

The Club Racing Board met by teleconference on November 3, 2020. Participating were Peter Keane, Chairman; David Arken, David Daugherty, Jim Goughary, John LaRue, Paula Hawthorne, Sam Henry, Tony Ave, and Shelly Pritchett, secretary. Also participating were: Bob Dowie, Chris Albin, and Marcus Meredith, BoD liaisons; Eric Prill, Chief Operations Officer, Deanna Flanagan, Director of Road Racing, Rick Harris, Club Racing Technical Manager and Scott Schmidt, Series Tech Chief The following decisions were made:

Member Advisory

None.

No Action Required

AS

1. #28308 (Kevin Smith) Request for Aftermarket Front Upper Control Arms

Thank you for your letter. The committee is always looking for ways to reduce the cost of building and operating AS competition vehicles. We are currently looking at many “off the shelf” components to aid in this goal. If you can help provide options for your car as well as other classified cars, your help would be greatly appreciated and reviewed. Specific suppliers and P/Ns would be very helpful.

2. #28428 (TIM KEZMAN) Weight Reduction for Limited Prep

Thank you for your letter. Please review, as we will, the current weights and let us know if there is any discrepancies that need to be addressed.

3. #28477 (Mark Morhaus) Request header for 4th Gen Camaro

Thank you for your letter. The detailed information and links are appreciated. The CRB has discussed various ways of balancing the performance and cost of building AS limited preparation cars. Along with camshafts, headers are always a viable option for performance improvement. Since headers can vary dramatically in cost and performance gain we feel options need to be limited and equal amongst all the classified cars. Your input is greatly appreciated and any further details on specific headers to be considered would also be greatly appreciated.

4. #29120 (Kyle Jones) Alternate Engine for AS Full Prep

Thank you for your letter. The CRB has been discussing options for a replacement cylinder head and the implementation of a potential replacement. It is a major concern of the committee and your input is always welcome. Please continue offering your input and suggestions. We hope to have available alternatives for the 2021 season and an implementation strategy for any alternative.

5. #29121 (Kenneth Felice) Cylinder Head Availability

Thank you for your letter. The CRB has been discussing options for a replacement cylinder head and the implementation of a potential replacement. It is a major concern of the committee and your input is always welcome. Please continue offering your input and suggestions. We hope to have available alternatives for the 2021 season and an implementation strategy for any alternative.

6. #29125 (Kenneth Felice) Alternative Heads

Thank you for your letter. Please see letter # 29121 in current Fastrack.

7. #29212 (Kyle Jones) Re: 29120 -Alternate Gear Ratios for use with an Alternate Engine

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter # 29121 in current Fastrack.

8. #29222 (Jim Wheeler) Opposes REC item 28748

Thank you for your letter. The CRB reviewed the decision to increase the rotor diameter at length. The discussion concluded, as many members indicated, that the current rotor size is sufficient. The tire size is the primary limiting factor currently. But review of many of the current suppliers of “off the shelf” brakes, the current limitation of rotor diameter excluded many of the available packages for the current cars. We recognize that some might be compelled to change their current brake systems, but hope the majority of competitors running current specifications, and 16 inch wheels, recognize it is not necessary to change their current hardware to be competitive. The primary objective of this change was to provide inexpensive options for competitors that provide effective brake capacity and high durability.

9. #29226 (Brian Himes) Do not approve brake rotor dia increase request

Thank you for your letter. The CRB reviewed the decision to increase the rotor diameter at length. The discussion concluded, as many members indicated, that the current rotor size is sufficient. The tire size is the primary limiting factor currently. But review of many of the current suppliers of “off the shelf” brakes, the current limitation of rotor diameter excluded many of the available packages for the current cars. We recognize that some might be compelled to change their current brake systems, but hope the majority of competitors running current specifications, and 16 inch wheels, recognize it is not necessary to change their current hardware to be competitive. The primary objective of this change was to provide inexpensive options for competitors that provide effective brake capacity and high durability.

