

CLUB RACING BOARD

CLUB RACING BOARD MINUTES | August 2, 2016

The Club Racing Board met by teleconference on August 2, 2016. Participating were Jim Wheeler, Chairman; Todd Butler, David Arken, John LaRue, Kevin Fandozzi, Peter Keane, Sam Henry, Tony Ave, and Pam Richardson, secretary. Also participating were: Bruce Lindstrand and Brian McCarthy, BoD liaisons; John Bauer, Club Racing Technical Manager, Michael Annis, Club Racing Technical Coordinator, and Chris Albin, Consultant. The following decisions were made:

Member Advisory

FC

1. #20043 (SCCA Staff) Compliant ECU Maps

A reminder to all FC competitors that the appropriate ECU Maps for the Zetec engine are available on the SCCA website:

<http://www.scca.com/pages/technical-forms-and-downloads>

Only those maps will be considered as compliant for 2016 Majors and Runoffs events. The PE3 map must be installed with Performance Electronics Version 35 firmware.

FV

1. #19808 (Stephen Saslow) Resume for the FV Advisory Committee

The CRB would like to thank the FV community for submitting resumes for the FV Ad Hoc Committee. The following people have been selected to serve. They will be contacted with conference call information and Ad Hoc business guidelines.

Al Varacins
Mitchell Ferguson
Stephen Saslow
John Pitello
Dennis Andrade
Charlie Turner

No Action Required

GCR

1. #19829 (Brian Ghidinelli) Runoffs Eligibility Proposal

Thank you for your thoughtful and thorough analysis of Runoffs participation. It will be shared with the Runoffs Planning Committee for future consideration.

GT2-ST

1. #18351 (Rob May) GT2/ST BMW M3 E92

Thank you for your request. The CRB did not receive the additional information needed to make this decision. If there is still interest in this request, please submit another letter with the information.

ITR

1. #19367 (Elazar Mann) Subaru SVX Question

Thank you for your question. Automatic transmissions are no longer prohibited in SCCA.

T2-T4

1. #19904 (Harley Kaplan) BMW Parity

Thank you for your letter. The CRB will continue to monitor recent changes to T2 and collect and analyze more data before making any more recommendations for changes. Expect possible changes for 2017.

Not Recommended

FC

1. #19704 (Mark Harper) Classification of Formula Renault 1600

Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not recommend this change at this time.

P1

1. #19548 (Lee Kaiser) P1 2 Stroke Engines

Thank you for your letter. The CRB will consider alternatives to the maximum 43mm venturi size on engines with less than 6 cylinders if verifiable engine data for a proposed alternative is provided.

2. #19928 (Jim Devenport) New Ad Hoc Committee to Review P1 rules

Thank you for your letter. The CRB will continue to monitor performance in the P1 class and does not recommend the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee at this time.

P2

1. #19793 (Jeff Shafer) Radical Cup Spec Line

Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not recommend this at this time, but will reconsider if complete build specs and a plan for verifying engine compliance with an open rebuild program is provided.

GCR

1. #19861 (John Snow) Clarify Helmet Language

Thank you for letter. The rule is adequate as written. There is no proven need for a rule change. Common sense dictates drivers would still wear some form of eye protection, even in a closed car.

2. #19933 (Todd Butler) 9.2.28.A 3 Digit Numbers

Thank you for your suggestion. This issue can be appropriately handled by the Supplemental Regulations for any event.

3. #19974 (Mike Ogren) Please Change the Word

Thank you for your suggestion. The rules are adequate as written. There are too many variables to address with a language change. Competitors dissatisfied with the application of an "assistance" ruling should use the protest process.

GT3

1. #19590 (Michael Heintzman) GT-3 Tub

Thank you for your letter. Because the GTCS is a written composite of maximum build specifications, GT does not differentiate between tube frame and tub frame cars.

GTA

1. #19575 (Butch Kummer) Windshield Thickness

Thank you for your request. The CRB believes the minimum requirements for safety, as stated in the GCR, are appropriate.

SM

1. #19507 (Tom Fowler) 1.6 Miata Parity

Thank you for your letter. After recent changes, the CRB and SMAC will continue to monitor parity for all years of cars.

