

## CLUB RACING BOARD

### CLUB RACING BOARD MINUTES | October 2, 2018

The Club Racing Board met by teleconference on October 2, 2018. Participating were Jim Wheeler, Chairman; Todd Butler, David Arken, John LaRue, Kevin Fandozzi, Peter Keane, Tim Myers, and Pam Richardson, secretary. Also participating were: Bob Dowie, Bruce Lindstrand, and Marcus Meredith, BoD liaisons; Rick Harris, Club Racing Technical Manager, and Scott Schmidt, Club Racing Technical Assistant. The following decisions were made:

#### **Member Advisory**

##### **SM**

1. #25451 (Club Racing Board) Member Advisory Memo Spec Miata  
After CRB review and in consultation with Mazda and SCCA Technical resources the CRB would like to provide the following Advisory Memo guidance for Spec Miata competitors:

Given recent events, the SCCA CRB would like to advise Spec Miata competitors that Spec Miata OEM, re-manufactured or rebuilt axles do not have a published specification nor are the axles a serviceable item. For the remainder of 2018, Spec Miata OEM, re-manufactured or rebuilt axles will not be a tech examined item. As a follow up, the CRB has asked the SMAC to provide a recommendation for 2019 for Spec Miata axles.

##### **STL**

1. #25313 (TO Johnson) Request Rule Clarification Re: RX-8 Factory Stock/Spec Brakes  
Thank you for your request. The STL class maximum rotor size is 300 mm. If the factory rotors on a vehicle exceed the 300 mm maximum then smaller rotors must be installed.

##### **STU**

1. #25301 (Andrew Chartrand) Request STU Suspension Fabrication Clarification  
A trailing arm suspension is considered fabricated, if all or any of the trailing arm doesn't remain stock. If pick up points are relocated, the weight multipliers must be added to the vehicle weight.

##### **T2-T4**

1. #25450 (Club Racing Board) Advisory Memo for Touring.  
Touring competitors are reminded that the following cars are spec cars from another series racing with SCCA and must adhere strictly to those spec rules when racing in SCCA Touring classes without exception. All competitors should have access to their spec class rules.

##### **T2:**

BMW 235iR - as homologated from BMW Motorsports. No other changes permitted. For reference, World-Challenge VTS 2/25/2016 rev.2

Nissan 350Z Spec Z - Must conform to all SpecZ 2018 Edition rules.

Spec Mustang: Must conform to all 2018 Spec Mustang rules.

##### **T3:**

Nissan 350Z Spec Z - Must conform to all SpecZ 2018 Edition rules.

BMW SpecE46 - Must conform to all SpecE46 rules in Appendix N. SpecE46 spec tire permitted per SpecE46 appendix rules.

## **No Action Required**

### **STU**

1. #25376 (Kevin Koelemeyer) Opposes Aftermarket Turbos in Letter #24832  
Thank you for your feedback. The CRB will continue to monitor class performance.

## **Not Recommended**

### **P2**

1. #25255 (Armen Megregian) Re: Letter #24959 Regarding Honda K20 Seals  
Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not recommend this change. If the Board of Directors approves the recommendation of sealed CN engines, competitors with existing engines may arrange for Aurora Motorsports to verify compliance with CN regulations and apply the required seals. Competitors also may arrange with Aurora Motorsports to have engines rebuilt and sealed. New sealed engines will be available for purchase from Aurora Motorsports. If a competitor wishes to purchase an engine from another source and have Aurora apply the required seals, a fee will be charged for verification of the engine's compliance with CN regulations and application of the seals.

2. #25405 (Armen Megregian) Follow Up to Letter 25255 Regarding Honda K20 Seals  
Thank you for your letter. The CRB does not recommend this change. Please see the responses to letter #25255 and letter #24959, October 2018 Fastrack Minutes.

### **GCR**

1. #25285 (Anthony Parker) Request Clarifying Racing/Passing After Waved Yellow Flag  
Thank you for your letter. Basically, you are requesting SCCA adopt the FIA definition for the no passing zone.

Due to varying track configurations and the shortage of flagging staff at our events, waiting for the next turn station to show a green flag will take away a lot of clear, safe track from racing once past the incident.

2. #25302 (Mark Pfeffer) Request Window Safety Net Approval

Thank you for your request. The GCR specifies the driver side "window" net must meet SFI 27.1 or FIA J253.11 specifications. The open roll cage net you are requesting to use does not meet either of those specifications and would not cover the majority of the window opening in most cars.

### **GT2**

1. #24794 (Joe Aquilante) Request to Classify GT 4 McLaren in GT2/ST Spec Line  
Thank you for your request. This car will be classified in the new GTX class for 2019. Please see the response to letter #23060, Technical Bulletin.

### **T1**

1. #25169 (Hugh Stewart) Request Compression Ratio Change for Alternate Piston  
Thank you for your request. 12.0 compression ratio pistons appear to be available.

## **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](http://www.clubracingboard.com).

## AS

1. #25249 (Club Racing Board) E/O for Letters 24929 and 24930, Approved by the BOD 8/2018

Add to the Notes for the 93-97 Restricted Prep. Camaro/Firebird 5.7L V8 after wording in letter #24929: *May use gears 1-4 or 2-5 of OEM gear ratios listed in this specification line to build a 4 speed Full Preparation Transmission with a 50 lb weight adder. May use gears 1-5 OEM gear ratios listed in this specification line to build a 5 speed Full Preparation Transmission with a 50 lb weight adder.*

Add to the Notes for the 98-02 Restricted Prep. Camaro/Firebird 5.7L V8 after wording in letter #24929: *May use gears 1-4 or 2-5 of OEM gear ratios listed in this specification line to build a 4 speed Full Preparation Transmission with a 50 lb. weight adder. May use gears 1-5 OEM gear ratios listed in this specification line to build a 5 speed Full Preparation Transmission with a 50 lb weight adder.*

Add to the Notes for the 03-04 Restricted Prep. Mustang Mach 1 4.6L V8 after wording in letter #24930: *May use gears 1-4 or 2-5 of OEM gear ratios listed in this specification line to build a 4 speed Full Preparation Transmission with a 50 lb weight adder. May use gears 1-5 OEM gear ratios listed in this specification line to build a 5 speed Full Preparation Transmission with a 50 lb weight adder.*

2. #25274 (Club Racing Board) Additional Transmission Gear Ratio Sets for FP Cars  
The Club Racing Board recommends the below ratio gear sets for all Full Preparation cars.  
Add 9.1.6.D.3.a.1.f:

*f. All FP cars may use any of the below gear ratios (along with sample vendor in parentheses) with a 50 lb weight adder:*

*2.42, 1.53, 1.23, 1.00, .63 (T5);  
2.87, 1.89, 1.28, 1.00, .82 (Tremec)  
2.64, 1.60, 1.23, 1.00 ( T10 X ratio set)  
2.57, 1.61, 1.26, 1.00 (Auto Gear)  
2.66, 1.78, 1.3, 1.00, .73 (General)*

## GCR

1. #25080 (SCCA Staff) Clarify Wording in GCR 3.5.1. Waivers

Change 3.5.1:

3.5.1. Waivers All participants must be properly credentialed for the event. Each adult participant must also either sign the SCCA waiver at the event or have an SCCA annual waiver on file at the National Office and present his hard card it at registration. Each minor participant must also have the event minor waiver signed by one or both parents. *If the minor, between the ages of 14-18 years old, requires hazardous area credentials they must* ~~or~~ have an executed annual minor waiver on file at the National Office and present his hard card at registration.