10. #29253 (Matt Regan) Opposes Brake rotor size

Thank you for your letter. The CRB reviewed the decision to increase the rotor diameter at length. The discussion concluded, as many members indicated, that the current rotor size is sufficient. The tire size is the primary limiting factor currently. But review of many of the current suppliers of “off the shelf” brakes, the current limitation of rotor diameter excluded many of the available packages for the current cars. We recognize that some might be compelled to change their current brake systems, but hope the majority of competitors running current specifications, and 16 inch wheels, recognize it is not necessary to change their current hardware to be competitive. The primary objective of this change was to provide inexpensive options for competitors that provide effective brake capacity and high durability.

11. #29255 (Mark Muddiman) Request tubular rear trailing arm clarification

Thank you for your letter. Your observation and making the committee aware of this issue is appreciated. Clarification is being discussed.

12. #29256 (Mark Muddiman) Disagree with letter #28748 - rotor diameter

Thank you for your letter. The CRB reviewed the decision to increase the rotor diameter at length. The discussion concluded, as many members indicated, that the current rotor size is sufficient. The tire size is the primary limiting factor currently. But review of many of the current suppliers of “off the shelf” brakes, the current limitation of rotor diameter excluded many of the available packages for the current cars. We recognize that some might be compelled to change their current brake systems, but hope the majority of competitors running current specifications, and 16 inch wheels, recognize it is not necessary to change their current hardware to be competitive. The primary objective of this change was to provide inexpensive options for competitors that provide effective brake capacity and high durability.

13. #29273 (Timothy White) Opposes 13

Thank you for your letter. The CRB reviewed the decision to increase the rotor diameter at length. The discussion concluded, as many members indicated, that the current rotor size is sufficient. The tire size is the primary limiting factor currently. But review of many of the current suppliers of “off the shelf” brakes, the current limitation of rotor diameter excluded many of the

available packages for the current cars. We recognize that some might be compelled to change their current brake systems, but hope the majority of competitors running current specifications, and 16 inch wheels, recognize it is not necessary to change their current hardware to be competitive. The primary objective of this change was to provide inexpensive options for competitors that provide effective brake capacity and high durability.

14. #29360 (Ted Warning) Against Request for Max Rotor Diameter Change

Thank you for your letter. The CRB reviewed the decision to increase the rotor diameter at length. The discussion concluded, as many members indicated, that the current rotor size is sufficient. The tire size is the primary limiting factor currently. But review of many of the current suppliers of “off the shelf” brakes, the current limitation of rotor diameter excluded many of the available packages for the current cars. We recognize that some might be compelled to change their current brake systems, but hope the majority of competitors running current specifications, and 16 inch wheels, recognize it is not necessary to change their current hardware to be competitive. The primary objective of this change was to provide inexpensive options for competitors that provide effective brake capacity and high durability.

15. #29418 (Jim Wheeler) R and A Compound Tires

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter # 29821 in the September Fastrack, which has been approved by the BoD.

16. #29462 (Jay Pistana) Opposition to Larger Brake Rotors

Thank you for your letter. The CRB reviewed the decision to increase the rotor diameter at length. The discussion concluded, as many members indicated, that the current rotor size is sufficient. The tire size is the primary limiting factor currently. But review of many of the current suppliers of “off the shelf” brakes, the current limitation of rotor diameter excluded many of the available packages for the current cars. We recognize that some might be compelled to change their current brake systems, but hope the majority of competitors running current specifications, and 16 inch wheels, recognize it is not necessary to change their current hardware to be competitive. The primary objective of this change was to provide inexpensive options for competitors that provide effective brake capacity and high durability.

17. #29550 (Kenneth McVicker) Favors AS Brake rotor upgrade

Thank you for your letter. A weight adjustment has been considered by the ASAC and CRB, but at this time not applied.

18. #29556 (American Sedan Committee) Request Dodge Challenger Spec Line to include 2015-Present

Thank you for your letter. Inclusion of the newer cars was included in letter 29543 in current Fastrack.

19. #29578 (Jay Pistana) R-type Spec Tire Support

Thank you for your letter and support of the recommended tire rule. Letter # 29821 in the September Fastrack has been approved by the BoD.