2. #19680 (Steve Scheifler) NA 1.6 Front Anti-Sway Bar

Thank you for your request. The CRB does not believe this change is necessary at this time.

3. #19798 (Chris Ciufu) 1.6 Differential Options

Thank you for your letter. The rule is adequate as written.

4. #19948 (Nick Leverone) M-Tuned Coolant By-pass

Thank you for your letter. The rule is adequate as written.

5. #19993 (David Wheeler) Ballast Bolts

Thank you for your letter. The rules are adequate as written.

STL

1. #19955 (Jon Cindric) 1990 Miata

Thank you for your letter. Per 9.1.4.E.6, the original dashboard/dashpad is required. Also, per 9.1.4.E.6, the whole replacement of the instruments, instrument cluster, and their OEM insert panels is allowed.

2. #20041 (Greg Amy) Approve the JDM K20A in STL

Thank you for your letter. The JDM-only K20A ("Civic Type R") has a compression ratio (11.5:1) not used in a USA-market engine and exceeds STL class limits. It is also equipped with the unique "PRC" intake manifold not used in a USA-market engine, and has valve lifts that exceed STL limits. Its stock horsepower significantly exceeds the performance envelope of STL.

Therefore, the JDM-only Honda K20A engine, and any of its unique components, is not approved for use in STL.

The K20A may be considered for classification in STU if requested.

T2-T4

1. #19977 (Eric Heinrich) Ditch the 90% of Stock Battery Weight Rule

Thank you for your request. This is against class philosophy and will create unnecessary expense for all competitors.

T4

1. #19908 (Derrick Ambrose) Header for 2014+ Mazda 3

Thank you for your letter. Due to recent adjustment, the CRB will continue to monitor performance and data for this car as it is developed, before making any additional recommendations.

Recommended Items for 2017

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.

GCR

1. #19866 (SCCA Staff) Update Section 5.1.2.B. U.S. Majors Tour language
Change 5.1.2.B.:

B. U. S. Majors Tour

The SCCA will appoint for each Conference, a Series Administrator, and, upon consultation with the Chairman of the Stewards Program, a Race Director and a Series Chief Tech Inspector. All other event stewards shall be appointed by the Executive Steward for the event's Division, with input from the Race Director. The organizer conducting the event appoints all other officials, subject to approval by the Executive Steward. U.S. Majors Tour Race Director and the Chief Steward at each event in their Conference. *At U.S. Majors Tour events, where there is a Race Director and a Chief Steward, the Race Director has final authority over the event. The Race Director must still adhere to the responsibilities stated in 3.1.1.D.2 and 5.12.2.*

2. #19909 (Todd Butler) 5.9.3.C Minimum Impound Inspection
Thank you for your letter. Change 5.9.3.C.:

5.9.3.C Minimum Impound Inspection

For each impounded car, the weight and ~~at least 2~~ other items appropriate for the class ~~will~~ *may* be inspected, as agreed upon by the Race Director or Chief Steward and the Series Chief Tech inspector or Chief Technical Inspector. The Race Director or Chief Steward may also order that a wheel or intake choke(s) or restrictors be removed during impound for inspection. These inspections are not subject to the fees outlined in 5.12.3.C.5. Additional inspections may be conducted through the protest procedures outlined in 8.3.3.

SM

1. #19951 (Spec Miata Committee) Allow Splined Spacer in Transmission

Add 9.1.7.C.2.g: *g. Transmission countershaft spacer Mazda p/n M504-17-304 may be replaced with a splined spacer of similar material, OD and length.*

Taken Care Of

B-Spec

1. #18585 (Jason Huepenbecker) Adopt Completely World Challenge Rules and Changes as They Happen
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #20072, Technical Bulletin.

2. #19700 (B-Spec Committee) Balance of Performance Adjustment to B-Spec Mini
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #20072, Technical Bulletin.

3. #19803 (Chi Ho) Balancing B-Spec Performance
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #20072, Technical Bulletin.

4. #19839 (Darren Seltzer) BOP Check For Entire Class
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #20072, Technical Bulletin.

5. #19995 (Alex Ratcliffe) Make B-Spec Cars Faster
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #20072, Technical Bulletin.

6. #20034 (Benjamin Morse) Additional Information Regarding the New Honda Fit and PWC
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #20072, Technical Bulletin.

