor to break in the middle of Figure 6 due to concern about low altitude. When told to resume, the competitor asked about which Figure he should start - The Chief Judge instructed to start at either Figure 6 or 7. The competitor then resumed at Figure 7. The Grading Judges were unaware that the Chief Judge had called a break and thus all awarded a HZ for Figure 6. Via this protest, the Chief Judge was requesting that this competitor be allowed to re-fly Figure 6, to obtain a grade, prior to beginning his Advanced Unknown Program. The Jury was told that the competitor wasn't requesting the re-flight, but the Chief Judge wished to make that offer available.

The Jury met to discuss, with Jury members associated with the Advanced category (including the Chair) recusing. Regarding a re-flight, the Jury noted that only rule 12.8 applied, and that by title is limited to grading issues caused by meteorological conditions. The Jury determined that there was no rules basis to allow the re-flight and thus the protest was denied.

Protest #2 – On October 1, the Jury received a protest from an Intermediate competitor. After being cleared into the box he had done a Safety Check in the box before turning out and re-entering with wing wags. The Chief Judge assessed an Improper Start penalty for not performing the Safety Check on base, prior to box entry. The competitor stated that the Program Briefing did not specify where Safety Checks could or could not be performed.

The Jury reviewed this protest. Two of Jury members had attended the Program Briefing and both agreed that a specific location of the Safety Check had not been presented. Further, the Jury saw no safety issue with performing the check in the box since the pilot had been cleared to enter. The Jury determined to uphold the protest because that the Improper Start was not appropriate per rule 14.3.4 – The Safety Check area had not been defined in the Program Briefing. The Jury instructed the Scorer to remove that penalty from the official results.

Protest #3 – On October 2, the Jury received a protest from a Grading Judge for the Intermediate Unknown Program. He was aware that one of the competitors had been assessed a 50 point late roll call penalty which the judge thought inappropriate. The protest said that late roll call penalties were not assessed during a Sportsman Program Briefing two days before. The subject Intermediate competitor also submitted rationale to support the protest. That memo stated that

he was unaware of being late because he had never been thus notified, so he didn't pay the \$50 fee prior to his flight. He requested that he be allowed to pay the monetary fee so that the point penalty would be removed from his scores for that flight.

The Jury met to discuss the many aspects of the situation. Two of the Jury members had been present at the briefing - Both had witnessed that this competitor had missed roll call, only to arrive about 2 minutes later. It was also noted that the Sportsman briefing time two days before had been mis-communicated by the Contest, causing some of the people involved in that briefing to scramble to make the earlier time – The resulting tardiness was beyond the control of those Sportsman competitors. The rules do not include who is responsible for determining lateness or how/to whom a late penalty fee is to be made. Importantly, the rule book states that the \$50 late fee is for the execution of a “special individual briefing”, which this competitor did not receive because he only missed the competitor and volunteer roll calls. Since he had not missed the actual briefing, during which he actively interacted with the Chief Judge, it was easy to assume that he wasn't considered late by the officials. Although somewhat obvious that more effort could have been taken by the competitor to assure there was no tardiness, the wording of the rules did not require that action.

The Jury determined to uphold the protest. There was agreement that the competitor did indeed miss roll call and a penalty was due. However, because of the rule wording and with no notification by any Contest Official, the competitor did not know that he faced a penalty that needed to be paid. A choice of either paying the \$50 fee or incurring the points penalty could be made by the pilot – He subsequently paid the \$50 penalty. The Scorer was notified to remove the points penalty from this competitor's results for that Program.

Jury Penalty Investigation

During the Intermediate Free Program the Jury received reports that a competitor was doing aerobatics while in the hold before being cleared into the box. Two Jury members immediately went to directly see what was happening but neither saw anything amiss.

After completion of this Program, numerous potential witnesses were contacted to try to establish what occurred. One competing pilot said he thought he saw a very steep bank but his son stated that he saw the aircraft vertical. An idle volunteer said she saw flying that was not typical of a hold, but she was unsure if it was aerobatic. One of the CJ assistants on the line said he saw a vertical maneuver. The two Overlords on the line didn't see anything directly but had been told by the CJ assistant so one radioed the pilot for explanation. The pilot stated that he was avoiding conflict with the glider leaving the box. One of the Grading Judges overheard the radio call and, with nobody actively competing, continuously watched the aircraft in the hold – He saw nothing unusual. Lastly, a glider coach said he saw the glider in a position that might be concerning to the powered pilot, followed by a steep wing-over type maneuver by the airplane away from the glider.

