

CLUB RACING BOARD

CLUB RACING BOARD MINUTES | October 6, 2015

The Club Racing Board met by teleconference on October 6, 2015. Participating were Jim Wheeler, Chairman; Chris Albin, David Arken, John LaRue, Kevin Fandozzi, Peter Keane, Sam Henry, and Pam Richardson, secretary. Also participating were: Bruce Lindstrand and Todd Butler, BoD liaisons; Eric Prill, Chief Operations Officer, John Bauer, Club Racing Technical Manager, Michael Annis, Club Racing Technical Coordinator. Dick Patullo was the guest from the BoD. The following decisions were made:

Member Advisory

None.

No Action Required

GCR

1. #17414 (Steven Pounds) Supports Data Technicians

Thank you for your support of the data technician program. The CRB encourages anyone who is interested in becoming a Race Data Tech, to be sure and ask that it be included on their membership profile.

SM

1. #17562 (Igor Levine) Regarding Results of 1.6 SM Engine Modification Tests

Thank you for your letter.

Not Recommended

GCR

1. #17278 (Sterling Cole) Proposed Change to Window Net Rule

SFI spec 37.1 addresses inside (right side) nets and are designed to control head movement.

2. #17357 (Tom Masterson) Change to Flagging Rules

Thank you for your suggestion. The CRB has determined that the current rules are adequate as written.

3. #17572 (Brett Whisenant) Mandatory Contact Impound

Thank you for your suggestion. The rules as written provide adequate avenues for Stewards to take actions for contact on the track.

GT2/ST

1. #17589 (John Bauer) Differentiate Between C7 Corvettes

Thank you for your inquiry. 9.1.2.F.4.i.6 states "Supercharging/turbocharging is prohibited." Should a competitor wish to have this car classified, he/she should submit a letter to the CRB requesting classification and for which class (crbscca.com).

STL

1. #14472 (Kirk Knestis) Consider Differences Between Sports Cars and Touring Cars in STL

Thank you for your letter. This is not recommended at this time.

Recommended Items for 2016

The following subjects will be referred to the Board of Directors for approval. Address all comments, both for and against, to the Club Racing Board. It is the BoD's policy to withhold voting on a rules change until there has been input from the membership on the presented rules. Member input is suggested and encouraged. Please send your comments via the form at www.clubracingboard.com.

FM

1. #17907 (Club Racing Board) Spec Tire

Per letter #15554, January 2015 Fastrack Minutes, the Club Racing Board proposes the below spec tire rule for Formula Mazda.

This rule change has been approved by the Board of Directors in their October 9-10, 2015 meeting, effective 1/1/2016.

Change 9.1.1.E.14:

14. Tires and Wheels

A. Formula Mazda Tire Specification -

1. Dry Tire - Goodyear 470 Compound Tire

Front Tire - Goodyear P/N D2659 - 20.0x7.0 - 13 - 470 Compound

Rear Tire - Goodyear P/N 2660 - 22.0x9.0-13 - 470 Compound

2. Rain Tires - open

A: **B.** A competitor shall start the race on tires used in a qualifying session for the race as identified by markings made on the tires by a race official. It is the responsibility of the competitor to ensure that his or her tires are appropriately marked prior to *(e.g., on the false grid)*, during, or immediately after *(e.g., as the car leaves the track)* after a qualifying session. On weekends where there are two races and only 1 qualifying session, this rule may be waived for the second race.

C. For races with more than one qualifying session, a competitor shall start the race on any marked tires from any qualifying session for the race.

D. If a competitor chooses to start the race on any tires that were not used in a qualifying session for the race and not appropriately marked, the competitor shall forfeit his or her grid position and start from the back of the grid. This forfeiture of grid position shall not apply if all qualifying sessions for the race were run under rain or wet conditions.

B: **E.** If a tire is damaged during a qualifying session, the competitor may replace that tire with a used tire upon approval by the Chief Steward. Should a tire be replaced for any *other* reason, the competitor shall forfeit his grid position and start at the back of the grid.

€: **F.** Rain tires may be used at any time. In the event that a grid position is determined by use of a manufactured rain tire (excluding hand grooved tires), the competitor may elect to start the race on either the rain tire which was used in qualifying or slicks which are other-wise compliant.

F: **G.** Use of tire warmers or cooling methods other than natural air convection or conduction is prohibited.

Ð: **H.** Any competitors deemed to have taken steps to circumvent these rules, or deemed to have used a foreign substance on the tire in order to gain an advantage shall be immediately disqualified from that event.

E: **I.** All cars shall run BBS (8" x 13") front and (10" x 13") rear wheels as specified by the manufacturer. Alternate BBS wheel center (Moses Smith Racing P/N 000-143 & 000-1504) *are* permitted.