P1

1. #19920 (Jim Devenport) Follow-up to My Earlier Submittal Letter #19785
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #19785, Technical Bulletin.

2. #19970 (Brian Willis) P1/P2 Ad Hoc Group P1 Relating to Engine Rules
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #19785, Technical Bulletin.

GCR

1. #19834 (Carolyn Kujala) Seats - Letter #19787
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #19787, August 2016 Fastrack Minutes.

GT2

1. #19364 (Jeff Kruger) Request of Classification
Thank you for your letter. This car is already classed.

SM

1. #19652 (Tom Scheifler) Chin Spoiler
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #19659, Technical Bulletin.

2. #19655 (Mike Higgins) NA Front Chin Spoiler
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #19659, Technical Bulletin.

3. #19679 (Steve Scheifler) NA Miata Front Spoiler/Chin
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #19659, Technical Bulletin.

T1

1. #19901 (Edward Werry) Re-Classify FR500S to T1
Thank you for your letter. This car is already classified in T1 under Mustang, (the 5.0 Cammer specification in the chart).
Please come out and race.

T4

1. #19795 (Julian Macias) Touring 4 Camber Rule, Specifically Related to the 14-15 Civic Si
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #19791, August 2016 Fastrack Minutes.

What Do You Think

None.

RESUMES

1. #19817 (Alexander Bertolucci) Advisory Committee Member Application
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

2. #19902 (John Petillo) Application for FV Ad Hoc Committee Membership
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

3. #19912 (Bruce Livermore) Request for Membership on New FV Ad Hoc Committee
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

4. #19934 (Charlie Turner) Formula Vee Ad Hoc Committee
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

5. #19967 (Dennis Andrade) Formula Vee Advisory Board
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

6. #19983 (Gary Kittell) Resume - FV Ad Hoc
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

7. #20040 (Alan Varacins/Speed Sport Engineering) FV AD Hoc Resume
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

8. #19830 (Dietmar Bauerle) Application for Ad Hoc Committee Consideration
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

9. #19875 (Stevan Davis) Resume Submission for Official FV Ad Hoc Committee
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

10. #19936 (Dennis Andrade) Ad Hoc Committee
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

11. #20063 (Formula/Sports Racing Committee) Mitchell Ferguson FV Ad Hoc
Thank you for your resume for the FV Ad Hoc. Please see the response to letter #19808.

CLUB RACING TECHNICAL BULLETIN

DATE: August 20, 2016

NUMBER: TB 16-09

FROM: Club Racing Board

TO: Competitors, Stewards, and Scrutineers

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

All changes are effective 9/1/2016 unless otherwise noted.

American Sedan

AS

1. #19964 (American Sedan Committee) Maximum Tire Size Clarification

In AS, clarify that tire sizes listed in the Weight column, and on spec lines, are maximum sizes by adding (*max*).

2. #20044 (Drew Cattell) RP CTS-V LS2 vs. LS6 Weight

In AS, Cadillac CTS-V (04-07) Restricted Prep., add the following language to the end of the LS2 engine notes:

"50 lb. weight penalty."

B-Spec

1. #20072 (B-Spec Committee) B-SPEC Update

Effective 8/20/16 in B-SPEC, make the following changes to the notes:

Ford Fiesta (4-dr) (11-12):

"~~34mm~~ 36mm flat plate restrictor required."

Honda Fit (09-12):

"~~34mm~~ 35mm Flat Plate Restrictor."

Mini Cooper (07-10):

"~~32mm~~ 34mm Flat Plate Restrictor."

Mini Cooper (2011-):

"~~32mm~~ 34mm Flat Plate Restrictor."

Formula/Sports Racing

F5

1. #20068 (Formula/Sports Racing Committee) F5 clarification for mc engines

In GCR section 9.1.1.D.14.A., add the following language as a new last paragraph:

"Stock air filters and air boxes may be removed, and air filters and air boxes are unrestricted."

In GCR section 9.1.1.D.15.F., add the following language:

"Carburetion or fuel injection may be used. Fuel injection, if used, must be stock and unmodified for the model and year of the engine that is used. Stock air filters and air boxes may be removed, and air filters and air boxes are unrestricted."

