

## CLUB RACING BOARD MINUTES

**CLUB RACING BOARD | SPORTS CAR CLUB OF AMERICA, INC. | Oct. 13, 2008**

The Club Racing Board met by e-mail on October 13, 2008. Participating were Bob Dowie, Chairman; Chris Albin, Stan Clayton, Dave Gomberg, Peter Keane, and Russ McHugh.

In addition to those items covered in Technical Bulletin 11-08, the following decisions were made:

### SUBMITTED TO BoD FOR APPROVAL

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. Comments may be e-mailed to crb@scca.com.

#### Formula

**Item 1.** Effective 1/1/09: Revise section 9.1.1.D.2.s.10 as follows:

Exhaust outlets on cars registered after January 1, 1986 shall not extend more than 60cm (23.60") behind the centerline of the rear axle and shall be positioned between 30mm (1.18") and 60cm (23.6") from the ground, measured to the bottom of the exhaust pipe.

**Item 2.** Effective 1/1/09: Delete 9.1.1.D.10.d as follows:

~~d. Wheel covers, wheel fans, or any device to fair in the wheel is prohibited.~~

#### Sports Racer

**Item 1.** Effective 1/1/09: Based on member input, to better balance the performance potential of different power-train configurations in CSR, delete section 9.1.9.A.2.a.6. DSR cars will still be welcome in CSR, but will have to run at the appropriate weight for their engine as classified in CSR.

~~Cars prepared to DSR specifications may compete in CSR at their current DSR weight.~~

#### Grand Touring

**Item 1.** Effective 1/1/09: Change section 9.1.2.F.4.b.12 as follows:

A spoiler may be fitted to the front of the car. It shall not protrude beyond the overall outline of the car as viewed from above except as follows: ~~in GT2 where a front spoiler may extend up to two (2) inches.~~

- GT2 front spoiler may extend up to 3 inches.
- GT3 front spoiler may extend up to 2 inches.
- GTLite front spoiler may extend up to 2 inches.

*In all classes, the spoiler shall not extend aft of the forward most part of the front fender opening (cutout), and shall not be mounted more than four (4) inches above the horizontal centerline of the front wheel hubs. The spoiler shall not cover the normal grill opening at the front of the car. An intermediate mounting device may be used on cars whose front bodywork is above the four (4) inch minimum. Openings are permitted for the purpose of ducting air to the brakes, radiator, airbox and/or oil cooler(s); equal openings may be placed in the standard lower front panel directly behind openings placed in the spoiler. When bumpers are retained, the spoiler and bumper shall appear to be two separate parts. The spoiler "pan" area forward of the leading edge of the front wheel openings shall be flat and follow, but not exceed, the line of the front fender/spoiler bottom.*

**Item 2.** Effective 1/1/09: Add new subsection 14 to section 9.1.2.F.4.b as follows:

#### 14. GTL Wing Rules

- A. The maximum width of the entire single element, flat plane wing assembly is 56.0 inches, but it may be no wider than the bodywork including fender flairs. The maximum chord is 8.0 inches. Wing endplates must fit within a rectangle measuring 8.5 inches wide by 3.0 inches high. Endplates must be flat, with no curvature or Gurney tabs. A maximum 0.5-inch wicker-bill may be employed.
- B. The wing shall be mounted to the trunk/deck lid with two brackets. Each mounting bracket shall attach to the wing at least 2.0 inches inboard of the endplates. The brackets may protrude through the trunk/deck lid to allow the brackets to be fastened together beneath the lid.