P2

1. #17098 (John Lisk) Clarification of P2 Section J, Para.4 and Section M

Thank you for your letter.

Assisted shifting as delivered from the factory on Radical Spec Line Cars (Table 1) is compliant for 2015.

Change 9.1.8.D.J.4: 4. Shift operation: all gear changes must be initiated and completed by the driver. Only mechanical gear shifting mechanisms are allowed **except as allowed by Table 1 Spec Line Cars**. This may include cables, rods, or other mechanical linkage systems. Assisted shifting of any kind is not allowed on any car **except as allowed by Table 1 Spec Line Cars**. Any other assisted shifting mechanisms are specifically not allowed. This prohibition is intended to eliminate the use of electric solenoid shifters, air-shifters and other devices not mechanically actuated and controlled completely by the driver. Devices that allow pre-selected gear changes are also prohibited. Existing cars converting to P2 for 2014 with assisted shifting mechanisms are permitted with a 50 lb weight penalty, but must remove the devices by September 1, 2014.

Marque	Wheelbase inches max/ Track Max inches	Weight Displacement	Engine	Restrictor	Notes
Radical SR-3 SR-4		Stock Engine 1000lb 1005cc max		37.5mm	Radical wing or P2 class compliant wing and end plate Radical rear diffuser permitted. Assisted shifting permitted
		Stock Engine 1300lb 1005 < 1370 cc max		40.5mm	

Radical SR-3 Radical Cup		1500lb	Sealed Radical Cup engine and transmission	<i>Unrestricted</i>	Radical wing or P2 class compliant wing and end plate Radical rear diffuser permitted. <i>Assisted shifting permitted</i>
Radical Club Sport, Pro- Sport, PR-6		Stock Engine 1000lb 1005cc		37.5mm	Radical wing or P2 class compliant wing and end plate: 61 in width min. Radical rear diffuser permitted. <i>Assisted shifting permitted</i>
		Stock Engine 1300lb 1370 cc max		40.5mm	

GCR

1. #17121 (Greg Amy) Letter #16946, Transmission Short Shift Kits

Thank you for your suggestion, which the CRB agrees with. Assuming letter #16946 is approved by the BOD in their October 2015 meeting, the CRB recommends adding the following language to 9.3.49: "unless restricted by individual class rules."

NOTE: Letter #16946 has been returned to the CRB for additional research and wording. This letter is also being returned to the CRB agenda as suggested additional words also need research and review.

Taken Care Of

GCR

1. #17441 (Kyle Colbey) Please Clarify Inconsistent GCR Classification of a Finisher

Thank you for your request. Please see the response to letter #16998, October 2015 Fastrack Minutes.

STU

1. #15448 (Anthony Simmers) Sports Cars/Coupes/Roadsters

Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #14472.

What Do You Think

AS

1. #17703 (Cheyne Daggett) Alt Transmission for 2011-14 Mustang GT RP

The CRB is seeking your feedback on the following proposal for the 2011-14 Mustang GT in Restricted Preparation.

The author requests an alternate transmission for this car due to transmission shifting problems (lockout or shifting into the wrong gear under hard braking). Restricted Preparation rules currently require OEM transmissions. All potential modifications to the shifting process, as permitted by the AS rules, have not resolved the shifting issues for this transmission. The replacement suggestion is for the Tremec Magnum XL with gear ratios of 2.97, 2.07, 1.43, 1.00, .80, .62 (stock is 3.66, 2.43, 1.69, 1.32, 1.00, .68). Should alternate transmissions be approved on a case by case basis for Restricted Preparation cars? Should this request be allowed in AS? Please send your feedback through the CRB letter system at www.crbscca.com.

RESUMES

None.

CLUB RACING TECHNICAL BULLETIN

DATE: October 20, 2015

NUMBER: TB 15-11

FROM: Club Racing Board

TO: Competitors, Stewards, and Scrutineers

SUBJECT: Errors and Omissions, Competition Adjustments, Clarifications, and Classifications

All changes are effective 10/30/2015 unless otherwise noted.

NOTE: This preliminary version of the Club Racing Technical Bulletin is provided at this time as a service to the membership. These items may be corrected and will not be official until published on the Fastrack page of the scca.com website on or about October 20.

American Sedan

AS

1. #17893 (American Sedan Committee) Clarify Carburetor Base Gasket Definition

In GCR Section 9.1.6.D.1.c.1.a. clarify carburetor base gasket language:

“Only the approved carburetor (Holley #4776, 600cfm 4bll), insulator (Holley #108-12), and manifold (Edelbrock Performer RPM #7101-General Motors / #7121- Ford/Mercury) shall be fitted to cars. The carburetor shall be identified by the numbers “4776”. Additional numbers stamped on the horn section of the carburetor, such as “-X” (indicating the die lot number for that carburetor) and “XXXX” (up to 4 digits indicating the day of the year the carburetor was produced along with the year in the decade it was produced) shall not be used to identify the carburetor. Two carburetor base gaskets (*each base gasket can be no thicker than .125 inches*) may be used, one on each side of the insulator.”