In GCR section 9.1.1.D.15.P., add the following language:

"The engine must be installed in the chassis so that the exhaust ports face the front of the car. The engine may be inclined from vertical. Mounting 'bolt bosses' may be removed from the exterior of the cases of the motorcycle engines to enable installation. Sprocket covers may be removed or modified from the motorcycle engines to provide for fitment of jackshafts or final drive chains."

FE

1. #20055 (SCCA Staff) Formula Enterprises Wet Tire Rule
NOTE: This was published in Racing Memo 16-05 on 7/28/16.

Effective 8/1/16 in GCR section 9.1.1.1.13, make the following changes:

Tires must run in sets of 4 as stated below:

DRY

American Racer

Front: PN: JA3C3, 22.0 X 8.0 - 13

Rear: PN: JA3MA, 22.5 X 10.0 -13

WET

Until ~~8/1/16~~ **9/30/16**

Hoosier Road Racing Wet

Front: PN: 44195, 21.5 X 8.0 X 13.0

Formula Enterprises (FE) Specifications

Rear: PN: 44217, 22.0 X10.0 X 13.0

After ~~8/1/16~~ **9/30/16**

American Racer

Front: PN: TBD, 22.0 X 8.0 X 13.0

Rear: PN: TBD, 22.5 X10.0 X 13.0

FF

1. #20075 (John LaRue) Overall Width in FC/FF

In FC/FF, FF/FC Dimensions - Table 4, Line H, add the following language:

“Maximum width - *To be taken on the wheel at the axle centerline.*”

P1

1. #19785 (James Devenport) Clarification of Proposed New Language in June 9 Prelims for P1

In GCR section 9.1.8.C.B.4., make the following changes:

“Group CN two seat sports cars complying with FIA Appendix J, Article 259 are eligible to compete in the P1 class.

The ~~vehicle~~ ***race car, exclusive of the engine*** must fully comply with the FIA regulations stated above, with the following allowances:”

In GCR section 9.1.8.C.B.4.i., remove the following language:

“Engines must comply with line J or line L (Table L) from the P1 engine table. ~~If an engine from line J is used, the engine build restrictions in FIA Appendix J, Article 259 must be met.~~ If an engine from Table L is used, the appropriate weight and restrictor must be used.”

In P1, Spec Line J, make the following changes to the notes:

“This engine may only be used in 2 seat CN cars only per 9.1.8.C.B.4.i (FIA CN Chassis)”

-Note: the i in the Notes column Spec Line J at the end of 9.1.8.C.B.4. is deleted.

Note from the CRB:

Thank you for your letter. The original intent of the P1 rules for the CN cars was to allow an unrestricted 2000cc engine build with no intake restrictor required. This engine allowance was included because the CN rules are more restrictive for underbody aero than is otherwise required for P1 cars. CN rule wording clean up implemented 1/1/2015 inadvertently removed that intent, the following changes will restore the original intent. The CRB will continue to monitor performance and make adjustments as necessary.

GCR

None.

Grand Touring

GT1

1. #19263 (Preston Calvert) Request for Classification

In GT1-ST, classify the 2016 Porsche 991 GT3-R as follows:

GT1-ST	Maximum Displacement	Minimum Weight	Restrictor	Notes
<i>2016 Porsche 991 GT3-R</i>	<i>3997</i>	<i>2689</i>		<i>Competitor must provide World Challenge, Appendix A, upon request. Cars must pass SCCA World Challenge Tech and have World Challenge Dog Tag fixed to vehicle.</i>

GT2

1. #19490 (John Litzinger) Add A Current GT 3 Car into GT 2 without a SIR

In GT2, classify the Ford Mustang body, years 2010-2011 as follows:

GT2 Cars - FORD					
Model	Years	Body Style	Drive-line	Wheel-base (in)	Notes
<i>Mustang</i>	<i>2010-11</i>	<i>2dr</i>	<i>RWD</i>	<i>101.0/107.1</i>	<i>Duratech DOHC engine, as specified in GT3, to run unrestricted in GT 2. Minimum weight is 1950 lbs.</i>

2. #19857 (Antonio Llona) Classify the BMW M52 2.8L Engine

In GT2, classify the BMW M52 2.8L engine as follows:

GT2 Engines - BMW								
Engine Family	Engine Type	Bore x Stroke (mm)	Disp. (CC)	Head Type	Valves / Cyl.	Fuel Induction	Weight (lbs)	Notes
<i>M52B28</i>	<i>DOHC</i>	<i>84.0 X 84.0</i>	<i>2793</i>	<i>Alum, Crossflow</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>Unrestricted automotive type</i>	<i>2140</i>	

Improved Touring

None.