## CONTENTS

<b>BOARD OF DIRECTORS</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>CLUB RACING</b>	<b>1</b>
CRB Minutes	1
Technical Bulletin	4
<b>COURT OF APPEALS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SOLO</b>	<b>8</b>
SEB Minutes	8
<b>RALLY</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>QUICK LINKS</b>	<b>10</b>

- C. The wing shall be mounted a minimum of 6.0 inches below the highest point of the roof as measured between the highest points of the roof and the wing.
- D. The trailing edge of the wing assembly must be located between 6.0 inches forward of the rearmost bodywork and the rearmost bodywork as measured along the vehicle longitudinal centerline.
- E. Cars with a wagon or hatch back style body must have the entire wing positioned between 6.0 and 28.0 inches of the rearmost bodywork as measured along the vehicle longitudinal centerline, and a maximum of 4.0 inches above the highest point of the roof.

A wagon-back style body is a car in which the rear edge of the roofline is no more than 28.0 inches forward of the rearmost bodywork as measured along the vehicle longitudinal centerline.

## Spec Miata

**Item 1.** Effective 1/1/09: Change section 9.1.8.C as follows:

The following items represent the only modifications and safety items permitted and/or required on Spec Miata automobiles other than safety items as required in Section 9. No permitted component/modification shall additionally perform a prohibited function. No updating or backdating of cars, models, specifications, and/or components thereof shall be permitted except as specifically authorized in these specifications.

A Shop Manual for the specific make, model, and year of automobile is required to be in the possession of each entrant. The manual is intended to aid Scrutineers in identifying parts and the configuration of the automobile.

~~All adjustments shall be at the manufacturer's specification and/or within the manufacturer's specified tolerances except as permitted within the SMCS.~~

~~Stock replacement parts may be obtained from sources other than the manufacturer provided they are the exact equivalent of the original parts. The intent of this rule is to allow the competitor to obtain replacement parts from standard industry outlets, e.g., auto parts distributors, rather than from the manufacturer. It is not intended to allow parts that do not meet all dimensional and material specifications of new parts from the manufacturer.~~

*All engines and internal components used in rebuilding or refurbishment must have been offered for sale by Mazda in the US for the correct year and VIN of car, except as otherwise provided for in these rules. The intent of this rule is to prohibit aftermarket parts or Mazda parts of incorrect specification or application.*

*Assembly, rebuild, and refurbishment procedures, and all associated dimensions, shall adhere to the published factory service procedures, except as otherwise provided for by these rules. No components may be added or omitted from those specified by the published factory service procedures. All components must be standard dimensions.*

*Any water pump and timing belt of original equipment manufacture design, dimensions, and specification may be used.*

The application and/or use of any painting, coating, plating, or impregnating substance (~~ie~~ e.g., anti-friction, thermal barrier, oil shedding coatings, chrome, anodizing, etc.) to any internal engine surface, transmission, differential, internal or external surfaces of the exhaust manifold or downtube, is prohibited.

**Item 2.** Effective 1/1/09: Change section 9.1.8.C.4.b as follows:

All cars may use the *Fat Cat Motorsports bump stop kit (p/n FCM-MT-KIT-SM)* or the unmodified Mazdaspeed bump stop (p/n 0000-04-5993AW) in conjunction with the 1999-up stock upper mount assembly consisting of the upper mount (p/n: NC10-28-340C), the upper mount bushing (p/n: NC10-28-776) and the upper mount washer (p/n: NC10-28-774), *and shock body spacer over the shock shaft (p/n 1234-56-789-AW)*. All other OEM upper mounting hardware shall be discarded. *Non-OEM equivalents may be used in place of the upper mount, upper mount bushing, and upper mount washer only. No other modifications are allowed.*

A metal or delrin plastic spacer as shown below may be added between the Mazdaspeed bump stop and the 1999 shock hat. The 0.31 inch measurement is +/- 0.01 in. All other measurements are non-critical and are shown for clarification purposes only. *In addition, a 3/8 inch steel hardware washer may be installed between the shock shaft and the bump stop. The washer shall be a maximum of 1/8 inch thick.*

**Item 3.** Effective 1/1/09: Change section 9.1.8.C.6.o as follows:

o. Tires -

~~1. National Competition~~

All cars shall use ~~the Toyo Proxes RA-1~~ R888 (205/50R15).