2. #17894 (American Sedan Committee) Rear Axle Tube Welding

In GCR section 9.1.6.D.3.c.1., add the following language to the end of the section:

“j. For any rear axle assembly, welding of the rear axle tubes is permitted.”

B-Spec

None.

Formula/Sports Racing

None.

GCR

1. #17715 (John Bauer) 2015 Helmets

In GCR section 9.3.20.C.2 add the following language:

“Crash helmets approved by the Snell Foundation with Snell sticker 2005 or later Special Application (SA2005) (*SA2005 will no longer be accepted as of 1/1/2017*), or SA2010/SAH2010, or SA2015/SAH2015, or by the SFI with a SFI Sticker SFI 31.1, or by the FIA standard 8860-2004 or later, or British Standards Institute BS6658-85 type A/FR. Each driver’s helmet shall be labeled with a minimum of the driver’s name. ~~Effective 1/1/12 to 1/1/17~~ The use of a head and neck restraint system that has been certified in accordance with SFI 38.1, FIA 8858-2002 or 8858-2010 is required; an SFI 38.1 or FIA 8858-2002 or 8858-2010 label must be properly affixed to the device. Accident damaged helmets should be sent by the driver or his or her representative to the Snell Memorial Foundation, 3628 Madison Ave., North Highland, CA. 95660 (ph.) 916-331-5073 (attn. Edward B. Becker). Details of the accident should be included. Freon based total loss helmet cooling systems are not allowed.”

Grand Touring

GT1

1. #17699 (Tony Stefanon) Classify the 2015 Cadillac CTSV in GT-1

In GT1, add the 2015 Cadillac CTS-V as follows:

*“General Motors Corporation - Cadillac
2015 Cadillac CTSV 102.0”*

GT2/ST

1. #17512 (Amir Haleem) Toyota Supra with 3UZFE V8 engine in GT2/ST, clarification needed

In GT2/ST, classify the 1993-1998 Toyota Supra as follows:

GT2/ST	Max Displ.	Min. Weight	Restrictor	Notes
<i>Toyota Supra (93-98)</i>	<i>4300</i>	<i>3000</i>		<i>Max. valve lift is .600". Max. compression ratio of 12.1:1. Must conform to Appendix K STO rules.</i>

Improved Touring

None.

Production

None.

Spec Miata

None.

Super Touring

ST

1. #16948 (Eric Heinrich) OEM ABS wording

In GCR section 9.1.4.N.8, make the following changes:

~~"8. Anti-Lock Braking Systems (ABS) are permitted on cars that use the OEM ABS brake components as supplied."~~

CRB Note: this does **not** remove the ability for competitors to use ABS. See GCR section 9.1.4.A.

Renumber section 9.1.4.N.10 to 9.1.4.N.8.

2. #17721 (Greg Amy) E&O, Requirement for FSM

In GCR section 9.1.4.A., add a new paragraph below the paragraph that starts with "Vehicle modifications are limited to those listed herein":

"To establish the originality and configuration of the vehicle, each driver/entrant shall have a factory shop manual for each of the specific make, model, and year of the automobile and engine (if changed). This manual shall be presented when so requested at any technical inspection. If the factory shop manual is no longer available from the vehicle manufacturer, an aftermarket shop manual will be accepted with proof of non-availability from the vehicle manufacturer. The proof of legality shall rest upon the protestor and/or protestee."

In GCR section 9.1.4.G.1.f., delete the section in its entirety:

~~"Competitors must have in their possession a copy of the factory shop manual for both the drivetrain and chassis for use by scrutineers."~~

STU

1. #17814 (James Clay) Spec E46 Tire Choice

Changes can be viewed at <http://www.scca.com/pages/cars-and-rules>.

Touring

None.

COURT OF APPEALS

**SCCA National Championship Runoffs
Judgment of the Court of Appeals
CSOM Reference Number 47
Jack Walbran vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-01-RO
September 23, 2015**

FACTS IN BRIEF

In impound after Formula 500 (F500) qualifying session #2 at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Tech staff measured bodywork on Jack Walbran's #67 F500 including the nose/tire relationship as specified in GCR 9.1.1.D.9. Per this rule, the nose body work may not stand taller than the front tires. Tech measured the left front body to be 5/8 inch higher than the tire with the driver in the car, and the right front as 7/8 inch taller. A Chief Steward's Action (CSA) was filed removing his qualifying times for September 22, 2015.