Production

None.

Spec Miata

1. #19050 (John Bauer) Bore/Overbore Dimensions Conflict

In GCR section 9.1.7.C.1.b., add the following language:

"1. The engine block may be decked/milled to achieve the factory specified compression ratio for the correct model year as listed. Honing of cylinders is permitted to a maximum standard diameter as shown in ~~Table 1:~~ *the*

SM Spec Lines. (REMOVE TABLE)

2. [no changes]

3. The cylinders may be bored .010" over to a maximum overbore ("*alternate*") diameter shown in ~~table 2:~~ *the SM Spec Lines. (REMOVE TABLE)*"

In SM, Change Spec Lines for bore as follows:

FROM

90-93: ~~78.0/78.25 (3.071/3.081)~~

94-05: ~~83.0/83.25 (3.268/3.278)~~

TO

90-93: **78.13mm/78.38mm (3.076"/3.086")**

94-05: **83.13mm/83.39mm (3.273"/3.283")**

2. #19659 (Chris Lefferdink) Please Change GCR section 9.1.7.C.6.c (Page 769)

In GCR section 9.1.7.C.6.c., add the following language:

"The "R" package Miata chin spoiler is allowed on 1990-1997 cars provided it is mounted in the OEM location. 1999-up cars may use the OEM chin spoiler for these cars (99-00 p/n: NC10- V4-900F or 01-05 p/n: NO67-V4-900G). **Aftermarket chin spoilers may be used but must use the same mounting holes, must have the same dimensions and must perform only the same functions as the OEM chin spoiler. Any material may be used.**"

3. #20046 (Spec Miata Committee) subsection rulebook clarification

In GCR section 9.1.7.C.1.o.3., make the following change:

"All sensors related to engine operating parameters must be used and must be stock Mazda parts. These sensors and their locations and mounts, and their wiring harness leads may not be altered except as allowed in subsection 6 **9** below. Any sensors required for analog type gauges must be in addition to the Mazda sensors. Data acquisition sensors may be added. Relocating the oil pressure sending in order to install an oil pressure gauge is permitted. On 96-05 cars a single fixed bracket may be installed to support and secure the crank position sensor (CPS) in its stock location. The bracket may only attach to the CPS, the CPS mounting bolt, and the closest oil pump threaded mounting hole and must serve no other purpose."

Super Touring

None.

Touring

T1

1. #20131 (SCCA Staff) Dry Sump Clarification

In GCR section 9.1.9.1.E., add the following clarification as a new entry:

"29. OEM engine configured full prep T1 cars may use a dry sump system with a +20lbs penalty. They may use an alternate oil pan and pickup with no penalty."

T2

1. #19982 (Touring Committee) 2015- Mustang GT allow 2014 exhaust manifold

In T2, Ford Mustang GT 5.0L (2015-), add the following language to the notes:

"2014 Mustang GT exhaust manifolds permitted."

T3

1. #19876 (Lenny Torrence) 4.6 Mustang Brake Upgrade

In T3, Ford Mustang Coupe GT & Shelby GT 4.6L (05-10), add the following language to the notes:

"Ford Racing part # M-2300-S permitted."

T4

1. #19953 (Jim Drago) Limited Slip in 2006-2015 MX5

In T4, Mazda MX-5 / Club Model (06-14), please change the notes as follows:

"The following items must remain stock ~~unless~~ **OEM unmodified, unless alternate part numbers are** permitted below: original wheels (06-14 factory wheels are allowed), and transmission, differential, **and LSD**. Factory bolt-in roll bar/cross member may be removed to facilitate roll cage installation. MSR option permitted. Suspension package permitted with a 100 lbs. weight increase that includes the following parts: front springs #0000-04-

9700-08, rear springs #0000-04-9400-07, helper springs #0000-04-HLPR-EB, F/R sway bar kit #GRM5-8M-D16, front end links #0000-04-5499, rear end links #0000-04-5498. Mazda Motorsports Cold Air intake Part #0000-06-5150-KT allowed 2009-2012 Mazda RX8 front hubs allowed. Mazdaspeed MX-5 Roof permitted #0000-07-5901 with +20lb increase to base weight. Effective 01/01/2017: The SM5 suspension (only) is allowed with a 75lb weight increase.”