~~2. Regional Competition~~

~~Any DOT approved tire is permitted. Racing, recapped, or regrooved tires are not allowed. Tire size is unrestricted. The only modifications allowed to tires are having treads "shaved" or "trued." Individual regions may require spec tires for regional races. Supplemental regulations for specific events should be checked.~~

## **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BoD**

None

## **MEMBER ADVISORIES**

1. CSR/DSR - The CRB invites input from the sports racing community about whether to continue to permit turbo/supercharging in the classes and under what restrictions, if any.
2. SM - The CRB invites input from the SM community to comment if it would be desirable to allow the 1990-93 1.6 liter cars to run a lighter flywheel to achieve class parity.

## **NEW CAR CLASSIFICATIONS**

None

## **REFERRED or TABLED**

None

## **Previously Addressed**

None

## **No Action Required**

None

## **Resumes**

None

# CLUB RACING TECHNICAL BULLETIN

**DATE:** October 7, 2008

**NUMBER:** TB 08-11

**FROM:** Club Racing Board

**TO:** Competitors, Stewards, and Scrutineers

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

All changes are effective 11/1/08 unless otherwise noted.

## Formula

### FC

1. Clarify section 9.1.1.B.3.a by removing the second to last sentence as follows: ~~Maximum valve lift against cam angle with zero tappet clearance: 0.400 +/- 0.005.~~
2. Clarify section 9.1.1.B.3.i by adding to the beginning of the paragraph as follows: *Regrinding camshaft lobes is permitted, as long as the camshaft lobe center is  $112^{\circ} \pm 2^{\circ}$ .*

## Sports Racer

### S2

1. Clarify section 9.1.9.B.5.a by as follows: ~~Maximum valve lift against cam angle with zero tappet clearance: 0.400 +/- 0.005.~~
2. Clarify section 9.1.9.B.5.a by adding to the beginning of the paragraph as follows: *Regrinding camshaft lobes is permitted, as long as the camshaft lobe center is  $112^{\circ} \pm 2^{\circ}$ .*

# COURT OF APPEALS

## JUDGMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS

Charles Cobbs vs. SOM, COA Ref. No. 08-16-SE

September 25, 2008

### FACTS IN BRIEF

At the Alabama and Atlanta Regions' Labor Day Double SARRC / Pro-IT Regional Race held at Barber Motorsports Road Course on Saturday August 30, 2008, Robert Bitterman, driver of car ITB #21 filed a mechanical protest after qualifying against Charles Cobbs, driver of car ITB #93, citing violation of GCR Sections 9.1.3.D. (Authorized Modifications to Improved Touring cars). Mr. Bitterman stated the removal of the front and rear bumpers on Mr. Cobbs' 1974 Alfa Romeo GTV was not an allowable modification. The Stewards of the Meet (SOM) Geoff Churchill, Paul Gauzens (Steward in Training) and Russ Smith, Chairman, heard testimony, inspected Mr. Cobbs' vehicle and upheld the protest. Mr. Cobbs chose not to bring his vehicle into compliance and did not start any of the races for the weekend. Mr. Cobbs is appealing the non-compliance decision.

### DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA) Richard Templeton, Fred Cummings (Alternate) and Robert Horansky, Chairman, met on September 18, 2008 to hear, review and render a decision on the appeal. David Nokes, regular Court member was out of the country and unavailable for this meeting.

### DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Letter of Appeal from Charles Cobbs received September 12, 2008.
2. Official Observer's Report and related documents, received September 12, 2008.
3. Email statements from Russ Smith, Chairman SOM, received September 15 and 16, 2008.
4. Email statement, including photos of Mr. Cobbs' vehicle, from SOM Geoff Churchill received September 13, 2008.
6. Email statement from Gwen Jackson, pre-event Registrar, received September 16, 2008.

