

From the TG - Thoughts on the 2009 voting agenda:

#1. The intent of this concept is to deal with two related issues; 1) the perceived inequity in drawing and holstering from a "straight drop" holster versus a "cross draw" holster, and 2) the current rule on holstering which actually overlooks the fact that ALL handguns break the 170° when being drawn and holstered.

The concept is based on the very strict requirement that all holsters do not deviate more than 30° relative to vertical "as worn." The concept further states that a "circle of safety exists around the shooter, centered on the holster about to be drawn or re-holstered. This circle essentially defines a cone with the peak at the holster and the base on the ground where the shooter stands. For an average size shooter, the holster is said to be approximately 3 ½ ' above the ground (height of the cone) making the base diameter approximately 4 feet. That circle around the shooter is said to be "safe" so long as the muzzle does not break the 30° angle on drawing or holstering. If the concept is adapted, it means that cross draw shooters would no longer have to take a step or swivel, and all shooters could draw or holster up range or down range, or could even turn 360° with the gun out of the holster, so long as the muzzle points within the cone.

The intention of the proposal is good, and the presentation makes some good points. The geometry of the presentation appears to make some sense, and I admit I was originally in favor of the idea. However, I am concerned with the human element in that the cone is only safe if the muzzle is kept inside of that cone. Whether shooters can manage to do that while on the clock, and whether the CRO can see well enough to judge position of the muzzle are concerns to me. A further concern is that the CRO, who should be within arm's length of the shooter, is right at the outer border of the cone. Any slight deviation from the cone could put the CRO at risk of being swept. The accompanying figure is one that Chuckaroo made by freezing a frame of the video on the SASS wire. It shows the potential bullet path made by a gun in a legal (30°) cant cross draw. (to see the video, go to the SASS website, look up Coyote Droppings (lower left side, under "quick links") and click on the videos (there are two of them)



Had the shooter been taller, the base of the cone would have been wider, and the CRO could hardly avoid being swept. In fact, the CRO is farther away in the picture than I prefer to be anyway if there was emergent need to stop the shooter physically.

It is not the TG's place to vote his or her opinion. I will vote your opinion, but I urge everyone to think about this one very carefully before casting your vote.

#2. Should we allow Bisley Style Hammers mated with non Bisley Style Grips and Bisley Style Grips mated with non Bisley Style Hammers?

This one is simple. The current rules permit just about every kind of hammer and frame combination except the Bisley. I can see no reason why the Bisley should be an exception.

#3. Should we allow the use on adjustable sighted revolvers in all categories except Classic Cowboy and Black Powder Categories? That would be to allow them in the Duelist and Gunfighter category. They are already legal in all age based categories and B Western.

Adjustable sight revolvers ("main match revolvers") are currently permitted in all age-based categories. There is a discrepancy in that "Senior Duelist category shooters may use any SASS-legal firearm or ammunition but must shoot Duelist or Double-Duelist Style only" but Under the Duelist category, it states: "Any Main Match fixed sight model revolver." Accepting this change would fix the discrepancy.

#4. Should we eliminate the minor safety penalty for overloading a RIFLE? This will do away with the double jeopardy penalty for overloading a rifle. Penalties for leaving rounds in the rifle would still apply but if a shooter over loaded the rifle they could clear within our rules and not be charged a penalty. (The only problem I see would be a rifle reload stage - state all reloads must come from the body.) Note this only applies to a rifle and NOT to a revolver or shotgun.

Last year, an attempt to eliminate the double jeopardy rule of minor safety for overloading a rifle and then appearing at the unloading table with a live round (two minor safeties) was narrowly defeated. This proposed change attempts to address the same issue, but only the overloading part. The rationale is that if a rifle is loaded with too many rounds, the shooter can still manage, (if he or she has the presence of mind) to fix the problem by jacked the excess round out before going to the unloading table. This pertains to the rifle ONLY. Most shooters will not likely have the presence of mind to realize that they have an overloaded rifle, and so will not likely take advantage of this rule if it passes. On the other hand, is there the possibility that some shooters may deliberately overload, as a hedge against jacking out a live one, and if they do not, simply jack out the extra live one at the end of the firing string?

#5. Should we create the new sanctioned shooting category "Frontier Cartridge Gunfighter." The category would follow the equipment and ammo guidelines of the current "Frontier

Cartridge” category and follow the shooting style requirements of the current “Gunfighter” Category.

This proposal simply includes Gunfighter style shooting in the cartridge-based category that already recognizes shooting duelist style.