2. #25166 (Glen Thielke) Race Data Technician  
Make changes to 5.11.5:

5.11.5. Race Data Technicians

*This program is to assist the Club Racing Board in performance balancing. If selected, drivers' participation is not optional and is not protestable. The data collected will not be used for compliance purposes. All cars carrying an SCCA data collection device shall report to impound immediately after their sessions.*

Data Technicians are ~~optional~~ Officials whose duties include:

- A. Being responsible for placing, operating and removing SCCA supplied data boxes on cars at all Club races.
- B. Analysis of data retrieved from all sources, including dyno runs, at-race data boxes and data provided by individual racers.
- C. Prepare reports to the applicable Advisory Committees, and to the CRB, with recommendations for competition adjustments.

*D. Data Technician's will be required:*

- 1. To keep all information collected and analysis completed confidential and not share the information outside of other licensed Data Technician, Road Racing Board, respective committees and SCCA National Staff.*
- 2. Not use the information for any purpose other than the performance of duties as a Data Technician on behalf of the SCCA.*

Change/Add to 9.3.16 DATA COLLECTION DEVICES

Data collection devices are considered to be instrumentation and are therefore allowed in all classes that permit the installation, replacement or addition of gauges, indicators or instruments.

*A. Driver Data Collection - Data collection devices are considered to be instrumentation and are therefore allowed in all classes that permit the installation, replacement or addition of gauges, indicators or instruments.*

*B. Official Data Collection - The Club Racing Board uses SCCA data acquisition devices to assist in performance balancing. Race Data Technicians assist in placing the SCCA data acquisition devices at events. If selected, drivers' participation is not optional and is not protestable. The data collected will not be used for compliance purposes. All cars carrying an SCCA data collection device shall report to impound immediately after their sessions.*

**GT General**

1. #25472 (Club Racing Board) Rules for GTX Class for 1019

9.1.2.H GTX Category Specifications:

A. Purpose and Philosophy

The intent of the GTX category is to allow competition of production-based vehicles that compete in professional road racing series in the United States.

The GTX class will have annual balance of performance (BOP) changes. Weights may be adjusted or cars may be subject to changes in intake restrictors to meet periodic professional series changes. Cars may be required to carry data acquisition equipment for review of performance.

B. Eligibility

Vehicles meeting one of the following criteria may compete in the GTX category:

FIA GT3:

- Cars will be approved on a case-by-case basis with supporting documentation.
- Competitors must have the FIA GT3 sheet, as approved, available for scrutineers when requested.
- Cars approved to run in accordance with their FIA GT3 specifications must adhere to those

specifications.

- See 9.1.XXX, table of Approved FIA GT3 Cars.

#### FIA GT4:

- Cars will be approved on a case-by-case basis with supporting documentation.
- Competitors must have the FIA GT4 sheet, as approved, available for scrutineers when requested.
- Cars approved to run in accordance with their FIA GT4 specifications must adhere to those specifications.
- See 9.1.XXX, table of Approved FIA GT4 Cars.

#### TCR:

- Cars will be approved on a case-by-case basis with supporting documentation.
- Competitors must have the TCR sheet, as approved, available for scrutineers when requested.
- Cars approved to run in accordance with their TCR specifications must adhere to those specifications.
- See 9.1.XXX, table of Approved TCR Cars.

#### GTX Tube Frame:

- GTX tube frame cars will consist of currently classified GT1 cars with improved aerodynamics, wheels, brakes and limited fuel injection systems. GTX tube frame cars must weigh 2780 pounds.

#### GTX Grand Am Tube Frame:

- GTX Grand Am tube frame cars will consist of fuel injected tube frame cars classified in the Grand Am Road Racing series from 2007-2013. GTX Grand Am tube frame cars must provide their Grand Am rule set and specifications.

#### C. Bodywork

1. FIA or TCR standard bodywork must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### D. Aerodynamic Devices

1. FIA or TCR aerodynamic devices must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications. Trans Am splitter tunnels and rear wing rules are permitted. Under panning may be installed under the engine bay and rear end housing.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### E. Interiors

1. FIA or TCR interiors must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### F. Chassis

1. FIA or TCR chassis must comply with their associated specifications.
2. FIA or TCR chassis weight must meet the vehicle weight listed on the associated specification line.
3. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
4. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### G. Engine

1. FIA or TCR engines must comply with their associated specifications.
2. FIA GT3 cars must compete with the listed restriction in the specification lines.
3. FIA GT4 cars are permitted to compete without restriction.
4. TCR cars are permitted to compete with 100% engine management.
5. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications. Additionally, the following engines are permitted:

362 cubic inch engines include:

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

6. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### H. Cooling System

1. FIA or TCR cooling systems must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### I. Fueling, Piping and Fuel Tanks

1. FIA or TCR fueling, piping and fuel tanks must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. GTX tube frame cars may install fuel injection system, maximum throttle body size TBD.
4. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### J. Oil System

1. FIA or TCR oil systems must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### K. Exhaust System

1. FIA or TCR exhaust systems must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### L. Electrical

1. FIA or TCR electrical systems must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### M. Drivetrain

1. FIA or TCR drivetrains must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

#### N. Suspension and Steering

1. FIA or TCR suspension and steering must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

## O. Brakes

1. FIA or TCR brakes must comply with their associated specifications.
2. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications, except brake calipers and rotors do not have a size limit.
3. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

## P. Tires and Wheels

1. Tires must conform to 9.3. Tires.
2. FIA or TCR wheels must comply with their associated specifications.
3. GTX tube frame cars shall refer to 9.1.2 GT1 category specifications, wheels may be increased to 12.5" front and 13" rear.
4. Grand Am tube frame cars must comply with the 2007-13 GA specifications.

FIA GT3 -					
Make		Model	Restrictor mm	Weight (lbs)	Notes
Acura	GT3- 047	NSX	None	3015	
Aston Martin	GT3-O32	Vantage	(2) 35 TIR (2) 41.5	2980	
Audi	GT3-038	R8 LMS	(2) 39	2980	
Bentley	GT3-035	Continental	(2) 38	3070	
BMW	GT3-043	M6	(2) 34 TIR	TBD	
Chevrolet	GT3-045	Corvette C7	52	3070	
Dodge	GT3-036	Viper	(2) 39	3120	
Ferrari	GT3-029	458	(2) 40 TIR	3025	
Ferrari	GT3-044	488	(2) 35 TIR	3025	
Lamborghini	GT3-040	Huracan	(2) 39	3015	
McLaren	GT3-037	650S	(2) 36 TIR	2915	
Mercedes	GT3-042	AMG GT	(2) 34.5	3090	
Porsche	GT3-041	991	(2) 41.5	2960	
Nissan	GT3-030	GT-R	(2) 40 TIR	3050	