Mr. Walbran protested the CSA penalty. He contended the rule does not indicate how compliance measurement should be done and is subject to interpretation. Per Mr. Walbran's testimony, on track the nose will drop 2 to 2.5 inches, thus making the body work compliant to 9.1.1.D.9. He further stated that a visual examination of the car at speed is possible.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Dan Hodge and Tom Brown, determined the only practical way to accurately measure the nose/tire difference is a static measurement with the car on a level surface. A definitive measurement of the nose at speed on the track is not possible. The SOM concluded the intent of GCR 9.1.1.D.9. is a static measurement rather than a dynamic (on track) measurement as suggested by Mr. Walbran.

Mr. Walbran appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell, and Michael West, Chairman, met on September 23, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal from Jack Walbran, Sept. 23, 2015
2. Protest document and SOM Ruling Summary, Sept. 23, 2015
3. Verbal testimony from Jack Walbran, Sept. 23, 2015
4. Written and verbal testimony from Jim Wheeler, Chairman of the Club Racing Board, Sept. 23, 2015
5. Written and verbal testimony plus pictures from Jeremy Morales, Sept. 23, 2015
6. Written and verbal testimony from Leon Mitchell, Sept. 23, 2015

FINDINGS

Mr. Walbran contends that at speed his body is below the maximum height stipulated in GCR 9.1.1.D.9. He further contends GCR 9.1.1.D.9. does not specify any particular method for measuring body ride height. Therefore, his request to have his body measured while at speed on the track must be honored.

In his testimony Mr. Wheeler, Chairman of the Club Racing Board (CRB), stated measurements are, and have always been, as raced and as can be measured in Impound or the Paddock.

Mr. Morales and Mr. Mitchell provided testimony and documents on behalf of Mr. Walbran. The pictures provided by Mr. Morales clearly show the body ride height can be set at or below the top of the tires. Mr. Mitchell testified that the ride height is adjustable. Mr. Mitchell further stated the body ride height was set high at this event to keep the car from bottoming while accommodating Mr. Walbran's preference for a soft suspension set up.

DECISION

Body ride height measurements, like all measurements, must be repeatable to ensure a fair and consistent application of the rule. A static measurement with the car at rest on a level surface is the only practical method for obtaining a true, accurate, and repeatable reading.

The COA does not agree with Mr. Walbran's assertion that measurements should be taken while the car is at speed on the track.

The Court finds Mr. Walbran's argument to be a strained interpretation and application of GCR 9.1.1.D.9. The COA disallows the Appeal.

The COA upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Walbran's appeal is well founded and his appeal fee, less the administrative amount retained by SCCA, shall be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA National Championship Runoffs
JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
CSOM Reference Number 30
Chief Steward vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-02-RO
September 23, 2015

FACTS IN BRIEF

On September 22, 2015, after Formula 500 (F500) qualifying session #2 at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Tech Staff filed a report that car #58, driven by Cory McLeod, had the balance pipe or plenum removed from the carburetor mounting and the ports in the inlet boots were plugged in violation of GCR 9.1.1.D. A Chief Steward's Action (CSA) was filed to remove his qualifying times for September 22, 2015. Mr. McLeod protested the CSA penalty.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Phil Shuey, Paul Gauzens, and Cathy Barnard met, reviewed the presented evidence, and heard testimony from three witnesses. The SOM determined that the GCR language is so ambiguous that any competitor could not, with certainty, comply with these rules as written. The SOM upheld the protest. The Chief Steward appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell, and Michael West (Chairman) met on September 23, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Letter of appeal from Dennis Dean, Chief Steward, dated Sept. 23, 2015.
2. Documents from the SOM dated Sept. 22, 2015.
3. Witness Statement and verbal testimony from David Arken, Club Racing Board, dated Sept. 23, 2015.

FINDINGS

Dennis Dean, 2015 Runoffs Chief Steward, appealed the decision of the SOM as he believed the rules as written inadequately define the proper carburetor intake configuration for the class.

The COA finds that the GCR allows the Rotax 593 engine that Mr. McLeod used. Late model versions of this engine came without a plenum/balance tube. GCR 9.1.1.D.14.A. permits "... no balance pipes, no plenums unless fitted as standard as on the 493 and 593 engine. 38mm intake boots, BPP 420867860 (last 6 digits 867860 are embossed on the boot) or Kimpex 07-100-33 shall be used for the 493 and 593 engines."

The required intake boots have molded ports to accept a plenum/balance tube. Since these intake boots were not used on the 593 late model engine, Mr. McLeod had to substitute them to be compliant. The manufacturer doesn't supply a plug for the required boot and adding the balance pipe/plenum to fill the holes is not permitted. The competitor supplied the plug.