20. #29704 (John Lechner) Opposed to Bigger Brake Rotors

Thank you very much for your input regarding the recently recommended change to the max. rotor diameter specification. The Adhoc Committee reviewed the decision to increase the rotor diameter at length. The discussion concluded, as many members indicated, that the current rotor size is sufficient. The tire size is the primary limiting factor currently. But review of many of the current suppliers of “off the shelf” brakes, the current limitation of rotor diameter excluded many of the available packages for the current cars. We recognize that some might be compelled to change their current brake systems, but hope the majority of competitors running current specifications, and 16 inch wheels, recognize it is not necessary to change their current hardware to be competitive. The primary objective of this change was to provide inexpensive options for competitors that provide effective brake capacity and high durability.

21. #29709 (Edward Zabinski) Mustang 4.6 Help

Thank you for your letter. In order to help improve the 4.6l competitiveness adjustments have been made while commonizing the specifications for the 05-14 Mustang. Please review the common specification line and continue to provide your input to the class.

22. #29711 (David Mead) Suggested Changes for AS Viability

Thank you for your letter. The ASAC has suggested a common specification line. Please review this change and continue to provide input to the Committee.

23. #29713 (David Mead) Remove Trick Flow Engine Kit TFS-K519-390-375 From Spec Lines

Thank you for your letter. We have recognized this error and is correcting the issue in the common specification for the 05-14 LP Mustang. Please refer to letter # 29824 in current Fastrack.

24. #29760 (Andy Schniedermeier) Aluminum Heads

Thank you for your letter. The committee has been discussing options for a replacement cylinder head and the implementation of a potential replacement. It is a major concern of the CRB and your input is always welcome. Please continue offering your input and suggestions. We hope to have available alternatives for the 2021 season and an implementation strategy for any alternative.

25. #29804 (Michael Lavigne) Request for Competition Adjustment for Mustang

Thank you for your letter. We have made adjustments for the 5.0l engine while combining the specification lines for the 05-14 Mustang please continue to provide input after reviewing the common specification line.

FC

1. #29726 (John Bach) Spec Tire Thoughts

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

2. #29731 (DEAN KIRILUK) Opposes Formula Continental potential spec tire - PLEASE NO

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

3. #29732 (Bruce Harrington) Opposes Spec tire

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

4. #29733 (Hunter Poole) Thoughts on a Spec Tire

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

5. #29734 (Nolan Allaer) Opposes Spec Tire Opinion

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

6. #29737 (John Sakamoto) Thoughts for Spec Tire Discussion

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

7. #29739 (B.J. Harrington) Opposes Spec tire

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

8. #29748 (Robert Allaer) Spec Tire Again

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

9. #29820 (Doug Brown) Spec Tire in FC/CFC

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board appreciates your comments.

P2

1. #29746 (Craig Farr) Increasing P2 Participation

Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #29822 in this Fastrack's Technical Bulletin.

2. #29764 (Tim Day Jr.) Request to Consider Separate Formulas to Achieve Parity in P2

Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #29822 in this Fastrack's Technical Bulletin.

3. #29770 (Vaughan Scott) Split Off New Bike Motors, Adjust Restrictors, Correct K20A Pace

Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #29822 in this Fastrack's Technical Bulletin.

4. #29775 (Keith Carter) Data Collection and Analysis

Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #29822 in this Fastrack's Technical Bulletin.

5. #29792 (Eric O'Brien) P2 Spec Line/Radical Competitiveness

Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #29822 in this Fastrack's Technical Bulletin.

6. #29793 (Paul Decker) P2 Spec Line Car Restrictors

Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #29822 in this Fastrack's Technical Bulletin.

7. #29811 (Robert Kazen) Request Action to Increase Participation in the Prototype 2 Class

Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #29822 in this Fastrack's Technical Bulletin.

Strategic

1. #29657 (Tyler Quance) Spec Miata Runoffs Wednesday Qualifying Session

Thank you for your letter. The CRB understands your concerns and will share your letter with the Executive Stewards. The CRB supports the decision of the Race Director.