FIA GT4 -					
Make		Model	Restrictor mm	Weight (lbs)	Notes
Aston Martin	GT4-	Vantage	NA	TBD	
Audi	GT4-038	R8	NA	3400	
BMW	GT4-	M4	NA	TBD	
Chevrolet	GT4-031	Camaro	NA	3310	
Ford	GT4-027	Mustang	NA	3490	
Ginetta	GT4-019	G55	NA	2600	
Maserati	GT4-MC	Gran Turismo	NA	3290	
MaClaren	GT4-030	570S	NA	3220	
Mercedes	GT4-xxx	AMG	NA	3270	
Panoz	GT4-xxx	Avezzano	NA	3310	
Porsche	GT4-024	Cayman	NA	2990	

TCR -					
Make	Model	Trans	Power Level	Weight (lbs)	Notes
Audi	RS3 LMS	SEQ	100%	2790	
Audi	RS3 LMS	DSG	100%	2715	
Honda	Civic Type R	SEQ	100%	2790	
Hyundai	i30 N	SEQ	100%	2790	
Volkswagon	Golf GTI	SEQ	100%	2790	
Volkswagon	Golf GTI	DSG	100%	2715	



## **T1**

1. #25148 (Hugh Stewart) Request for Carbon Fiber Trunk Lid on BMW E46 M3  
Thank you for your request. Please add to the Notes for the T1-FP BMW E46 M3: *CSL style carbon fiber rear trunk lid allowed +75lbs.*

## **Taken Care Of**

### **P2**

1. #25240 (Armen Megregian) Concern Over Letter #25098 and Diffusers  
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #25237, Technical Bulletin.

### **IT General**

1. #25272 (James Bell) Opposes IT Rule Change - Tires to Be Minimum 200 Treadwear  
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #24710, October 2018 Fastrack Minutes.

### **ITC**

1. #25289 (Jennifer Ettish) Opposes Tires  
Thank you for your letter. Please see the response to letter #24710 October 2018 Fastrack Minutes.

## **What Do You Think**

None.

## **RESUMES**

None.

## TECH BULLETIN

DATE: October 20, 2018

NUMBER: TB 18-11

FROM: Club Racing Board

TO: Competitors, Stewards, and Scrutineers

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

All changes are effective 11/1/2018 unless otherwise noted.

### American Sedan

None

### B-Spec

None

### Formula/Sports Racing

#### FA

1. #25109 (Formula/Sports Racing Committee) Admit F3 Americas Car to FA

In FA Table 2, add a new spec line as follows:

Table 2						
Car	Engine	Wheel Width (in)	Aero	Transmission	Weight	Notes
<i>F3 Americas</i>	<i>2.0 Liter Honda K20c1</i>	<i>see notes</i>	<i>see notes</i>	<i>see notes</i>	<i>see notes</i>	<i>Car must comply with F3 Americas rules. Competitors must have current copies of FIA Formula 3 Technical Regulations, Onroak Automotive Ligier JS F3 Information Manual, and HPD engine-related specifications and instructions in their possession and present them upon request.</i>

In GCR Section 9.1.1.A.1.e, add the following language:

“Superchargers or turbochargers are not permitted *unless specifically authorized by a spec line in Table 2.*”

2. #25262 (Formula/Sports Racing Committee) Move Swift 014 - MZR 2.0 line to FA Table 2

In FA Table 1, delete Line P in its entirety.

In FA Table 2, add a new spec line as follows:

Table 2						
Car	Engine	Wheel Width (in) ± .060	Aero			Notes
<i>Swift 014 chassis only</i>	<i>Mazda MZR 2.0</i>	<i>(F) 10 (R) 14 Min. &amp; 15 Max.</i>	<i>See FA rules</i>	<i>5 speed sequential</i>	<i>1300</i>	<i>Sealed engine sourced by Elite Engines</i>

## FE

1. #25433 (Robey Clark) Request for Anti Roll / Sway Bar Clarification

In GCR section 9.1.1.I.8.f, add the wording as follows:

*“Anti-roll bars (sway bars) may be **run** disconnected, but not removed. **One anti-roll bar link may be removed from the chassis for safety reasons, but no modification of the link or attachments is permitted.**”*

## FV

1. #24977 (Formula/Sports Racing Committee) Request Spec Tire for FV

In GCR section 9.1.1.C.3.D, make changes as follows:

~~“Any tire size may be fitted, except that ungrooved radial race tires (radial slicks) are not allowed. **The following tires are required:**”~~

*“Fronts*

*Hoosier #43337 FVS*

*21.0 x 5.0 x 15”*

*“Rears*

*Hoosier #43353 FVS*

*22.5 x 5.5 x 15”*

*“Rain tires are open for 2019.*

*Effective 1/1/2020, the following rain tire is required:*

*Hoosier #44266*

*22.5 x 5.0 x 15 Hoosier WET (rain)”*

2. #25222 (Richard Pare) Replacement front Spindles Clarification

In GCR section 9.1.1.C.3.A.11 add the wording as follows:

*“Alternate spindle from ICP, part number ICPVWS001, A alternate spindle from cip1.com, part number C26-412-020 and alternate spindle carrier C26-412- 025 are allowed.”*

## P2

1. #25237 (Armen Megregian) Concern over letter #25908 about CN bodywork

In P2 Table 1, FIA Group CN non-composite chassis spec line, change the notes as follows:

*“FIA Group CN homologated chassis, brake calipers and discs, hub carriers, and suspension components required. ~~FIA Group CN compliant~~ **V de V Endurance Series permitted** bodywork, **rear diffuser**, wing, wheels, and assisted shifting ~~permitted~~ **allowed**. Must comply with all other P2 requirements. **Competitors must have copies of FIA Group CN Technical Regulations and V de V Endurance Series Sporting and Technical Regulations in their possession and present them upon request.**”*

2. #25318 (Formula/Sports Racing Committee) Correct P2 Table 1 (Spec Line Cars)

AMAC-AM5 E&O

In P2 Table 1, AMAC-AM5, Fox-2 Seater, Zephyrus, Decker 1/2 spec line, add to notes as follows:

*“Decker 1/2: minimum width 52 inches. **AMAC-AM5: minimum width 54 inches.**”*

## GCR

None

## Grand Touring

### GT2

1. #25214 (Grand Touring Committee) GT2/ST wording relocation for better viewing

In GCR Appendix K.P.1. add the wording as follows:

*“**Slicks allowed on all GT2/ST cars with a 100-pound weight penalty.**”*

## GTL

1. #25431 (Joe Harlan) Request to fix E and O in 240sx classification  
In GTL, NISSAN 240SX (S13/S14) add to notes as follows:

<b>GTL Cars - Nissan</b>					
Model	Years	Body Style	Drive-line	Wheel-base (in)	Notes
240-SX (S13/S14)	NA	2dr	RWD	97.5 or 99.4	<i>Hood Bulge allowed, no openings.</i>

See Race Memo 18-07

## Production

1. #24579 (David Mead) Request to add allowances for 2016+ Miata in EP  
In EP, classify the Mazda MX-5 (16-18) as follows:

<b>EP</b>	Prep. Level	Weight (lbs)	Engine Type	Bore x Stroke mm/(in.)	Displ. cc/ (ci) (nominal)	Block Mat'l	Head/PN & Mat'l	Valves IN & EX mm/(in.)	Carb. No. & Type	Wheel-base mm/(in.)	Track (F/R) mm/(in.)
<i>Mazda MX-5 (16-18)</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2350 *2409 **2468</i>	<i>4 cyl. DOHC</i>	<i>83.6 x 91.2 (3.29x3.59)</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Alum</i>	<i>Alum</i>	<i>(I) (1.25) (E) (1.04)</i>	<i>Fuel Injection</i>	<i>(90.9)</i>	<i>(63.2/63.5)</i>

Wheels (max)	Trans. Speeds (max)	Brakes Std. (mm/(in.))	Brakes Alt.: mm/(in.)	Fuel Injected Equipped Throttle Body Inside Diameter (mm) +/- .25mm	Notes:
<i>17 x 8</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>(F) 280 x 22 vented (R) 280 x 9.5 solid</i>		<i>Stock Throttle Body I.D.</i>	<i>Comp. Ratio limited to 13.0:1. Valve lift limited to .500". OEM hardtop allowed.</i>

In EP, Mazda MX-5, make changes as follows:  
Mazda MX-5 *Global Cup* (16-18)".

## FP

1. #25173 (Robert Zatz) Request to classify Ford Escort ZX2  
In FP, classify the Ford Escort ZX2 (98-03) as follows: see attached

FP	Prep. Level	Weight (lbs)	Engine Type	Bore x Stroke mm/(in.)	Displ. cc/ (ci) (nominal)	Block Mat'l	Head/PN & Mat'l	Valves IN & EX mm/(in.)	Carb. No. & Type	Wheel-base mm/(in.)	Track (F/R) mm/(in.)
<i>Ford Escort ZX-2 (98-03)</i>	2	2275 *2332 **2389	4 cyl. DOHC	84.0 x 88.0	1989	Alum	Alum	(I) 32.0 (E) 28.0	Fuel Injection	(98.4)	(60.7/60.7)

Wheels (max)	Trans. Speeds (max)	Brakes Std. (mm/(in.))	Brakes Alt.: mm/(in.)	Fuel Injected Equipped Throttle Body Inside Diameter (mm) +/- .25mm	Notes:
15 x 7	5	(F) 257 x 22 vented (R) 251 x 9 solid		Stock Throttle Body I.D.	Comp. Ratio limited to 11.0:1. Valve lift limited to .450".

2. #25281 (Brett Whisenant) Request 2002-2004 Ford Focus SVT classification  
In FP, classify the Ford Focus SVT (02-04) as follows: see attached

FP	Prep. Level	Weight (lbs)	Engine Type	Bore x Stroke mm/(in.)	Displ. cc/ (ci) (nominal)	Block Mat'l	Head/PN & Mat'l	Valves IN & EX mm/(in.)	Carb. No. & Type	Wheel-base mm/(in.)	Track (F/R) mm/(in.)
<i>Ford Focus SVT (02-04)</i>	2	2375 *2434 **2494	4 cyl. DOHC	84.0 x 88.0	1989	Alum	Alum	(I) 33.5 (E) 28.0	Fuel Injection	(103.0)	(63.1/62.8)

Wheels (max)	Trans. Speeds (max)	Brakes Std. (mm/(in.))	Brakes Alt.: mm/(in.)	Fuel Injected Equipped Throttle Body Inside Diameter (mm) +/- .25mm	Notes:
17 x 8	6	(F) 300 x 24 vented (R) 280 x 10 solid		Stock Throttle Body I.D.	Comp. Ratio limited to 11.0:1. Valve lift limited to .450".

## Spec Miata

1. #25451 (Club Racing Board ) Spec Miata Axles

Given recent events, the SCCA CRB makes the following change to the GCR effective immediately for the remainder of the 2018 Spec Miata season. The CRB acknowledges that Spec Miata OEM, re-manufactured or rebuilt axles do not have a published specification nor are the axles a serviceable item. As a follow-up the CRB has asked the SMAC to provide a recommendation for 2019 for Spec Miata axles.

Add to section 9.1.7.C.2

*"i. The half-shaft CV Joints shall be an OEM or OEM equivalent part. The internal cage and bearing dimensions are unrestricted. This rule is effective until 12/31/18."*

See Race Memo 18-08

## Strategic

None

**Super Touring  
ST General**

1. #25319 (Darren Murdock) Rules Clarifications

In GCR section 9.1.4.M.16.a, add the wording as follows:

*“disconnected, pump, belt, pulley, and hoses may be removed. Hoses may also be looped. Steering rack or box may be modified internally to work without pump.”*

**Touring**

**T1**

1. #25290 (Christopher Childs) Request for FP350S

In T1, Ford Mustang / Thunderbird, delete the spec line as follows:

Max Displacement: ~~5200 Shelby FP350S sealed engine, M-6007-M52R~~

Min weight: ~~3525~~

Required restrictor: ~~65mm flat plate~~

2. #25410 (Club Racing Board ) Request to classify 2015 Porsche Cayman S and GTS 3.4L Effective 9-26-2018, in T1, add the Porsche Cayman S and GTS 3.4L (14-15) as follows: see attached

<b>T1</b>	<b>Maximum Displ.</b>	<b>Min. Weight</b>	<b>Required Restrictor</b>	<b>Engine Notes</b>	<b>Chassis Notes</b>
Porsche Cayman/S/GTS (05-13-15)	<i>3400</i>	<i>2750</i>			
	3600	2800			
	3800	2850		Must meet OEM Specification	

See RM 18-06

### JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Bob Demers vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-09-NE October 4, 2018

#### FACTS IN BRIEF

On June 24, 2018, following the final race of the of the day at Watkins Glen International, Bob Demers (T2 #5) filed a Protest charging John Heinricy (T4 #38) with violation of GCR 6.11.1.A., B., C., and D. Mr. Demers specifically charged Mr. Heinricy with making an unsafe pass that resulted in contact putting Mr. Demers' car into a track barrier.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Terry Hanushek, Phil Kelly, Meridith Croucher, Tim Meddaugh, Donna McDonough, Richard Muise, and John Walsh (Chairman), met, interviewed witnesses, reviewed witness statements, and determined that there was likely shared responsibility for the incident, but no evidence of a violation of GCR 6.11.1. Mr. Demers appealed the ruling issued by the SOM.

#### DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Anne Christian, Pat McCammon, and Spencer Gorham (Chairman) met on August 9, 2018, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

#### DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal letter from Bob Demers, received July 3, 2018.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received July 11, 2018.
3. Email statement from Steve Pence, Super Tour Race Director, received July 11, 2018.
4. Additional witness statements and video provided by Mr. Demers in support of his appeal, received July 12, 2018.
5. Protest rehearing documents, received September 5, 2018.

#### FINDINGS

Mr. Demers provided a detailed account and additional video of the incident. Race Director Steve Pence provided an explanatory statement detailing the incident and his support of the appeal. In-car videos were available from Mr. Demers' car and a following car driven by Felix Borodaty (T4 #56).