The COA acknowledges the restricted nature of the class that no component of approved engines may be altered, modified, or changed, nor be of any other than original equipment manufacture unless specifically authorized. The COA further acknowledges the competitors dilemma in complying with the rules as written.

DECISION

The COA disallows the Appeal and upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. The COA urges the CRB to review and update the GCR sections for F500. The Chief Steward's appeal was well founded.

COURT OF APPEALS

**SCCA National Championship Runoffs
Judgement of the Court of Appeals
CSOM Reference Number 79
Errors and Omissions, COA Ref. No. 15-03-RO
September 24, 2015**

FACTS IN BRIEF

In impound following Touring 4 (T4) qualifying session #4 at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Tech staff filed a Technical Investigation Report indicating that car #09, a 2015 Honda Civic Si driven by Philip Royle, had wheels that measured 18 X 7.5 inches, which exceeds the wheel size specified in GCR 9.1.9. T4 Spec Line. A Chief Stewards Action (CSA) was filed removing Mr. Royle's qualifying times for that session.

Mr. Royle and Aaron Hale, Senior Engineer for Honda Performance Development, met with Chief Steward Dennis Dean to discuss filing a protest of the CSA. Based on information provided by Mr. Hale, Mr. Dean filed an appeal requesting investigation of a possible Error and Omission (E&O) in GCR 9.1.9.D.7.a. (T4 Category rules) and the T4 Spec Line specifically related to Max Wheel Size.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), Michael West, Rick Mitchell, and Laurie Sheppard, Chairman, met on September 24, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal (E&O) from Dennis Dean, dated Sept. 24, 2015
2. Technical Inspection Report, dated Sept. 24, 2015
3. Chief Stewards Action, dated Sept. 24, 2015
4. Written and verbal testimony from Jim Wheeler, Chairman of the Club Racing Board, Sept. 24, 2015
5. Written and verbal testimony from Aaron Hale, Sept. 24, 2015
6. Verbal testimony from Philip Royle, Sept. 24, 2015
7. 2015 Honda Civic Si OEM factory alloy rim specifications available from www.hondapartworld.com

FINDINGS

Mr. Hale confirmed the 18 X 7.5 inch wheel used by Mr. Royle is in fact the original wheel delivered on the 2015 Honda Civic Si. He also confirmed that the online specifications for the OEM factory alloy rim were accurate.

Mr. Wheeler confirmed that the Club Racing Board's (CRB) intent for the T4 2014-15 Honda Civic Si is to use the heavier stock wheel rather than a lighter replacement wheel. The T4 Spec Line correctly states: "The following items must remain stock:... original wheels...". The Max Wheel Size (inch) is specified for replacement wheels, but since only original wheels are compliant, the reference to 18 X 7 inch wheels is an error.

DECISION

The COA determined that the wheel size listed for the T4 2014-15 Honda Civic Si in the T4 Spec Line is incorrect. The CSA is vacated based on an Error in GCR 9.1.9 T4 Spec Line. Mr. Royle's qualifying times are reinstated. The COA urges the CRB to amend the referenced wheel size on the 2014-15 Honda Civic Si T4 Spec Line to eliminate confusion. The Chief Steward's Error and Omissions appeal is well founded.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA National Championship Runoffs
Judgement of the Court of Appeals
CSOM Reference Number 89
Chief Steward vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-04-RO
September 26, 2015

FACTS IN BRIEF

On September 25, 2015, following the Touring 4 (T4) race at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Tech staff filed a Technical Inspection Report stating the right rear wheel camber on car #21, driven by Michael Tsay, was set at negative 3.3 degrees and was not in compliance with GCR 9.1.9.D.5.a.1. (Suspension Adjustments). A Chief Steward's Action (CSA) was filed disqualifying Mr. Tsay.

Mr. Tsay protested the CSA penalty. He maintained his car was correctly prepared with the allowed sport suspension kit and springs listed in GCR 9.1.9. T4 Spec Line, which does not allow for, nor provide any means for camber adjustment.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Barb Knox, Pat McCammon, and Ken Jones, upheld the protest citing GCR 1.2.3.C.2. (Interpreting and Applying the GCR) which stipulates the order of precedence of rules within the GCR and which states the Spec Line is the most specific rule to be applied.

The Chief Steward appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell, and Michael West, Chairman, met on September 26, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal from Dennis Dean, Chief Steward, Sept. 26, 2015
2. Protest file documents and SOM Ruling Summary, Sept. 26, 2015
3. Testimony from Dennis Dean, Chief Steward, Sept. 26, 2015
4. Testimony from SOM, Sept. 26, 2015

FINDINGS

The Chief Steward disagreed with the SOM ruling that GCR 1.2.3.C.2. places the Spec Line above the general class rules in order of precedence. He contended the Class Rules are composed of both the prose and the associated Spec Lines for the class and must be considered together. He is concerned that adopting the position of placing preparation authorities granted in the Spec Line above authorities stated in the General Class Rules will result in an "uneven playing field for our competitors."