GT3

1. #29560 (Michael Heintzman) GT3 4-valve SIR Size Increases Concern

Thank you for your letter.

2. #29667 (Michael Heintzman) Addendum to Letter #29560

Thank you for your letter. Please see response for Letter 29555 in current Fastrack.

IT General

1. #28819 (John Budrevic) Request for vehicle Classification

Thank you for your letter. ITE is a regional class operated under a number of rule sets at regional levels, not a national one controlled by the ITCS. This car is certainly a candidate for catchall rules like ITE, SPO, etc., however does not fit the IT philosophy or performance envelopes.

The Author is in Gainesville, FL, putting him in the SEDIV. Rules for their club racing regional classes can be found on the divisional website sediv racing.com. SEDIV offers SPO for turbocharged cars like this one but it would not meet the safety requirements of production or GT that the category requires. The direct link is as follows:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1AltjwB8ZaEBIT5Ctkb5dLScUeFXojudW/view>

ITB

1. #29482 (Gregg Campbell) Clarification Maximum Allowable Wheel Rim and Tire Section Widths

Thank you for your letter. Wider wheels were allowed in IT classes where the existing wheel sizes and tire offerings are or were becoming rare, and similar but common wheel sizes existed (i.e. 14 or 15x6 to 15x7). In order to limit the overall performance benefit of this allowance over existing wheels, the maximum tire size was set lower on the newly allowed (larger) widths than on the legacy (smaller) width wheels. Wheel widths are stated as "MAX" meaning that the tire section limits are for all wheels up to that width but no larger (e.g a 6.1" wide wheel would be treated as a 7" wheel in ITB).

Prod General

1. #29510 (Anthony Parker) Against Proposed Production Brake Rules

Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not recommend any further modifications to the currently proposed changes to the brake rules, but your concerns will be passed along.

2. #29541 (Sam Halkias) Support for Brake Proposal with One Concern

Thank you for your letter. The first line in the proposed changes to the brake rules was specifically designed and worded to protect the continued use of all currently approved brake packages without any weight penalty, as listed in the "Brakes Std." and "Brakes Alt." columns of a vehicle's spec line. So if your vehicle already has an alternate package specified in the "Brakes Alt" column of its spec line, then its continued use would absolutely still be permitted without any weight penalty.

SM

1. #29365 (Michael Kamalian) Front Hub addendum to letter 29331

Thank you for your letter. See response to letter 29331 in current Fastrack.

2. #29464 (Cord Bauer) Bauer Limited Production copy Extended Lower Ball Joints

Thank you for your letter. At this time the only legal ball joint alternative is the Bauer extended ball joint. Any other non OEM extended ball joint would not be legal without going through the approval process through the SMAC and CRB.

STU

1. #29474 (Alan Orban) Request rule clarification

Thank you for your letter. Bolt on flares are allowed within perimeters established in GCR.

Not Recommended

AS

1. #28360 (Brian Himes) Request for AS Engine Build Sheet Adjustment

Thank you for your letter. The committee is always looking for ways to reduce the cost of operating AS competition vehicles. We are currently considering modifications to the current engine rules. The maximum overbore is one area being considered for increasing the useful life of the current blocks. Your input is helpful in making decisions regarding these future changes.

F5

1. #29570 (Jim Murphy) Request to Increase the Wheelbase

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board does not recommend this change because it would effectively require competitors to lengthen the wheelbase of all existing cars. Please see the response to letter #27420 in the October 2019 Fastrack Minutes.

2. #29758 (S. Jay Novak) Class Participation

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board does not recommend these changes. At the 2020 Runoffs at Road America, a two-cycle car qualified second fastest (0.096sec off pole position), set the fastest lap of the race (by 0.152sec), and finished 0.584sec behind the winning car. Please see also the responses to letters #28677 and #28673 in the April 2020 Fastrack Minutes, letter #28068 in the February 2020 Fastrack Minutes, and letter #27515 in the December 2019 Fastrack Minutes.