2. #19965 (Dave Ogburn) 05-06 Corolla XRS Rear Sway Bar Clarification

In T4, Toyota Corolla XRS (05-06), make the following changes to the notes:

“Canton Accusump #24-026, install sandwich #24-700, valve #24- 260, and related hoses and brackets allowed. Any spring up to a maximum spring rate of 800 pounds may be used. OEM optional limited slip differential permitted. *Up to* 32mm OEM style and configuration rear sway bar ~~allowed~~ *permitted*. Header allowed. Front strut tower brace allowed. OBD2 requirement for ECU does not apply. Moroso oil pan 20970 allowed.”

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS

Ray Mason vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 16-12-NE

July 28, 2016

FACTS IN BRIEF

On June 25, 2016, following the Group 2 FE Majors Race at Watkins Glen International, Steve Pence, Race Director, filed a Request For Action (RFA) to investigate contact between Car #57, driven by Joe Sammut, and Car #25, driven by Ray Mason. The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Gene Kern, John Walsh, and Tyrone Noles, Chairman, met, reviewed the evidence, heard testimony from witnesses, and determined that Mr. Mason violated General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A. (Avoid contact) and 6.11.1.D. (Overtaking drivers responsibility). The SOM assigned Mr. Mason a penalty of disqualification from the event, a three (3) month suspension followed by an eight (8) event weekend probation. This assigned six (6) points to Mr. Mason's competition license. Mr. Mason appealed the SOM ruling.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Jerry Wannarka, Spencer Gorham, and Rick Mitchell (Chairman) met on July 21 and July 28, 2016 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal letter from Ray Mason, dated July 5, 2016.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received July 14, 2016.
3. Video from Car # 25 (Mason), received July 14, 2016.
4. Email from Stephen Pence (Race Director), received July 28, 2016.
5. Letter from Kathy Barnes (Chairman of the SOM), dated July 18, 2016.

FINDINGS

The SOM viewed videos from Mr. Sammut and from two competitors behind the incident. The contact caused Mr. Mason's car to become airborne and land on top of Mr. Sammut's car. Still pictures, captured from Mr. Sammut's video, indicated that Mr. Mason's tires came in contact with Mr. Sammut's helmet. Neither car continued to race. Mr. Mason's video was not available to the SOM but he submitted it with the appeal.

In his appeal, Mr. Mason alleges that Mr. Sammut in Car #57 slowed rapidly, causing the contact between the cars at the bus stop, Turn #5, on the first lap.

Mr. Mason's video shows Mr. Sammut's car (#57) in front of Mr. Mason's car (#25). Neither car had competitors on either side. Mr. Sammut moved to driver's right looking around other competitors then moved left back in line with the cars in front of him. He then slowed for traffic ahead. Mr. Mason slowed too little and his nose hit the right rear wheel of Car #57. Car #57 started to spin and Car #25 went over the cockpit of Car #57.

The COA believes Mr. Mason had the ability to avoid the contact and didn't. The slow down going into turn 5 at the start of the race was to be expected. Mr. Sammut's slowing was not severe enough to be a factor in the incident. The spacing between the cars was enough for Mr. Mason to maneuver around Mr. Sammut. Mr. Mason showed a lack of situational awareness.

In his appeal Mr. Mason also stated that the penalty of suspension and probation is excessive. The penalties assessed by the SOM are within their powers. There is no compelling evidence to support changing the penalties.