The Chief Steward acknowledged the suspension kit supplied by Honda and listed in GCR 9.1.9. T4 Spec Line for Honda Civic Si (12-13), is non-adjustable. He further acknowledged the suspension kit pieces on the right rear were not removed in Impound and measured or compared to stock parts from Honda to determine if any had been altered, modified, or damaged. His CSA and the penalty were based solely on the camber measurement.

The COA notes the referenced T4 Spec Line does not list any maximum camber setting. The COA further notes the suspension parts were not examined to determine if any alternations or modifications had been made to the suspension parts that may have caused the out of compliance measurement. Absent any evidence that Mr. Tsay or racing damage altered the suspension parts it must be accepted that the kit was installed correctly. The resulting camber measurement must be accepted due to the absence of a stated maximum negative camber measurement on the Spec Line which takes precedence over the general rule.

DECISION

The COA agrees that the hierarchical application of the rule set dictates that precedence is given to the Spec Line. The COA further determines that no evidence exists that would indicate any alteration/modification of the approved suspension kit occurred. The COA disallows the Appeal. The COA upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. The Chief Steward's appeal is well founded.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA National Championship Runoffs
Judgement of the Court of Appeals
CSOM Reference Number 90
Jason Isley vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-05-RO
September 26, 2015

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following the H Production (HP) race at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Operating Steward Ken Patterson filed a Request for Action (RFA) to investigate all car to car contact between and among Cars #37 driven by Brian Linn, #99 driven by Jason Isley, and #137 driven by Alan Hulse II on the last lap of the race.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Kathy Barnes, Scott Bowman and Kevin Coulter, reviewed available video footage from SpeedCast TV, in-car video from Car #99 and in-car video from Car #137, as well as interviewed all drivers involved in the incidents and other witnesses. The SOM concluded that each contact occurrence investigated was a racing incident.

Mr. Isley appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell, and Michael West, Chairman, met on September 26, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal letter from Jason Isley, Sept. 26, 2015
2. Request for Action file documents, including SOC interview forms and videos, dated Sept. 25-26, 2015
3. SOM Ruling Summary and Basis for Decision, Sept. 26, 2015
4. YouTube video taken from the Starters stand on Sept. 25, 2015

FINDINGS

The COA reviewed the documentation and witness statements provided to the SOM as well as viewed all available video of the incidents. Mr. Isley provided no additional evidence.

After reviewing all available video evidence of the last lap incidents, a single cause could not be determined. Rather, the contact was a series of racing incidents occurring during very close wheel-to-wheel competition.

DECISION

The COA agrees with the SOM that the contact was caused by a combination of factors with no single cause. The COA disallows the Appeal, upholding the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Isley's appeal is well founded and his appeal fee, less the amount retained by SCCA, shall be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA National Championship Runoffs
Judgement of the Court of Appeals
CSOM Reference Number 90
Alan Hulse II vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-06-RO
September 26, 2015

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following the H Production (HP) race at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Operating Steward Ken Patterson filed a Request for Action (RFA) to investigate all car to car contact between and among Cars #37 driven by Brian Linn, #99 driven by Jason Isley, and #137 driven by Alan Hulse II on the last lap of the race.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Kathy Barnes, Scott Bowman and Kevin Coulter, reviewed available video footage from SpeedCast TV, in-car video from Car #99 and in-car video from Car #137, as well as interviewed all drivers involved in the incidents and other witnesses. The SOM concluded that each contact occurrence investigated was a racing incident.

Mr. Hulse appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell, and Michael West, Chairman, met on September 26, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal letter from Alan Hulse II, Sept. 26, 2015
2. Request for Action file documents, including SOC interview forms and videos, dated Sept. 25-26, 2015
3. SOM Ruling Summary and Basis for Decision, Sept. 26, 2015
4. YouTube video taken from the Starters stand on Sept. 25, 2015

FINDINGS

The COA reviewed the documentation and witness statements provided to the SOM as well as viewed all available video of the incidents. In his appeal letter, Mr. Hulse also requested the COA review and consider additional references not previously available to the SOM, including video posted on YouTube that had been taken from the starters stand. He also suggested Mr. Linn and Mr. Isley had violated Supplemental Regulations 5.14 by making use of the Banking Apron during the final lap incident.

After reviewing all available video evidence of the last lap incidents, a single cause could not be determined. Rather, the contact was a series of racing incidents occurring during very close wheel-to-wheel competition.

The COA notes that consideration of violations of Supplemental Regulations 5.14 regarding use of the apron was not a part of the original RFA and is therefore not germane to the appeal.