The incident occurred at the apex of turn 11. Mr. Heinricy attempted an outside pass of Mr. Demers after trailing him on the prior lap. Mr. Demers was on the right side of the track approaching the corner apex. Mr. Heinricy was on the left side of the track taking a normal racing line. As both cars reached the apex, Mr. Heinricy's path intersected the path of Mr. Demers. The front of Mr. Demers' car contacted the right side of Mr. Heinricy's car. The contact caused Mr. Demers' car to spin and contact the left side track barrier head on. Mr. Demers' car was unable to continue, and Mr. Heinricy continued to complete the race. Mr. Demers suffered significant physical injuries as a result of the contact. The SOM decision found that both drivers had shared responsibility for the incident.

The COA found that Mr. Demers, due to injuries suffered in the crash, was not in a physical condition to gather and present evidence or give reasonable testimony to the SOM at the time of the hearing.

Under GCR 8.4.5.A. and GCR 8.4.5.A.2., the COA may request the original SOM reconvene and rehear a protest. In this case the COA requested a new SOM be convened by Fred Brinkel, NE Division Executive Steward, to provide Mr. Demers and Mr. Heinricy with full due process. The COA returned the decision and all evidence to the SOM on August 6, 2018, requesting they convene and hear the protest.

The new SOM members were Ken Blackburn, John Nesbitt, and Kathy McLeod (Chairman). On September 5, 2018, the SOM found that Mr. Heinricy had violated GCR 6.11.1.A./B./C./D. by failing to leave racing room and making avoidable contact. Mr. Heinricy was penalized with being moved to last overall race position and a ten (10) event weekend probation. The SOM decision was not appealed.

### **DECISION**

The COA upholds the revised SOM decision in its entirety. All parties were provided adequate time for subsequent appeals and the matter is now closed. Mr. Demers' appeal was well founded, and his appeal fee, less the administrative portion retained by SCCA, will be returned.



**JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**  
**Lev Uretsky vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-13-NE**  
**September 13, 2018**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

On July 22, 2018, following the Group 5 U.S. Majors Race at New Jersey Motorsports Park, multiple protests were filed charging Lev Uretsky (STL #14) with violating General Competition Rules (GCR) 2.1.4 (Driving recklessly or dangerously) and 6.1. (Flags).

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), David Gomberg, Grant McStay, and Kathy McLeod, Chairman, opted to hear all protests simultaneously. The SOM met, reviewed the evidence, and determined that Mr. Uretsky violated GCR 6.1.1.B. The SOM penalized Mr. Uretsky with loss of three (3) positions in class plus no Majors points for Sunday's race. The SOM additionally issued a penalty of probation for a period of three (3) event weekends for Unsportsmanlike Conduct (GCR 2.1.7.). Mr. Uretsky is appealing only the probation penalty.

**DATES OF THE COURT**

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Laurie Sheppard, Spencer Gorham, and Anne Christian (Chairman) met August 30 and September 6 and 13, 2018 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

**DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Appeal letter from Lev Uretsky, received by the COA August 23, 2018.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received August 23, 2018.
3. Video evidence considered by the SOM, received August 23, 2018.
4. Event Summary from Kathy McCleod, Chairman SOM, received August 23, 2018.

**FINDINGS**

The multiple protests considered by the SOM listed two infractions: GCR 2.1.4. (Driving recklessly or dangerously) and GCR 6.1. (Flags). The COA notes that one Protest form does say Mr. Uretsky exhibited unsportsmanlike behavior when approached in impound but does not specifically charge violation of GCR 2.1.7. None of the witness statements from the protestors mention the alleged unsportsmanlike behavior and no additional witness statements are found that support the statement on the protest form. A narrative written by the Chairman of the Stewards of the Meeting mentioned Mr. Uretsky's attitude during his private interview.

The COA finds the lack of documentation or paper trail describing investigation of the allegation of unsportsmanlike conduct is not supportive of the assessment of a penalty. The COA directs that the three (3) event weekend probation for violation of GCR 2.1.7. (Unsportsmanlike Conduct) is rescinded.

Mr. Uretsky provided a narrative account of the multiple on track passes under full course yellow and acknowledged fault with an apology in his appeal letter to the COA. Since Mr. Uretsky did not appeal the penalty assessed for passing under a full course yellow flag condition, the COA declares that issue closed and the penalty of loss of three (3) positions in class and associated Majors points is not subject to this appeal ruling.

The three (3) penalty points applied to Mr. Uretsky's license for the penalty of "Probation of SCCA competition privileges" are removed. In the absence of other penalties, the COA directs that two (2) penalty points be applied to Mr. Uretsky's license for the penalty of "Loss of time, lap, or finishing position" for violation of 6.1.1.B. (Yellow Flag).

SCCA strives to ensure that ALL participants in its events and activities enjoy a welcoming environment, free of harassment, discrimination, and any behavior that interferes with a safe, fun and exciting experience. Competitors are reminded to treat each other with the highest respect when interacting after a race.

**DECISION**

The COA overturns the SOM decision to impose probation for Unsportsmanlike Conduct and the penalty is rescinded. Mr. Uretsky's appeal is well founded and the appeal fee, less the administrative portion retained by SCCA, will be returned.

**JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**  
**Sam Schechter vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-14-NE**  
**September 13, 2018**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

On July 29, 2018, at the MARRS #6 regional race at Summit Point Motorsports Park, Sam Schechter, driver of Spec Miata (SM) #87 protested Michael Collins, driver of SM #75, charging that Mr. Collins violated GCR 6.11.1.A. and D. Mr. Schechter claimed that Mr. Collins left the track surface and when returning contacted the rear of Mr. Schechter's car. A Request for Action (RFA) was also initiated by Assistant Chief Steward Fred Brinkel, citing the same incident.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Jim Harrison, Larry Oliver, George Bloeser, Terry Hanushek, and John Deonarine Jr., Chairman, met, reviewed the evidence, and upheld the protest. The SOM considered the protest and the RFA together as a single action. The SOM found that both drivers shared responsibility for the incident and each was penalized with a reprimand. The penalty of reprimand caused one (1) penalty point to be assessed to each driver. Mr. Schechter appealed the SOM ruling.

**DATES OF THE COURT**

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Pat McCammon, Michael West, and Spencer Gorham, (Chairman) met on August 30 and September 6 and 13, 2018 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

**DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Appeal letter from Sam Schechter, received by the COA August 24, 2018.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received August 24, 2018.
3. Video evidence from Car #46, Car #75, and Car #87 considered by the SOM, received August 24, 2018.
4. New video evidence from Mr. Schechter, received August 24, 2018.
5. Email from Michael Collins, received August 24, 2018.
6. Email from John Deonarine Jr, Chairman SOM, received August 31, 2018.

**FINDINGS**

The COA reviewed the written and video evidence referenced in the SOM decision and the appeal. The videos were viewed from the two cars involved and from Car #46, traveling immediately behind the incident. The videos showed that on the first racing lap Car #87 was leading Car #75 between turns 2 and 3. Car #87 was initially at the center of the track with Car #75 on his right with some overlap. Car #87 moved to the right to take the racing line behind a leading car. His move forced Car #75 to move driver's right with two wheels off the racing surface to avoid contact. As Car #75 attempted to move back to the racing surface he contacted the rear of Car #87. Car #87 spun 90 degrees to the racing line and left the track contacting a fixed barrier. Car #75 continued to finish the race.