FA

1. #29642 (DAVID OLEARY) Request to re-think FB in FA

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board does not recommend these changes. The F1000 pole position time at the 2013 Runoffs (2:04.786) compares favorably with the FA pole position time at the 2020 Runoffs (2:04.274), and the current rules also permit modification of F1000 engines in FA. Please see the responses to letter #27319 in the January 2020 Fastrack Technical Bulletin and letter #28162 in the April 2020 Fastrack Technical Bulletin.

P1

1. #29533 (Ed Dickinson) 13B Peripheral Port Rotary Restrictor

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board does not recommend this change. Balance of Performance (BoP) adjustments are used to bring an engine platform in line with other platforms' rate of acceleration in a speed range before aerodynamic drag has a significant effect. BoP adjustments are not used to equalize lap time performance or ensure overall competitiveness, and the Club Racing Board does not adjust power or minimum weight to balance differing chassis configurations. Data obtained during the 2019 U.S. Majors season shows that the Mazda 13B's performance is fully in line with and at no disadvantage to other engine platforms' rate of acceleration, so removal of the 13B's inlet restrictor is not warranted. Please see the responses to letter #25759 in the January 2019 Fastrack Minutes and letter #27736 in the December 2019 Fastrack Minutes.

2. #29621 (Johnnie Crean) Request to reduce horsepower of DP02 and FA conversions

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board does not recommend these changes. The competitiveness of the Elan DP02 and FA conversions is not the result of a better power-to-weight ratio than other P1 platforms. On-track data obtained during the 2020 U.S. Majors Tour season and the 2020 National Championship Runoffs confirms that the acceleration rates of the 2.5 liter Elan DP02 and 1.6 liter FA conversions are fully in line with and have no advantage over the acceleration rates of other P1 engine platforms, so a reduction in power is not warranted.

3. #29683 (Keith Carter) P1 Weight Reduction

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board does not recommend this change. On-track data obtained during the 2020 National Championship Runoffs confirms that the 1.0 liter platform's rate of acceleration is fully in line with and at no disadvantage to the acceleration rates of other P1 engine platforms, so a 50lb. weight reduction is not warranted.

4. #29756 (Kevin Kloepfer) Elan DP02 IMSA-spec sealed engine

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board does not recommend this change. The sealed IMSA-spec 2.0L engine is not within the P1 performance envelope. In the U.S. Majors Tour event at Sebring, an Elan DP02 using the sealed engine qualified more than 11 seconds off the pole position time of a DP02 equipped with a modified engine, and at the 2020 Runoffs a DP02 using the sealed engine failed to qualify within 115% of the fastest P1 qualifying time and did not improve on its grid time after receiving a waiver for the race.

P2

1. #29685 (Keith Carter) Monobloc Calipers

Thank you for your letter. The Club Racing Board does not recommend this change. The P2 class is intended to be a relatively low cost sports racing class, and certain technologies are restricted to further this goal. While the cost of these technologies may be somewhat lower now than at the inception of the class, revising the rules to allow them would set the standard and create a perception that they are necessary in order to be competitive, which would ultimately raise the cost of participation for all competitors in the class.

GCR

1. #29478 (Laurie Sheppard) Race Winner in a timed race

Thank you for your letter. Current rules are adequate as written. The circumstances that created this incident were caused by an operational error during the race.

2. #29489 (Jim Murphy) Better Flexibility for Split Starts

Thank you for your letter. GCR Section 6.5.5. allows the flexibility to do what you propose.

GT1

1. #29581 (Michael Seay) Request weight reduction for 23 degree heads

Thank you for letter. There are many options for better performing cylinder heads in this class and we do not recommend a weight break for the 23 degree cylinder head.

IT General

1. #28983 (Ron Munnerlyn) Request to allow 1.6 Miatas in ITA convert to 94-01 differential

Thank you for your letter. Your request is not within the class philosophy. IT does not allow modification or replacement of major components of the vehicle such as the differential carrier /rear end. Differentials are available that fit the 1.6L NA Miata's (e.g. Kaaz, OS Giken), where many cars classed in IT must resort to modified OEM or very rare and hard to find differentials. This is part of the "warts and all" philosophy that keeps the IT rules simple and limited. Allowing such a modification opens the door to similar such changes across the range of IT classifications and potentially cascading requests for other cross-platform bolt-ons. That is unwanted, the change is inconsistent with the class philosophy, and the justification for the change isn't even a real problem for the car.