The Jury discussed the event in relation to it being an unsafe flying violation. Significant Jury concerns included flight safety, competitive fairness, and possible impact on the viability of the

contest at this site in the future. After reviewing the witness accounts, the Jury felt there was simply not enough evidence to firmly establish that a violation in fact did occur. Nonetheless, Jury members later had a meeting with the subject competitor to express the seriousness of the issue. The pilot repeated that while in the hold he saw the glider then lost sight of it under his airplane - While he did not think he was in imminent risk of collision, he did execute a sharp turn to improve the situation. Because there was no verified violation, no penalty was assessed.

Free Unknowns

The Jury followed the P&P requirements in all respects to support both the figure selection and sequence checking portions of the Advanced and Unlimited Free Unknown programs. However, P&P 503 does not prohibit repetition of selected figures in Free Unknown I programs. It also does not prohibit use of a figure used in the Free Unknown I Program in the Free Unknown I Program. Both are inconsistent with the CIVA rules and thus likely an unintended omission. Although neither repetition was violated in the 2025 programs, it is recommended that P&P 503 be updated to add these restrictions.

The figure selection meetings were held as scheduled by the Contest Director and each was well-attended by the competitors. Each competitor, in order of the current standings as provided by the Scorer, proposed a figure for the program by drawing it on a flip chart along with the Aresti element numbers. That figure was then input into the OpenAero Free Unknown Designer tool. Many thanks to Jury members Mike Lents who used strong OpenAero skills to make that task move smoothly. As this was being done, other Jury members verified the legality of the figure and assured no elements were repeated from earlier figure submissions. Immediately following the meeting, the ten verified figures were emailed in the OpenAero format to all the competitors. Proposed sequence submission date/time and the need to provide an OpenAero .seq file format was included in that message.

As proposed sequences were received, each was thoroughly reviewed towards compliance with the program requirements. Although OpenAero does this check, Jury members also did a manual verification. The presentation on the forms of each submission was also reviewed - In a few cases there were adjustments made in the figure arrangement to improve readability. When complete, each submission was assigned a unique designator (letter code). As quickly as possible after the submission deadline, and within the published contest timeline, an email of the set of proposed sequences was sent to all competitors in that category, along with instructions of how/when each pilot was to make their selection of the sequence they wished to fly. Hardcopies of the submissions were also posted on the wall opposite of the Jury office.

Recommendations

#1 – P&P 503.10.3 limits the number of 4-Minute Free competitors to 10, with 503.10.4 allowing the Jury to permit an additional 5 more. This is an important program that we should encourage more participation, not restrict to just a few. In recent years we have typically had much fewer than 10 pilots, but there is the potential to grow this area of aerobatics. In any case, eliminating the limit would remove the need to have the Contest Director and Jury confer over this question. Also, without the hard number constraint, pilots who have not flown the Championship programs will have more confidence to commit to the logistics of joining this program. Suggest replacing the specific limit with a statement that allows the Contest Director (with Contest Jury concurrence) to constrain participation only if resources and/or time are an issue.

#2 –P&P 503.10.2 allows a pilot who has not competed in the Championships to fly the 4-Minute Free. However, often such a competitor will not have had any introduction to the contest box. From both a safety and fairness perspective, allowing a short practice flight in the box would be appropriate for non-Championship pilots. P&P 503.10 should specifically permit a practice flight in this situation, conditioned on the availability of time and some limits on what/how many figures may be flown.

#3 – The rules do not have clear allowance for Chief Judge to direct interruption of a Performance for any reason other than possible disqualification. Restart of a Performance after a Chief Judge break is also not defined. Since the ability to call breaks is a key aspect of maintaining safety in the box, the rules should be amended to add this capability. For instances where a Performance is stopped due to unsafe flying, the rules should also cover how the Jury may proceed should they determine a flight may be safely reflown.

#4 – Rule 14.3.7 specifies that a low call may be assessed for a Safety Check if a majority of the Grading Judges concur. However, the forms used by the Grading Judges and the Chief Judge Penalty form have no location where this violation should be recorded. Both forms should be revised to provide space where low Safety Check penalties may be marked.

#5 – Rule 25.1.5(a)(i) states that states that the \$50 late Program Briefing fee is for the execution of a “special individual briefing”. If a specific individual briefing is not necessary because only the roll call was missed, then the result would be no fee due. However, this does not seem like the intention of the rule, which is to penalize for missing the roll call itself. The rule should thus be revised to remove the connection between the penalty and the special individual briefing. Tied to this revision, a tardy competitor should be notified by a Contest Official that the violation was recorded and the fee is due - The rules should assure that there is no misunderstanding if a penalty is incurred.