The SOM found that both drivers violated GCR 6.11.1. (Rules of the Road/On Course Driver Conduct.) The COA reviewed the additional video and written evidence submitted by Mr. Schechter but found that it did not add to understanding of the incident in question.

The COA finds that Mr. Schechter violated GCR 6.11.1.B. (Racing Room) and Mr. Collins violated GCR 6.11.1.A (Contact). The COA does not find sufficient evidence to overturn the SOM's decision. The penalties assessed by the SOM are within their purview as defined in

GCR 7.2. (Range of Penalties).

**DECISION**

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

**JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**  
**Jon Brandstad vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-15-NP**  
**September 13, 2018**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

On July 28, 2018, at the conclusion of the San Francisco Region Double Regional 11-12, Group 4 race at WeatherTech Raceway Laguna Seca, Assistant Chief Steward Gary Pitts filed a Request for Action (RFA) for the SOM to investigate contact between Formula Continental (FC) #81 driven by Ken Rozeboom and Formula F (FF) #95 driven by Jon Brandstad for potential violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A., B., C., and D. (On Course Driver Conduct).

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Ed Gains, Mary Lou Robson, and Gary Meeker (Chairman), met, reviewed the evidence, and determined that Mr. Brandstad violated GCR 6.11.1.B. and 6.11.1.C. The SOM placed Mr. Brandstad on probation for one (1) race weekend. Mr. Brandstad appealed the ruling of the SOM.

**DATES OF THE COURT**

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA), Laurie Sheppard, Michael West, and Pat McCammon (Chairman), met on August 30 and September 6 and 13, 2018, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

**DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Appeal letter from Jon Brandstad and Appeal Letter envelope postmarked August 1, 2018, received by COA on August 25, 2018.
2. Video evidence from Mr. Brandstad, received August 25, 2018.
3. Official Observers Report and related documents, received August 25, 2018.
4. Video evidence considered by the SOM, received September 3, 2018.
5. Additional post-incident photographs and witness statements provided with the appeal, received August 25, 2018.

**FINDINGS**

The COA viewed race videos provided to the SOM which showed Mr. Rozeboom (Car #81) was following Mr. Brandstad (Car #95). Car #81 initiated a pass prior to Turn 1 but slowed and dropped back from Mr. Brandstad in response to a local yellow flag at Turn 1. Car #81 caught back up with Car #95 at Turn 3 and continued to trail Car #95 through Turn 4. Upon exiting Turn 4, Car #95 moved driver's left to the track limit; this allowed Car #81 room to initiate a pass on driver's right during the approach to the Turn 5 apex curbing.

As Car #95 moved driver's right toward Turn 5, Car #81 moved further right to avoid contact, eventually placing two right wheels off the racing surface. Because Car #95 continued to move driver's right, its right front tire touched the left front tire of Car #81. As a result of the contact, Car #81 launched into the air, slid along the right side of Car #95 and came to rest perpendicular to the track in front of Car #95. Both cars were heavily damaged and neither rejoined the race.

Mr. Brandstad provided witness statements from competitors who frequent WeatherTech Raceway Laguna Seca. These statements indicate Mr. Brandstad is a seasoned competitor at this track, and that these competitors believe a pass on driver's right at Turn 5 would be unexpected.

Mr. Brandstad told the SOM multiple times that he did not look in his mirrors prior to the

contact. He also said he was not aware that Car #81 was beside him as they approached Turn 5, and that he believed a pass on the right between Turn 4 and 5 is not reasonable.

The COA found that per GCR 6.11.1.B. and C. each driver has a right to and must respect others' racing room. Mr. Rozeboom (Car #81) saw an opening and began a pass on driver's right prior to the turn-in point for Turn 5, leaving Mr. Brandstad (Car #95) adequate racing room. Car #81 achieved an overlap of nearly a full car length by the time of contact, as evidenced by the initial contact being front wheel to front wheel. By Mr. Brandstad's own admission, he moved driver's right approaching Turn 5, unaware that Mr. Rozeboom was alongside him.

The video evidence shows that Mr. Rozeboom provided racing room and attempted to avoid contact in compliance with GCR 6.11.1.B. ("Each competitor has a right to racing room..."). There is no evidence that Mr. Brandstad did the same.

The COA finds that the SOM reached a fair and reasoned decision based on the evidence available to them.

### **DECISION**

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

**JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**  
**Thomas Ferrara vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-16-NP**  
**September 13, 2018**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

On August 11, 2018, following the Group 11 race at Portland International Raceway, Gary Van Horn, Chief Steward (CS), filed a Request For Action (RFA) for a Stewards of the Meeting investigation of a multiple car incident following display of the green flag to start the race. Specifically, the CS cited cars #4, Brad Rampelberg; #43, Dave Dunning; #87, Will Schrader; and #00, Thomas Ferrara as being involved.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Gail Fetterman, Jeff Niess, Dan Mullins, and George Harper, Chairman, met, reviewed video evidence from all four cars, witness statements from the four drivers, and an incident report from the Turn 1 Corner Crew. The SOM determined Mr. Ferrara caused the incident and his actions were not in compliance with GCR 6.11.1.A. (On Course Driver Conduct – Avoid Physical Contact). They assessed a penalty of loss of two (2) finishing positions. Two (2) penalty points were assigned to Mr. Ferrara's competition license. Mr. Ferrara is appealing the SOM ruling.

**DATES OF THE COURT**

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Anne Christian, Pat McCammon, and Michael West, Chairman, met on September 6 and September 13, 2018, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

**DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Appeal letter from Thomas Ferrara, received by the COA August 28, 2018.
2. Appeal Letter Envelope postmarked August 17, 2018, received August 28, 2018.
3. Official Observers Report and related documents/evidence, received September 3, 2018.
4. In-car video from Cars #4, #43, #87, and #00, received September 5, 2018.

**FINDINGS**

In his appeal, Mr. Ferrara states the SOM advised him they reviewed four video tapes of which three were inconclusive. He further states the SOM advised they based their decision on what they observed in his video evidence. The COA thoroughly reviewed the SOM ruling and notes that Mr. Ferrara's in car video evidence served as the basis for the ruling. The SOM did state the other three videos were reviewed.

Mr. Ferrara states he did not impact Car #4 and, thus, did not start the metal to metal contacts between multiple cars. In his appeal he provided a detailed analysis supported by 31 still shots from his video evidence. The COA reviewed all video evidence submitted to the SOM. Mr. Ferrara's (#00) video provided a view of the other vehicles as he was the trailing car. After receiving the green flag, Mr. Ferrara moved to the extreme right side of the track and partially alongside Mr. Rampelberg (#4). Mr. Rampelberg was forced to the right by Car #43 (Dave Dunning), blocking Mr. Ferrara's lane forward which caused Mr. Ferrara to back away from Mr. Rampelberg. As the field approached the corner, the two cars in front of Mr. Rampelberg applied their brakes. Mr. Ferrara was behind Mr. Rampelberg at this point and Mr. Rampelberg's tail lights were fully in view. Mr. Rampelberg locked his brakes an instant later to avoid hitting Car #43 (Dunning). Mr. Rampelberg's braking action caused him to slide to driver's right alongside Mr. Dunning's car (#43). The COA notes Mr. Dunning was also moving to driver's right. Mr. Rampelberg and Mr. Dunning then made contact. The contact briefly lifted Mr. Rampelberg into the air.