No one requests a "no performance advantage" item because it has no performance benefit. The CRB does not recommend this allowance.

HP

1. #29637 (Jason Stine) Request Competition Adjustment for HP Spridget

Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not recommend any changes at this time. A fair amount of data has been collected on front running HP L1/L2 1275cc Spridget's over the past several years, and its performance and lap time potential on a majority of tracks appears to be within the expectations of HP. Its performance will continue to be monitored.

Prod General

1. #29498 (Aaron Johnson) Support Letter 27417 Except 6 Piston Front 4 Piston Rear Calipers

Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not recommend expanding the number of pistons on alternate calipers to 6. The responses to the distributed survey were overwhelmingly in favor of limiting caliper piston count to a max of 4. Market research has also shown that quality 4-piston alternate calipers are quite plentiful, while on average the pricing of similar 6-piston calipers increases.

SM

1. #28806 (Tom Sager) 2nd request for '94 - '97 weight reduction

Thank you for your letter. The SMAC does not currently recommend this change at this time. SMAC/SCCA have a plan in place to gather more data on all model year cars and will continue to monitor entries, finishing results and the data we collect throughout the season.

2. #28807 (Tom Sager) Supporting spreadsheet for letter 28806

Thank you for your letter. The SMAC does not currently recommend this change at this time. SMAC/SCCA have a plan in place to gather more data on all model year cars and will continue to monitor entries, finishing results and the data we collect throughout the season.

3. #29040 (Marc Cefalo) competition adjustment on spec line for Na1.8

Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not see this as a viable parity resolution path.

4. #29063 (Marc Cefalo) Coil-over Sleeve Trimming

Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not feel this is a necessary change at this time.

5. #29331 (Michael Kamalian) Alternate Front Hubs

Thank you for your letter. The CRB can not weigh in on this topic at this time. More testing and information is needed to make a decision.

6. #29542 (Justin Coker) Remove Corresponding VIN to Engine/Chassis Modification

Thank you or your letter. The CRB has addressed this request multiple times over the years and do not believe it fits with the class philosophy.

7. #29691 (Sean McAuliffe) Request to Limit Tires

Thank you for your letter. SMAC very recently put out a WDYT to the community about limiting times and the community overwhelmingly did not support a tire limiting program once the details of how it could/would be implemented were identified.

STL

1. #29521 (Richard Astacio) Tire for Spec Mx-5 Challenge

Thank you for your letter. Toyo tires are part of the Spec MX-5 Challenge ruleset.

STU

1. #29511 (Mark Crellin) Request for Dive Planes

Thank you for your letter. Your request is against class philosophy.

T2

1. #29468 (Tim Myers) Request to classify Audi TCR in T2 on street tires (180TW min.)

Thank you for your letter. We don't feel that the modification level of the TCR cars is a good fit in T2. Please consider running them in GTX.

Recommended Items

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.

AS

1. #29821 (American Sedan Committee) Hoosier A7 compound tire exclusion

In AS, GCR section 9.1.6.D.6.b., tires, add as follows:

"4. American Sedans may not compete or qualify on Hoosier A7 compound tires effective 06/15/2021."

2. #29825 (American Sedan Committee) Introduction of Crate Motors for 2021 season

In AS, GCR Section 9.1.6.F, add the following:

"Implementation of "Crate Motor" options for Full preparation, Ford and General Motors produced cars is recommended for 2021 season.