#6 – When a Performance is aborted for any reason and the competitor allowed to reflly, the rules do not specify how to handle the Presentation Grade. In some cases, Grading Judges may have provided a Presentation Grade after the abort, which would suggest that this be amended as necessary based on the entirety of the two flights making up the Performance. The rules should thus be revised to include this situation.

#7 – P&P 503.9.1.5 lists figure restrictions for the Free Unknown I Program but it omits the CIVA restriction against repetition of any Aresti figure element number within that program. P&P 503.9.1.6 lists figure restrictions for the Free Unknown II Program but it does not include the CIVA restriction against repetition of any complete figure from the Free Unknown I. Both of these restrictions are reasonable given the nature of these Free Unknowns. These two P&P 503 sections should be modified to add the CIVA repetition restrictions.

#8 – P&P 503.9.2.1 says that each pilot may submit “a Free Unknown sequence” as part of the Free Unknown process. In the past, some competitors have submitted multiple sequences, often with minor variations, among which they can later select a preference. This places an undue burden on the Contest Jury to review the multiple sequences for legality. In submitting sequences, each competitor should put the effort to create the single sequence they want to fly. P&P 503.9.2.1 should be modified to say “one Free Unknown sequence”. Note that this is not intended to prevent a competitor from helping other pilots submit sequences, only that there should only be one sequence provided in each competitor’s name.

I appreciated the opportunity to serve as the Jury Chair in 2025. Please contact me if any additional information is desired.

Barrett Hines
Jury Chair

Attachments: Pre-contest coordination briefing
Copies of the 3 dispositioned protests



U.S. National Aerobatics Championships

Jury Operations

September 28 – October 3, 2025

Jury Members



Jury Members		
Barrett Hines (Chair)	(805) 217-3998	barretthines@verizon.net
Keith Doyne (Alternate Chair)	(717) 512-2608	kdoyne@verizon.net
Monique Hartmann	(561) 713-4280	mrsoilcan@gmail.com
Aaron McCartan	(712) 346-8700	northernplanes@outlook.com
Nick Slabakov	(720) 231-3498	nick@slabakov.com
Matthew Smith	(206) 375-6567	mattfsmith@yahoo.com
Luke Penner	(204) 355-7143	Luke@harvsairinverted.com
Jury Alternates		
Jeff Granger	(574) 721-4340	jgranger230@gmail.com
Jen Watson	(619) 244-0069	maule5637m@gmail.com
Craig Gifford	(952) 681-0066	craig@craiggifford.com
Gordon Penner	(513) 520-6065	penner.gk@gmail.com
Dagmar Kress	(303) 887-4473	dagmaraerobatics@me.com
Philip Gragg	(208) 272-0141	PGragg@cwsf.edu
Mike Lents	(218) 779-2725	michael.lents@und.edu

Jury Room & Its Use



- A room in Hangar 509 is dedicated for the Jury
- This is the “official” Jury meeting location
- Jury notices, etc. will be posted there
 - Protests & FUs posted in hallway outside
- You may use this as your base, but recognize:
 - Priority is for Jury business
 - Jury discussions not open to others
 - Shared use with other Jury members

September 15, 2025

3

IAC Rules Govern Jury Ops



- Jury enforces contest ops to follow rules book
 - Don't create rules, apply rules per their intent
- Jury may suspend contest due to deviation
- Jury hears & rules on protests
 - Process detailed in rule book
 - Discussion & votes of Jury are confidential
- Jury may apply penalties
 - Must consider input from relevant contest staff

September 15, 2025

4

P&P 506 Governs Jury Ops



- Jury may stop contest for a ops rules deviation
 - Any Jury member may notify CD & CJ of issue
 - If unresolved, remainder of Jury rules on stoppage
- Jury rules on protests, DQs, safety violations
 - Any Jury member can receive a protest input
 - Inputs received must be provided to Jury Chair
 - Conduct per IAC Rules + P&P 503 (videos use)
 - Chair abstains unless a tie
- Jury supervises Free Unknown meetings
- Jury members monitor contest operations

September 15, 2025

5

P&P 506 Monitoring by Jury



- Jury members monitor contest ops
 - Flight Line (incl. pilot briefings)
 - Weather
 - Scoring Office
 - Boundary Judges
 - Judges Line
- Answer questions, if asked
- Assess ops toward compliance to rules
 - Significant issues flagged to CD & CJ immediately
 - Minor issues debriefed to Jury Chair at end of day

September 15, 2025

6

Monitoring by Jury



- **DRAFT** Matrix of monitoring assignments
(Based on Schedule of 9/9/2025)