The COA fully reviewed Mr. Ferrara's still shot evidence in context with all the video evidence

used by the SOM and agrees with Mr. Ferrara. Mr. Ferrara's still photographs clearly reflect that he was not close enough for nose to tail contact with Car #4 (Rampelberg) when Car #43 (Dunning) and Car #4 (Rampelberg) first made contact. He did not make contact with Car #4 until after the side to side contact between Cars #43 and #4. Mr. Ferrara did not cause the multiple car incidents. The COA does acknowledge he had incidental impact with Car #4 after the melee was well in progress. His contact with Car #4 at that point was unavoidable.

Based on the new and material evidence assessed in context with the full body of evidence relied on by the SOM, the COA determines Mr. Ferrara did not cause the incident and did not violate GCR 6.11.1.A. Mr. Ferrara's finishing position will be restored and the penalty points will be removed from his competition license.

### **DECISION**

The COA overturns the SOM's decision in its entirety. Mr. Ferrara's appeal is well founded. Mr. Ferrara's appeal fee, less the administrative portion retained by SCCA, will be returned.



**JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**  
**Peter Jankovskis vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-17-CN**  
**September 13, 2018**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

On July 29, 2018, following the Group 5 race at the Cat's Meow Majors Races at Road America, Assistant Chief Steward Bev Heilicher filed a Request For Action (RFA) to investigate contact between Tom Dalrymple (SRF3 #84) and Peter Jankovskis (SRF3 #6). The contact occurred on the front straight as reported by witnesses at Start.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Fred Cummings, John Hertsgaard, Kathy Maleck, and Paula Spencer (Chairman) met, reviewed the evidence, heard witnesses, and determined Mr. Jankovskis had violated General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A., B., C., and D. and imposed a penalty of Reprimand. The penalty imposes one (1) penalty point on Mr. Jankovskis' license. Mr. Jankovskis was notified of the results of the RFA via email on August 7, 2018. He is appealing the ruling of the SOM.

**DATES OF THE COURT**

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Michael West, Spencer Gorham, and Laurie Sheppard (Chairman) met on September 6 and 13, 2018 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

**DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Appeal letter from Mr. Jankovskis, received by COA August 28, 2018.
2. Email and video from Martin Wiedenhoeft, received September 4, 2018.
3. Official Observers Report and related documents, received September 4, 2018.
4. Video evidence considered by the SOM, received September 4, 2018.
5. Copy of Appeal Request email from Mr. Jankovskis, received at SCCA August 13, 2018.

**FINDINGS**

Mr. Jankovskis provided a detailed rebuttal to each rule the SOM found he violated. He also submitted a witness statement and an additional video from a trailing car that were not available to the SOM.

The COA reviewed witness statements describing the incident and full race video evidence considered by the SOM as well as the new video showing the actions leading to the contact between Mr. Jankovskis in Car #6 and Mr. Dalrymple in Car #84. For several laps, Mr. Dalrymple led a tight three-car group, with Car #64 immediately behind and Mr. Jankovskis trailing. On Lap 9, Car #64 passed Mr. Dalrymple on the approach to Turn 5. Mr. Jankovskis unsuccessfully attempted to follow Car #64 past Mr. Dalrymple, and the two were briefly side by side before Mr. Jankovskis dropped back.

Mr. Dalrymple continued to shadow Car #64, apparently attempting to maintain a draft. Car #64 made several moves to break the draft and retain the lead through the next several turns.

After executing Turn 14, Car #64 moved to the right of the center line of the track and Mr. Dalrymple followed. When Mr. Dalrymple unexpectedly moved right in response to the move by Car #64, Mr. Jankovskis stayed on the left side of the track which is normally considered the faster line and he moved partially alongside Mr. Dalrymple. The overlap was approximately two-thirds of a car length. Approaching Start/Finish, Car #64 moved back toward the normal line (driver's left) and again, Mr. Dalrymple followed his lead. However, by his own admission, Mr. Dalrymple did not check his mirrors before moving to the left. Mr. Dalrymple contacted Mr.

Jankovskis at least twice, forcing him to drop his two left wheels off track into the grass.

The SOM ruled that each driver shared responsibility for the incident, stating that both drivers were responsible for avoiding contact and respecting the other's right to racing room. The SOM also ruled that Mr. Jankovskis was attempting to pass Mr. Dalrymple and did not accomplish it safely, citing GCR 6.11.1.D.

The COA disagrees that both drivers were equally responsible for the contact. Rather, the COA finds that it was Mr. Dalrymple's selection of an atypical line between Turn 14 and Start/Finish and then attempting to return to the usual line when another car was already alongside that caused the contact. The normal racing line is faster, which allowed Mr. Jankovskis to move alongside Mr. Dalrymple. Mr. Jankovskis was traveling in a straight line on the extreme left side of the track, leaving adequate racing room for Mr. Dalrymple. Mr. Jankovskis did not initiate an unsafe pass attempt that could not be completed. Had Mr. Dalrymple not taken away Mr. Jankovskis' racing room, Mr. Jankovskis may or may not have completed a pass, but both cars could have continued safely to the next turn.

The COA rules that the penalty of Reprimand for violation of GCR 6.11.1.A. (Avoidable contact), B. (Racing room), C. (Blocking), and D. (Passing) is rescinded and the associated one (1) penalty point is to be removed from Mr. Jankovskis' license.

### **DECISION**

The COA overturns the SOM decision against Mr. Jankovskis in its entirety. Mr. Jankovskis' appeal was well founded, and his appeal fee, less the administrative portion retained by SCCA, will be returned.

**JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**  
**Lev Uretsky vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-18-NE**  
**October 4, 2018**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

On September 2, 2018, at the Washington DC Region Regional at Summit Point Motorsports Park, Assistant Chief Steward, Chris Current, filed a Request for Action (RFA) asking to investigate Lev Uretsky (STL #41) who did not report to impound after the Group 8 race on Sunday. Mr. Uretsky finished first in class.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), James Shoemaker, Larry Oliver and Steve Keadle (Chairman), met, reviewed the evidence, and determined Mr. Uretsky failed to report to post-race impound and therefore violated General Competition Rules (GCR) 5.9.3.C. and Supplemental Regulations (SR) Impound. The SOM assigned a penalty of Loss of Finishing Position by moving Mr. Uretsky to last finishing position in class and awarding no series points for Sunday's race. In accordance with GCR 7.4., two (2) mandatory penalty points were added to his competition license. On Monday morning, September 3, 2018, Mr. Uretsky was called to the SOM and given their ruling. Mr. Uretsky is appealing the decision of the SOM.

**DATES OF THE COURT**

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Spencer Gorham, Pat McCammon, and Anne Christian (Chairman) met on September 27, 2018, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

**DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Appeal letter from Lev Uretsky, received September 18, 2018.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received September 25, 2018.
3. Supplemental Regulations, 2018 MARRS Labor Day Double, obtained September 14, 2018.
4. Addendum to appeal from Lev Uretsky, received October 2, 2018.