9.1.6.F. Engine build Sheets:

1. Full Preparation

(full prep verbiage)

2. Crate Motor equipped full preparation vehicles

The following "crate motors" may be utilized in Full preparation vehicles

Ford Performance M-6007-D347SR7 engine assembly for Ford produced vehicles

GM Performance parts CT400 P/N-19370604 engine assembly for GM produced vehicles

No modifications may be made to these engine assemblies except the following listed components. All replaced components must be replaced with components meeting existing full preparation rules. If components are not furnished with the "Crate Motor" assembly, all additional components must meet existing Full preparation rules:

- 1. Oil pan and oil pump pickup.*
- 2. Valve/Rocker covers*
- 3. Distributor assembly*
- 4. Spark plugs*
- 5. Water pump*
- 6. Thermostat*
- 7. Fuel pump*

Disassembly of the engine is permitted for repair. All components must be replaced with exact OEM replacement components.

RPM limiters must be installed on Vehicles utilizing "Crate Motor" assemblies. RPM limits will be specified on vehicle specification lines. RPM limits must be demonstrated by the competitor upon request of SCCA official.

"Crate Motor" equipped vehicles are not subject to additional weight additions due to increased displacement. Adjustments to min weights may be made to balance performance if necessary. Refer to specification line for minimum weight requirements."

3. #29826 (American Sedan Committee) Introduction of restrictor plate for Full Preparation engines

In AS, GCR Section 9.1.6.D.1.c.1.c., add the following:

"Effective March 1, 2021, all cars shall fit a 1/8 inch flat plate, sharp edge orifice, 4 hole restrictor between the Carburetor and insulator, All air entering the intake must pass through the restrictor plate. The center of the holes of the restrictor plate must be aligned within 3.0mm of the centers of the carburetor throttle plate holes. The max diameter of the holes is 39.0 mm. unless specified in the individual car's specification line. An additional base gasket, as described in section 9.1.6.D.1.c.1.a may be used."

In AS, GCR Section 9.1.6.D.1.f.1.e., add the following:

"Engine RPM limiters must be installed on all vehicles. Maximum engine RPM is 7600. Individual vehicle/engine limits may be adjusted and would be specified on vehicle specification lines. RPM limits must be demonstrated by the competitor upon request of SCCA official."

In AS, GCR Section 9.1.6.D.1.f.2.e., add the following:

"Engine RPM limiters must be installed on all vehicles. Vehicles equipped with Engine Management controllers, ECU, may utilize the internal ECU RPM limiter. Maximum engine RPM is 7600. Individual vehicle/engine limits may be adjusted and would be specified on vehicle specification lines. RPM limits must be demonstrated by the competitor upon request of SCCA official."

GCR

1. #29717 (Jim Rogaski) GCR Appendix D Need

In GCR, delete Appendix D in entirety.

GTX

1. #29508 (Chris Ludwig) GTX Fuel Injection Component Approval Request

In GTX, GCR Section 9.1.2.H.G.5, change as follows:

*"GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications. Additionally, the following engines are permitted 362 cubic inch engines include, **Engine Management is unrestricted.***

- Chevrolet R07
- Ford FR9
- Dodge R6
- Toyota Phase 11"

ITR

1. #28914 (Harper Sharpe) Request Turbocharged Cars

In IT, GCR Section 9.1.3.D.3, insert the following and renumber following sections as follows:

"3. Turbocharged engines (only)

The following rules are specific to cars equipped from the factory with turbocharged engines and classified in the ITCS. Section D.1 applies except where there are disagreements between section D.1 and these rules (e.g Exhausts and Intakes), in which event these rules take precedence.

a. The Turbo must be identical to the original stock turbo fitted from the factory.

b. Exhaust system shall remain as stock from the cylinder head to the turbo outlet. Exhaust system tubing after the turbocharger may be no larger than the factory exhaust tubing. Catalytic convertors may be removed.

c. All intake tubing from the air cleaner to the turbo and from the turbo to the throttle body including any intercooler(s) must remain stock or stock replacement parts. Stock air metering device must be retained in its original location and housing.

d. Engine control unit (ECU) and calibration (AKA tune or map) must remain stock, no aftermarket tuning, or alternate ECU is permitted. Factory ECU updates such as those done in accordance with a recall or service bulletin from the vehicle manufacturer are permitted.

e. A port for measuring intake manifold pressure must be provided and available for scrutineering use. This port shall be capped or plugged when on track."