### FINDINGS

In his appeal Mr. Cobbs contended that he has run his car in ITB for four years in this configuration. He provided pictures of GTV race vehicles without bumpers; many of the photos were not SCCA racing vehicles. The COA determined that none of the photos provided showed Improved Touring class designations.

The GCR is clear in specifying that Improved Touring is a restricted class. No component or part normally found on a stock example of a given vehicle may be removed unless specified in the authorized modifications. There is no statement allowing removal of bumpers in any sections of GCR 9.1.3.D.

### DECISION

The Court of Appeals upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Cobbs' appeal is not well founded and his appeal fee will be retained by SCCA.

# COURT OF APPEALS

## Judgment of the Court of Appeals

William Emery vs. SOM, COA Reference 08-17-NE

October 5, 2008

### PRIOR PROCEEDINGS AND FACTS IN BRIEF

During the WOR Games held August 30-31, 2008 at Nelson Ledges, Assistant Chief Steward Barry Kaplan filed a Request For Action (RFA) against William Emery, driver of EP # 91, for violations of GCR 6.8.1.A, B, and C (On Course Driver Conduct) as well as GCR 6.11.2 (Meaning of Flags). The Stewards of the Meet (SOM) listed as John Pfetzing, John Baker and John Peterson, Chairman, met, reviewed evidence, took testimony and assessed a penalty of 6 months suspension followed by Mr. Emery being required to go through Driver's School prior to reinstatement of his license. Subsequently, Debra LaFond, Chief Steward, filed a Chief Steward's Action (CSA) prohibiting Mr. Emery from competing in Sunday's race citing GCR 5.12.2.B.5 (Chief Steward's Power to Prevent Dangerous Car or Driver from Competing). Mr. Emery is appealing those decisions.

### DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), JoAnne Jensen (Alternate), Dick Templeton, and Robert Horansky, Chairman, met on September 18, 25, and October 5, 2008 to hear, review and render a decision on the appeal. David Nokes, regular Court member was unavailable for these meetings.

### DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Appeal from William Emery and accompanying documents.
2. Official Observer's Report and related documents including numerous witness statements, the race log, and Official Results.
3. Email from Barry Kaplan dated September 16, 2008.

4. Email from John Peterson dated September 19, 2008.
5. Email from William Emery to Terry Ozment forwarded to the COA on September 23, 2008.
6. Video from Daniel Styduhar, mechanic and crew member for Mr. Emery, received September 29, 2008.

#### **FINDINGS**

During Race Group 3A, cars 56 and 17 running first and second in class began to lap car 91 as they approached Start/Finish. Emergency vehicles were being dispatched from just past Start/Finish at the same time. There is confusion among the witnesses as to what flags were being displayed. The Starter testified that a blue flag was displayed, others saw white flags, yellow flags or a combination of all three.

Car 91 (Mr. Emery), which was slow prior to Start/Finish, slowed even more and moved slightly left. Car 56 attempted to pass #91 on the right and #17 elected to go left. Car 91 moved back to the right to allow # 17 racing room and was hit in his right rear by car 56. Car 56 spun into the tire wall which created a full course blockage that led to a red flag situation.

Mr. Emery admitted that he continued around the course and came upon red flags at several corners prior to coming to a stop.

Mr. Styduhar's video was irrelevant, and provided no new evidence in this matter.

#### **DECISION**

The Court of Appeals amends the decision of the SOM as follows: Mr. Emery's license suspension and driver's school attendance requirement are to be expunged and the 6 penalty points assessed him removed from his record. Instead, Mr. Emery is disqualified from the event and placed on probation for nine (9) race weekends. The COA was unable to act on the CSA, as Mr. Emery did not exercise his right to protest that action. The disqualification will add 4 penalty points to his record. Mr. Emery's appeal is well founded and his appeal fee, less the amount retained by SCCA, will be returned.