DECISION

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

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS

Kat Hakola vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 16-13-RM

July 28, 2016

FACTS IN BRIEF

On July 3, 2016, following the Group 5 Majors Race at High Plains Raceway, Kat Hakola, entrant for SM #85 (driven by John Harms), protested Paul Moore, SRF #5. Ms. Hakola charged Mr. Moore with making an unsafe pass in violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.B., C., and D. (On Course Driver Conduct). The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Costa Dunias, Leigh Swan, Phil Shuey, and Bill Metcalf, Chairman, met, reviewed the evidence, heard testimony from witnesses, and determined the evidence did not establish that GCR 6.11.1.A., B., C., or D were violated. The SOM disallowed the protest. Ms. Hakola appealed the SOM ruling.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Jerry Wannarka, Spencer Gorham, and Michael West (Chairman) met on July 21 and July 28, 2016 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal letter from Kat Hakola, dated July 12, 2016.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received July 20, 2016.
3. Letter from Bill Metcalf (Chairman of the SOM) citing online links to video evidence reviewed by the SOM, dated July 7, 2016.

FINDINGS

The SOM viewed videos from SM #85 (Kat Hakola entrant/John Harms driver), SRF #5 (Paul Moore), and a fixed camera mounted at Start/Finish. All the video evidence shows SM #85 hitting SRF #5 in the left rear, climbing up the rear end of SRF #5, and landing on top of SRF #5.

In her appeal, Ms. Hakola does not specifically ask for any change in the SOM ruling, but states the appeal is intended to bring to the attention of the "board" a need for review of flagging procedures and race control's role in managing the on track racing. It also suggests a review of Mr. Moore's readiness to compete at the Majors level might be required. These issues are outside the scope of the original protest and SOM ruling, and the COA will not address them other than to note their inclusion in the appeal.

Ms. Hakola alleges that Mr. Moore was driving erratically, was not experienced enough to have been competing in a Majors race, should not have gotten between two competitors racing for position in class, and should have been removed from the race via a Black Flag. She further asserts upon passing SM #85, Mr. Moore unexpectedly moved to driver's right and abruptly braked which did not leave Mr. Harms room to avoid the collision.

The COA reviewed all evidence considered by the SOM. Testimony obtained from the witnesses, with the exception of Mr. Harms, does not support Ms. Hakola's assertion that Mr. Moore's pass was unsafe. In addition, the video evidence shows Mr. Moore executed a safe pass, safely moved driver's right in line with SM #3, stayed in line with SM #3 entering the turn, was braking for the turn at approximately the same time as SM #3, and thus did not impede Mr. Harms' racing room. The video does show Mr. Moore braking as he enters the turn along with braking by SM #3. Braking by the cars as they entered the turn appears to be an expected action and Mr. Moore's slowing was consistent with SM #3's.

With her appeal Ms. Hakola also submitted a witness statement from Rick Schader, driver of SM #3. In his statement, Mr. Schader acknowledges he did not see the incident, only the aftermath with SM #85 on top of SRF #5. Therefore, his testimony is of limited value.

In addition, the video provided with the appeal shows Mr. Harms sweeping through Turn 1 on the same line on laps prior to the incident while following SM #3. However, the circumstances were different and he failed to anticipate his position relative to SRF #5. Simply stated, Mr. Harms ran into and over Mr. Moore. Mr. Harms showed a lack of situational awareness.

DECISION

The COA upholds the SOM's decision in its entirety. Ms. Hakola's appeal is well founded and the appeal fee, less the amount retained by SCCA, will be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS

Theodore R. Cahall, Jr. vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 16-14-NE

August 7, 2016

FACTS IN BRIEF

On Sunday, July 10, 2016, at the MARRS 6 event at Summit Point Raceway, following the Group 2 Regional Race, Chief Steward John Nesbitt filed a Chief Stewards Action (CSA) citing Theodore R. Cahall, Jr., driver of Car #82 for a violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 5.9.2.B. (Minimum Event Safety Inspection/Logbook – Tech Sticker.) Mr. Nesbitt disqualified Mr. Cahall from the event, which included two races for points in the Mid-Atlantic Road Racing Series (MARRS).

Mr. Cahall protested Mr. Nesbitt's action as an "excessive penalty" for the infraction. The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) A.G. Robbins, Walt Michaels, John Snodgrass, Douglas Nickel, and David Nokes, Chairman, met, reviewed the evidence, heard testimony from witnesses, and disallowed the protest leaving the disqualification in effect. Mr. Cahall is appealing the decision of the SOM.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Spencer Gorham, Rick Mitchell, and Laurie Sheppard (Chairman) met on July 30 and August 7, 2016 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Official Observers Report and related documents, received July 22, 2016.
2. Appeal letter from Theodore R. Cahall, Jr., received July 22, 2016.
3. Letter from John Nesbitt, received July 22, 2016.
4. Letter from David Nokes, received July 25, 2016.