DECISION

The COA agrees with the SOM that the contact was caused by a combination of factors with no single cause. The COA disallows the Appeal, upholding the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Hulse's appeal is well founded and his fee, less the amount retained by SCCA, shall be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA National Championship Runoffs
JUDGMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
CSOM Reference Number 105
Jim Creighton vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-07-RO
September 27, 2015

FACTS IN BRIEF

On September 26, 2015, after the F Production (FP) race at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Tech staff filed a Technical Inspection Report indicating that car #7, driven by Eric Prill, had a thermal coating on the exterior of the intake manifold that was non-compliant with GCR 9.1.5.E.2.b.7. which states: "The intake manifold may be port matched on the port mating surface to a depth of no more than one inch. Balance pipes or tubes on all intake manifolds can be plugged or restricted. The intake manifold cannot otherwise be modified." A Chief Steward's Action (CSA) was filed to disqualify Mr. Prill. Mr. Prill protested the CSA penalty.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Ken Jones, Pat McCammon, John Switzer, and Barb Knox, met on September 27, 2015, reviewed the presented evidence and heard testimony. The SOM determined the modification is specifically allowed per 9.1.5.E.2.a.3. The intake manifold is part of the drive train by the hierarchy of the GCR section and per Club Racing Board (CRB) witness testimony. The SOM upheld the protest.

Jim Creighton, Production Line Chief, appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell and Michael West (Chairman) met on September 27, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Letter of appeal from Jim Creighton, Production Line Chief, dated Sept. 27, 2015.
2. Documents from the SOM dated Sept. 27, 2015.
3. Phone call with Chris Albin, Club Racing Board, Sept. 27, 2015.

FINDINGS

Mr. Creighton asserted that GCR 9.1.5.E.2.b.7. is specific to the intake manifold and takes precedence over GCR 9.1.5.E.2.a.3. which is more general, relates to the drive train, and states that "Stock and permitted alternate components of the drive train can have thermal barrier and friction altering coatings applied."

The COA agrees the intake manifold is a component of the drive train but as written the two passages are at the same level of priority, conflict with each other, and are ambiguous. GCR 9.1.5.E.2.b.7 specifically addresses mechanical changes (cutting, grinding, etc.) that are allowed for the Intake Manifold. The rule referenced by Mr. Creighton sets forth mechanical modifications (port matching, plugging, etc.) that may be made to the Intake Manifold. The sentence relied upon by Mr. Creighton when taken in context with the rest of the rule prohibits any further modifications to the flow of air and fluid through the manifold. Mr. Creighton's definition to the sentence is only applicable in context with the specific rule in which it appears.

Additionally, Chris Albin, speaking for the CRB, stated that thermal coatings are allowed on the intake manifold.

DECISION

The COA upholds the decision of the first court. Mr. Creighton's appeal is well founded and his appeal fee will be returned. The COA urges the CRB to review and simplify the GCR 9.1.5.E.2.a.3 and GCR 9.1.5.E.2.b.7.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA National Championship Runoffs
Judgement of the Court of Appeals
CSOM Reference Number 99
Charlie Campbell vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-08-RO
September 27, 2015

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following the F Production (FP) race at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Barbara McClellan, Operating Steward, filed a Request for Action (RFA) to investigate metal to metal contact between Charlie Campbell, #89 and Eric Prill, #7 at the Bus Stop Chicane.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Paul Gauzens, Cathy Barnard, and Phil Shuey, determined Mr. Campbell violated GCR 6.11.1.A (On Course Driver Conduct) and Supplemental Regulation 5.13 (Bump Drafting). The SOM assessed loss of one finishing position and a four race weekend probation to be served concurrently with any other probation penalty. Three penalty points were levied against Mr. Campbell's competition license.

Mr. Campbell appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell, and Michael West, Chairman, met on September 27, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal from Charlie Campbell, Sept. 27, 2015
2. Request for Action file documents and SOM Ruling Summary, Sept. 27, 2015
3. Testimony from Charlie Campbell, Sept. 27, 2015

FINDINGS

Mr. Campbell asserted the Stewards of the Meeting did not rule correctly based on the evidence. He restated that he was not bump drafting at entry to the Bus Stop and gave Mr. Prill racing room. He also asserted that it was unfair that the same SOM panel heard and ruled on this action and another metal to metal incident in the same race. Other than his assertions, Mr. Campbell offered no additional evidence.

The COA reviewed all testimony and the video evidence, but does not agree with Mr. Campbell's arguments. In addition, it is neither prohibited nor unusual for the same court to hear and render a decision on multiple cases simultaneously when they involve the same competitor or competition.