**FINDINGS**

The COA examined Mr. Uretsky's appeal letter and his analysis. In his appeal, Mr. Uretsky admitted not reporting to impound. He provided a written narrative stating why he didn't feel he needed to go to impound, citing GCR 5.9.3. as not mandating post-race impound except at specific types of events. The COA also reviewed the documents included in the Observers Report and obtained a copy of the event Supplemental Regulations for the 2018 MARRS Labor Day Double at Summit Point.

GCR 5.9.3.A. states that post-race impound is mandatory at all U.S. Major Tour races and at the Runoffs. It further states "It is recommended at all other events." Washington, D. C. Region chose to exercise this authority and clearly stated the Impound mandate in the Supplemental Regulations for the event. The GCR states in Appendix B that "Supplemental Regulations establish specific conditions for an event."

The COA notes that when registering for the event online, Mr. Uretsky had multiple opportunities to download the event Supplemental Regulations and Schedule. Before completing his registration, Mr. Uretsky had to click a checkbox accepting the event waiver which reads in part: "I acknowledge that I *have* Read and Understand the event Supplemental Regulations, "Supps", for this event, and agree to abide by them."

The COA finds that Mr. Uretsky violated GCR 5.9.3.C. and Supplemental Regulations "Impound" by failing to report to post-race impound. The penalty assessed is consistent with the SCCA Penalty Guidelines for violation of GCR 5.9.3.C. and is within the authority of the SOM. The two (2) penalty points imposed on Mr. Uretsky's competition license are mandated

per GCR 7.4.6. for a penalty of Loss of Position assessed by the SOM.

**DECISION**

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

**JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**  
**LisaKay Foyle vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-19-CN**  
**October 4, 2018**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

On September 8, 2018, at the Fall Sprints held at Blackhawk Farms, following Group 5 qualifying, LisaKay Foyle, Chief Steward, filed Chief Steward's Actions voiding the qualifying times of Chris Pedersen, GT2/TA2 #67 and Scott Sanda, GT2/TA2 #75, citing non-compliant roll cage braces extending from the Main Hoop to the rear. The tubing did not meet the minimum requirements as specified in General Competition Rules (GCR) 9.4.B.2.c., 9.4.F.2., 9.4.F.3., 9.4.F.4., 9.4.F.5., and 9.4.F.6. TA2 cars may enter in GT2 under GCR Appendix L or current TransAm rules.

Messrs. Pedersen and Sanda protested Ms. Foyle's action stating that both cars had been approved for TransAm competition and therefore, were eligible to compete in SCCA road races. The Stewards of the Meeting, Bev Heileicher, Hank Jaffe, John Maurus, Fred Cummings, and Corky Swanson, Chairman, met, reviewed witness statements, heard witnesses, and upheld the Chief Steward's Actions. Ms. Foyle appealed the SOM ruling citing variances in roll bar specifications between the GCR and the TransAm (TA2) rules and requested the rules sets be brought into agreement via an Errors and Omissions ruling.

**DATES OF THE COURT**

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Pat McCammon, Laurie Sheppard, and Michael West (Chairman) met on September 27 and October 4, 2018 to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

**DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Letter of Appeal from LisaKay Foyle, received Sept. 18, 2018.
2. 2018 TransAm Rule Book, received Sept. 18, 2018.
3. Official Observer's Report and related documents, received Sept. 26, 2018.
4. Additional information email from Corky Swanson, Chair SOM, received Sept. 27, 2018.
5. GT2/TA informational memo from Dave Kettler, Divisional Administrator of Scrutineering, SCCA Central Division, received Sept. 27, 2018.
6. SCCA Technical Services Member Advisory Memo 18-08, received September 28, 2018.
7. Memo from Kevin Coulter, Central Division Executive Steward, received September 30, 2018.
8. Memo and opinion from Chris Pedersen, received October 3, 2018.

**FINDINGS**

LisaKay Foyle, Chief Steward, requested the COA review the pertinent sections of the GCR and the TransAm rules set for TA2 cars and bring the rules sets into agreement with an Errors and Omissions ruling.

Simultaneously this issue was submitted to the Club Racing Board requesting they provide clarification and corrective action as appropriate. On September 28, 2018, SCCA Technical Services issued Member Advisory Memo 18-08 from the Club Racing Board which states:

*"It has come to the attention of the SCCA that roll cage structures in certain TA2 cars do not meet the roll cage specifications as outlined in GCR section 9.4. Regardless if the car has a current logbook, any car not meeting the outer diameter and tubing wall thicknesses will not be allowed to compete in SCCA sanctioned events. Contact a nationally licensed SCCA scrutineer if you need verification of compliance."*

Member Advisory 18-08 definitively addressed and resolved the issues cited in Ms. Foyle's appeal. The COA will take no further action on this appeal.

The COA notes that neither Messrs. Pedersen nor Sanda appealed the SOM ruling upholding the Chief Steward's Actions (loss of qualifying times). Those issues are closed and were not reviewed as part of this appeal.

**DECISION**

The COA returns Ms. Foyle's appeal unheard. Ms. Foyle's appeal fee will be returned.

**JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**  
**Brandon Fetch vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 18-20-NE**  
**October 19, 2018**

**FACTS IN BRIEF**

On September 15, 2018, following the Group 6 race of The Fun One Double Regional at Watkins Glen International, Brandon Fetch, driver of Spec Miata (SM) #48 filed a Protest against Nick Rosengrant (SM #107). Mr. Fetch alleged Mr. Rosengrant violated General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A-C. when their cars made contact at Turn 6.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Paula Hawthorne, Tyrone Noles, and Gene Kern (Chairman) met, reviewed the evidence, heard witnesses, and determined both drivers shared responsibility for the contact. The SOM reprimanded both drivers for violating GCR 6.11.1.A. and C. (Rules of the Road). The Reprimand penalties each carry one (1) automatic penalty point. Mr. Fetch appealed the ruling of the SOM.

**DATES OF THE COURT**

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Laurie Sheppard, Anne Christian, and Pat McCammon (Chairman) met on October 16, 2018, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

**DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Appeal letter from Mr. Fetch, received October 8, 2018.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received October 8, 2018.
3. Video evidence considered by the SOM, received October 8, 2018.

**FINDINGS**

At the exit of Turn 5, Mr. Fetch (SM #48) was following Mr. Rosengrant (SM #107). As they approached Turn 6, Car #48 took the inside line left of Car #107 and they maintained their side-by-side positions through the turn. As they exited the left hand turn Car #48 drifted to driver's right past the mid-point of the track. Car #107 was at the track limit on drivers right and moved left to stay on the racing surface. The right front of Car #48 contacted the left side of Car #107 causing it to spin and continue. Car #48 also spun, contacting the guard rail on both the left and right side of the track. Car #48 retired from the competition.

In his appeal, Mr. Fetch indicated he would supply new evidence by October 5, 2018. SCCA issued the Notification Letter on October 8, 2018, stating that all new information "must be received no later than ten (10) days following the date of this Notification Letter." As of close of business on October 18, 2018, no additional evidence was received.

The COA finds the SOM made a fair and reasoned decision based on the evidence available to them. Given the lack of additional evidence, the COA has no basis on which to disagree with the first court.

**DECISION**

The COA upholds the SOM decision in its entirety. Mr. Fetch's appeal was not well founded and his appeal fee will be retained by SCCA.