Jury Member	Saturday	Sunday	Monday				Tuesday			Wednesday		Thursday			Friday		
	ORDER	UNL/FU1	UNL	SPT/PRI	ADV	INT/PG	UNL/FU2	UNL	SPT/PRI	ADV/FU2	ADV	INT/PG	INT/PG	UNL	SPT/PRI	ADV	4-Min.
Barrett Hines	Order	FU	SO FU	SO	Flying	SO	FU	SO FL	SO FU	FU	Flying	SO FU	SO FU	SO FL	SO	Flying	SO JL
Keith Deyne		FU	W	W	W SO	W	FU	W JL	W	FU	W SO	W FU	W FU	W JL	W SO	W	
Monique Hartmann			FL	FL		JL					JL			JL			FL
Aaron McCartan	Order	FU	Flying		JL		FU	Flying	FL			FL		Flying			Flying
Nick Slabakov	Order		Judge		Judge	FL		Judge	JL		Judge	JL	FL	Judge		Judge	Judge
Matthew Smith			JL	Judge	FL	Judge			Judge		Judge	Judge	Judge	Judge	JL		
Luke Penner	Order	FU	Flying	JL			FU	Flying			FL			Flying	FL		Flying

Colors:

- Sportsman / Primary Program Flights
- Intermediate / Primary Glider Program Flights
- Advanced Program Flights
- Unlimited Program Flights
- Free Unknown Figures Meeting
- Flying in this Category
- Judge for this Category

Codes:

- Order = ADV & UNL Flight Order Draws
- FL = Flight/Star Line (incl. PI at Briefing)
- W = Weather
- SO = Scoring Office
- JL = Judge Line
- FU = Free Unknown Figures Meeting
- FU = Free Unknown Sequences Check

- We can adjust as needed - OK to swap tasks
- Does not require continuous, detailed oversight
 - Use best judgement from what observed

September 15, 2025

7

Openness & Fairness to All



- Anchor actions to Rules Book & P&P 506
 - Assess situation – What rules apply?
 - Need decision rationale tied specific rules
- Keep an open mind
 - Consider grievant's position & evidence
 - Consider other available evidence
- Freely support contestants & Contest staff

September 15, 2025

8

Conflicts of Interest (COI)



- Jury Member must recuse self if:
 - It would appear they are biased toward an issue
 - Involves category they're competing in
 - Involves a relative, training partner, paid relationship
 - Anything reasonably leading to accusations of impartiality
 - Self-identify COI if not obvious to others
- If COI, recuse from both discussion & voting
- Can pull in Alternate Members if/as needed
 - Quorum of 3 required but more is often better

September 15, 2025

9

Conflicts of Interest



- A same-category COI is most likely
 - Two Jury members are not competing
 - If regarding Advanced, Jury Chair must recuse
 - Keith Doyme will act as Chair
 - Bring in Alternates to fill recused members
- Members from different regions/chapters/etc.
 - Not likely many must recuse due to other conflicts

September 15, 2025

10



INTERNATIONAL AEROBATIC CLUB, INC.
OFFICIAL PROTEST FORM

Contest Name: <u>U.S. National Aerobatic Championships</u>		Date: <u>9/29/2025</u>
Competitor Name: <u>Alexander Huey</u>		Time: <u>16:10 EDT</u>
Category: <u>Advanced Power</u>	Flight Program: <u>tenzin</u>	
Applicable section(s) of IAC Official Contest Rules: <u>11.5.1</u>		
Brief description of protest (use back of page if necessary) <u>While serving as Chief Judge for the Advanced tenzin flight, I became concerned about the competitor's altitude and called break-break-break in the middle of figure 6. Then before the competitor resumed, he asked me if he should re-fly figure 6 or start on on figure 7. I replied that he could start start on 6 or 7.</u> <u>Continued on back →</u>		
Contest Jury Decision: <u>The protest is denied. Reflights are only allowed under rule 12.8 for meteorological conditions.</u>		

Keith Doye (acting)
Chairman, Contest Jury

9/30/2025
Date
12:11 P.M.
Time

Copies to: Contest File
IAC Headquarters
Protester
Official Bulletin Board

The competitor elected to restart on 7. I erroneously thought that he had completed figure 6.

The Grading Judges were unaware that I had told the competitor to stop in the middle of figure 6 and unanimously awarded a #2 for that figure.

I request that the competitor be allowed to re-fly figure 6 prior to flying the Advanced free sequence.

Submitted by: DJ Molny, Chief Judge, Advanced.