EP

1. #29529 (Ronald Earp) E Prod Valve Train Request

In Production, GCR Section 9.1.5.E.2.f.5, change as follows:

"Pushrods are unrestricted. Rocker shafts and/or shaft pedestals, when utilized in the stock system, can be replaced by alternate shafts and/or pedestals and are unrestricted. Valve rocker arms, *and/or* rocker type cam followers *are unrestricted, but the* rocker ratios and *or* rocker/follower ratios must be stock."

Taken Care Of
Strategic

1. #29052 (Armen Megregian) Sunday Grp2 race at the June Sprints

Thank you for your letter. This has been referred to the event operations team.

2. #29352 (Tim Minor) Scca Pro Licence

Thank you for your letter. This had been referred to SCCA Pro Racing.

3. #29618 (Tim Linerud) Treatment of Peter Zekert

Thank you for your letter. Please see the November 2020 Court of Appeals and October 23, 2020 Board of Directors Minutes posted in Fastrack.

4. #29619 (David Ligon) Peter Zekert denied entry at the runoffs

Thank you for your letter. Please see the November 2020 Court of Appeals and October 23, 2020 Board of Directors Minutes posted in Fastrack.

5. #29623 (Tim White) Peter Zekert

Thank you for your letter. Please see the November 2020 Court of Appeals and October 23, 2020 Board of Directors Minutes posted in Fastrack.

6. #29633 (Peter Zekert) Runoffs Supps: Eligibility for a Race Start

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter 29695 in this edition of Fastrack.

7. #29695 (Jason Stine) Strict Enforcement of 115% Rule at Runoffs

Thank you for your letter. The CRB will work with the Race Director and event staff to finalize the supplemental regulations language prior to the 2021 Runoffs.

EP

1. #29517 (Kevin Koelemeyer) Support of Proposed Brake Rule Change

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to Letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

2. #29584 (Heikki Silegren) Favors alternate brakes in Production

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

FP

1. #29518 (Perry Simonds) Support of Brake Rule

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to Letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

2. #29525 (Stephen Simonds) Support for New Brake Rule

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to Letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

HP

1. #29571 (Bill Hingston) Supports alt brakes

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to Letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

Prod General

1. #29491 (Eric Prill) Support for Letter #27417 Production Brakes

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to Letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

2. #29516 (William Hubiak) Support for Changes to brake rule

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to Letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

3. #29519 (Eric Griesinger) Support of New Alternate Brake Rule

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to Letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

4. #29520 (Bill Lamkin) Support of Proposed Brake Rule

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to Letter #29516 in the current Fastrack.

5. #29538 (Mike Cummings) Opposition to Changes to the Brake Rules in Production

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter #29510 in current Fastrack.

6. #29568 (Mike Bachman) Opposed to Letter 27417 Production Brake Upgrade

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter #29510 in current Fastrack.

7. #29572 (John Faull) Opposes Alternate Brakes for Production

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter #29510 in current Fastrack.

8. #29587 (Jonathon Becker) Opposes proposed brake rules change for production

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter #29510 in the current Fastrack.

9. #29662 (Aaron Johnson) No Weight Penalty for New Brake Rule

Thank you for your letter. Please see response to letter #29510 in the current Fastrack.

T2

1. #29267 (ALI SALIH) Reevaluate BoP for T2 / E92M3

Thank you for your letter. Please see recent changes allowed in letter 28266 in current Fastrack.

2. #29651 (Ali Salih) Please Remove BBK Penalty From e92M3 Spec Line

Thank you for your letter. Please see recent changes allowed in letter 28266 in current Fastrack.

What Do You Think

ST General

1. #26402 (John Weisberg) Request to create a flat plate restrictor size/engine displ table

The Club Racing Board requests class stakeholder input on considered throttle body changes in the ST class. Please reply via the CRB letter log system.

1. Should ST standardize a throttle body size per displacement? Or per class?
2. Should individual throttle bodies be allowed in all STU engines with a weight penalty?

RESUMES

None.