DECISION

The COA upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Campbell's appeal is well founded and his appeal fee, less the amount retained by SCCA, shall be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA National Championship Runoffs
Judgement of the Court of Appeals
CSOM Reference Number 100
Charlie Campbell vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-09-RO
September 27, 2015

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following the F Production (FP) race at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs, Barbara McClellan, Operating Steward, filed a Request for Action (RFA) to investigate metal to metal contact between Charlie Campbell, #89 and Gary Baucom, #189 at Turn 3.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Paul Gauzens, Cathy Barnard, and Phil Shuey, determined Mr. Campbell violated GCR 6.11.1.A. (On Course Driver Conduct) and 6.11.1.D (Responsibility of Overtaking Driver). The SOM assessed loss of two finishing positions and a six race weekend probation to be served concurrently with any other probation penalty. Three penalty points were levied against Mr. Campbell's competition license.

Mr. Campbell appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell, and Michael West, Chairman, met on September 27, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal from Charlie Campbell, Sept. 27, 2015
2. Request for Action file documents and SOM Ruling Summary, Sept. 27, 2015
3. Testimony from Charlie Campbell, Sept. 27, 2015

FINDINGS

Mr. Campbell asserted the Stewards of the Meeting did not correctly rule based on the evidence. He stated Mr. Baucom's car was not handling well all week and that Mr. Baucom was not taking a consistent line through the Infield turns. He further stated his car oversteered as Mr. Baucom turned into Turn 3 and his counter steer correction caused him to touch Mr. Baucom's right rear corner. Mr. Campbell feels it was an unavoidable racing incident. He also asserted that it was unfair that the same SOM panel heard and ruled on this action and another metal to metal incident from the same race. Other than his statements, Mr. Campbell offered no additional evidence.

The COA reviewed all testimony and the video evidence, but does not agree with Mr. Campbell's arguments. In addition, it is neither prohibited nor unusual for the same court to hear and render a decision on multiple cases simultaneously when they involve the same competitor or competition.

DECISION

The COA upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Campbell's appeal is well founded and his appeal fee, less the amount retained by SCCA, shall be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA National Championship Runoffs
JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
CSOM Reference Number 106
Susan Dixon vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 15-10-RO
September 27, 2015

FACTS IN BRIEF

On September 25, 2015, after the Spec Miata (SM) race at the 2015 National Championship Runoffs the SM Class Compliance Chief (CCC), John Bauer, filed a Technical Inspection Report indicating the compression ratio on Car # 118, driven by Jonathan Goring, was not compliant. Car #118 was disqualified under a Chief Stewards Action (CSA). Susan Dixon, entrant for Car #118, protested the CSA.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Morriss Pendleton, Tom Brown, Herb Shipp, and Dan Hodge reviewed available documentation and interviewed witnesses. They determined that the measuring process was conducted appropriately, the car was not compliant, and the disqualification would stand. Susan Dixon, entrant for Car #118, appealed the decision of the SOM.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Laurie Sheppard, Rick Mitchell, and Michael West (Chairman) met on September 27, 2015 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Documents from the SOM dated Sept. 27, 2015.
2. Witness statement from John Bauer, CCC for SM dated Sept. 27, 2015.
3. Interview with Frank Diringer, Tech Inspector, on Sept. 27, 2015.

FINDINGS

As the Class Compliance Chief for Spec Miata, John Bauer said an error was discovered in the figures used to calculate the compression ratio on car #118. Mr. Bauer explained that a value used in the mathematical calculation of the compression ratio had been transcribed incorrectly. That value had been used in each subsequent calculation, resulting in a repeated incorrect determination of Car #118's compression ratio. Once the error was identified and the correct value substituted in the calculation, the compression ratio was determined to be within the factory and GCR limit. Mr. Bauer further stated the car was compliant.

DECISION

The COA overturns the SOM decision in its entirety. The COA upholds the Appeal, and directs both Ms. Dixon's appeal fee and protest fee be returned in full.

TIME TRIALS ADMINISTRATION COUNCIL

TIME TRIALS ADMINISTRATION COUNCIL MINUTES | October 14, 2015

Expected Participants:

Chuck Deprow, Craig Farr, Dave Deborde, Jim Cyle, Kent Carter, Lee Hill, Matthew Yip, Roy Mallory

Reports:

Board of Directors Report

- None

Ongoing Business:

- Time Trials Rule Book - 2015 revisions
 - Rollbar language acceptable as written
- Medical Requirements
 - Concerns raised at National
 - Contacting Insurance for clarification and direction
 - TTR - no changes required
 - TT License form - revisions required
- SA2015 Helmets
 - SA2005 helmets "expire" at the end of Jan 2017
- Open TTAC positions
 - Replacement Chairman - appointment requested
 - Membership changes
 - Jerry Cabe - resigning effective Summer 2015
 - Tony Machi - added effective September 2015