INTERNATIONAL AEROBATIC CLUB, INC.
OFFICIAL PROTEST FORM

Contest Name: <u>Nationals</u>		Date: <u>10/1/2025</u>
Competitor Name: <u>JUSTIN HICKSON</u>		Time: <u>1740</u>
Category: <u>INTERMEDIATE FREE</u>	Flight Program: <u>FREE</u>	
Applicable section(s) of IAC Official Contest Rules: <u>14.3.4</u>		
Brief description of protest (use back of page if necessary) <u>Competitor was cleared into the box and completed the safety check in the box, then set up for his wags and competition flight. During the Program Briefing, no specifics mentioned about requiring safety checks on base only nor prohibited from being in the box.</u>		
Contest Jury Decision: <u>THE BRIEFING FOR THIS PROGRAM DID NOT INCLUDE SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING WHERE THE SAFETY CHECK COULD BE DONE. COMPETITOR DOING CHECK IN THE BOX WAS THUS BOTH SAFE & ALLOWABLE.</u> <u>⇒ CORRECT SCORING TO REMOVE THE ILLEGAL START PENALTY</u>		


Chairman, Contest Jury

10/2/2025
Date

1000
Time

Copies to: Contest File
IAC Headquarters
Protester
Official Bulletin Board

Tab 3 - Form 06



INTERNATIONAL AEROBATIC CLUB, INC.
OFFICIAL PROTEST FORM

Contest Name: <u>NATIONALS</u>		Date: <u>10-2-25</u>
Competitor Name: <u>Chris Ivell</u> <u>Sub 2</u>		Time: <u>11:14 AM</u>
Category: <u>Intermediate</u>	Flight Program: <u>Unknown</u>	
Applicable section(s) of IAC Official Contest Rules: <u>25.1.5 A1 A11</u>		
Brief description of protest (use back of page if necessary). <u>Casey Siebel</u> <u>Competitor missed his name on</u> <u>a portion of the briefing. He</u> <u>was assessed a 50 point penalty.</u> <u>He asked questions for hours</u> <u>Two people missed sportsman brief</u> <u>roll Tuesday and no penalty was</u> <u>assessed. (See attached)</u>		
Contest Jury Decision: <u>SINCE COMPETITOR WAS NOT ASKED TO PAY FEE AT</u> <u>BRIEFING END, IT WAS NOT APPROPRIATE TO APPLY</u> <u>PENALTY POINTS. COMPETITOR WAS IN FACT LATE, SO</u> <u>A PENALTY IS DUE, BUT PAYMENT OF THE \$50 FEE</u> <u>MAY BE MADE IN LIEU OF POINTS.</u> <u>→ COMPETITOR PAID \$50 PENALTY FEE</u> <u>→ SCORER TO REMOVE FAILURE TO PREPARE PENALTY POINTS.</u>		

[Signature]
Chairman, Contest Jury

10/2/2023
Date

1455
Time

Copies to: Contest File
IAC Headquarters
Protester
Official Bulletin Board

Contest Name: U.S. National Championships - Power

Competitor Name: Casey Siebel

Category: Power Intermediate

Flight Program: Unknown

Applicable section(s) of IAC Official Contest Rules: 25.1.5(a) & 13.1.1

Date: 10/2/2025

Time: 1301

This morning (10/2), I entered the briefing room through the back stairs during roll call, just as or just after my name was called.

I was under the impression that volunteers were called before pilots, and as volunteer roll call was in progress I believed my name had not been called. I was incorrect.

Once the roll call finished the Chief Judge talked about hold procedures, and I asked a question at the start of the briefing portion about the hold procedures.

After the briefing finished I went up to the Chief Judge and asked for further clarification on my question regarding the hold procedures. The Chief Judge did not inform me that I had missed my name in the roll call. I did not receive any "special individual briefing." No one informed me that I was expected to pay \$50 or that a penalty was going to be assessed on my flight.

Section 25.1.5(a)(i) states: "Competitors who miss roll call... shall be charged \$50 to receive a special individual briefing."

Section 25.1.5(a)(ii): "If the special briefing fee has not been paid by the time the competitor flies, the Chief Judge will assess a Failure to Prepare Penalty."

I am now and was then willing and able to pay the \$50 special briefing fee by any modality the contest has deemed available.

With regard to "Failure to Prepare" the following Power Intermediate competitors and judge are able to serve as witnesses to my presence in the briefing room before roll call completed and before any procedures were briefed:

Sean Tucker: (831) 224 0909

Raul O'Brien: (267) 303 4798

Chris Rudd: (850) 766 3756

Justin Miller: (319) 360 5062