FINDINGS

In his appeal, Mr. Cahall asks the COA to amend the penalty for the GCR violation and to consider each points race separately. Mr. Cahall asserts that he was not notified that a Request For Action (RFA) was pending and because he did not list crew on his entry form, any communication between Tech staff and his paddock support team was incorrect. He also states that Grid staff did not prevent him from going on track when he presented his car with no event tech sticker.

The COA finds that the MARRS 6 race weekend was conducted under a single SCCA Sanction Number, indicating it was a single event that included multiple races awarding points. Disqualification from the event applies equally to all points races within the event.

The COA understands that an RFA was initiated on Saturday afternoon citing a violation of GCR 2.1.2. (Acting to enable a person or car known to be ineligible, not properly entered, or credentialed to participate in an event.) when Mr. Cahall was away from the track. The RFA was withdrawn prior to any notification, investigation, or action being taken. The CSA which Mr. Cahall protested is the only action under appeal.

The COA notes that there is no GCR requirement for Grid staff to verify the presence of an event tech sticker on all cars entering the track, although they often do so to support the event organizers' obligation and desire to conduct a safe event. The responsibility for ensuring that an event tech sticker is displayed rests solely with the competitor.

Mr. Cahall's assertion that communication with his paddock support team was incorrect is not substantiated by his testimony to the SOM. Mr. Cahall's witness statement, submitted as part of his protest and signed by him on July 10, 2016, refers to "his crew" several times. Glenn Murphey, who reported his status as "crew", provided a witness statement to support Mr. Cahall's testimony. Since Mr. Cahall and his car were being supported on track, in the paddock, and off-site by a racing services provider, the COA does not agree that communications with Mr. Murphey were incorrect, even though Mr. Murphey was not specifically listed on Mr. Cahall's entry form.

Mr. Cahall explains in his appeal letter that he correctly obtained an event tech sticker using the logbook for Car #78, which he entered in the event. Car #78's engine failed during qualifying; Mr. Cahall visited Registration and Timing & Scoring to change to Car #82 for the remainder of the event. Per GCR 5.9.2.B. the minimum inspection for each event requires reviewing of the current Vehicle Logbook. Mr. Cahall changed to a different vehicle and should have presented that vehicle's current logbook for inspection prior to taking Car #82 onto the track for the Saturday race. He acknowledges not doing so was an oversight on

his part.

During the Saturday race, Car #82 sustained crash damage. Tech staff requested to see the vehicle's logbook. Mr. Murphey provided the logbook and the Tech inspector noticed there wasn't an entry for MARRS 6. The logbook was taken to the Tech Steward. Mr. Cahall's witness statement says that his crew informed him that Tech had the logbook although his appeal states he did not talk to Mr. Murphey. Instead, in his appeal, Mr. Cahall states that he heard through a third party that Tech had spoken to Mr. Murphey and "all was in order." When the Tech inspector returned later on Saturday afternoon to document the crash damage, Car #82 had been removed for repairs. Mr. Cahall had also left the track and did not speak with the Tech staff or Tech Steward.

On Sunday morning Mr. Cahall presented Car #82 for a hardship lap to verify the repairs. Later, while Car #82 was on the grid for the Sunday race, the absence of an event tech sticker was identified. This was reported to Mr. Nesbitt, who went to the grid and spoke with Mr. Cahall. Mr. Cahall's witness statement says his crew told him the car had been teched, although as previously noted, his appeal states he did not speak to Mr. Murphey. Mr. Cahall requested and received permission to race, stating that he would show Mr. Nesbitt his logbook after the race. Mr. Cahall reported to impound after the race where it was confirmed that Car #82 had not been issued an event tech sticker.

The COA finds that Mr. Cahall did not obtain an event tech sticker for Car #82. Per his appeal letter, he did not speak to Tech himself or personally verify that his vehicle's logbook had been returned or that an event tech sticker had been issued. The penalty assessed is within the powers of the Chief Steward (GCR 5.12.3.C.1.) and the SOM did not find cause to reverse or amend the action. The COA also finds no cause for reversal or amendment.

DECISION

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