## **COURT OF APPEALS**

#### **JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**Chris Windsor vs. SOM COA 08-16-NE**

**October 5, 2008**

#### **PRIOR PROCEEDINGS AND FACTS IN BRIEF**

At the Washington D.C. Region MARRS 7 Regional Race at Summit Point Motorsports Park on September 1, 2008, Chris Windsor, driver of SSM #38, filed a protest against Ed York, driver of SSM #56, citing violation of GCR Paragraph 6.8.1.A (On Course Driver Conduct, Avoiding Contact). Chris Windsor alleged that Ed York made contact with him twice during the last lap of the race. The Stewards of The Meet (SOM) Dave Gomberg, Kathy McLeod, Joe Willer, and Earl Hurlbut, Chairman, heard testimony from both drivers, viewed videos, inspected the cars, and disallowed the protest. Mr. Windsor is appealing that decision

#### **DATES OF THE COURT**

The Court of Appeals (COA), comprised of Dave Nokes, Dick Templeton, and Bob Horansky, Chairman, met on September 25 and October 5, 2008, to review the First Court's decision.

#### **DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED**

1. Appeal E-Mail copy from Chris Windsor, received September 17, 2008.
2. Observers Report and related documents received September 17, 2008.
3. Copies of the Windsor video and one from Car #16 (Kevin Kopp, Driver) received September 23, 2008.

#### **FINDINGS**

Chris Windsor contends that the contact between his car and that of Ed York occurred twice on the last lap between Turns 9 and 10, causing him to lift, and lose position and the win. The SOM viewed the videos from Chris Windsor's car and one from Car #16 which was the third place car following Mr. Windsor and Mr. York. There was no entry in the race log regarding any contact, nor were there any corner station or spectator witnesses. The SOM could not find any damage on either vehicle that could be tied to this contact. In his witness statement, Mr. York admits to contact as he attempted a pass to the right of Mr. Windsor at Turn 9, claiming Mr. Windsor moved over into him. Mr. York claims he backed off and followed Mr. Windsor into Turn 10. He then claims Mr. Windsor slowed and he was able to execute the pass to the right.

#### **DECISION**

The Court of Appeals upholds the First Court. Mr. Windsor did not provide any new evidence. Mr. Windsor's appeal is not well founded and his appeal fee will be retained by SCCA.

# COURT OF APPEALS - RULES INTERPRETATION

## JUDGMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS

### RULES INTERPRETATION: FC CRANKCASE INTERIOR SURFACE AND PISTON LOWER SURFACE MODIFICATION

COA 08-04-RI

September 25, 2008

#### FACTS IN BRIEF

Arthur E. Smith filed a request for a Rules interpretation (GCR 8.1.4.) on June 20, 2008. The Chairman of the Steward's Program appointed a First Court consisting of Robert Eddy, Steve Harris, Barbara Knox and Gary Meeker, Chairman, to review and make a decision on his request. The First Court met by conference calls, reviewed the evidence supplied by Mr. Smith and consulted with other individuals before reaching their conclusion. The First Court did not consult with the Club Racing Board.

Mr. Smith requested that two questions be reviewed:

1. "Is the modification of the inner surface of a [Formula Continental] crankcase (specifically excluding the main caps) compliant with the GCR as currently written given the crankcase (and the oil/dry sump pan) **exists solely** (emphasis supplied) to perform the critical lubrication system functions of containment and collection of oil that has escaped pressure fed journal bearings and/or the flood lubrication of the camshaft and its followers?"
2. "Is the modification of the lower surface of the four pistons also compliant with the GCR as currently written given the lower surface **exists solely** (emphasis supplied) to perform the critical lubrication system function of containment of oil that has escaped pressure fed journal bearings and/or the flood lubrication of the camshaft and its followers?"

The First Court, after their extensive review, determined that modifying neither the crankcase nor the pistons as requested is permitted under the current GCR rules for Formula Continental contained in GCR 9.1.1. B.3., or B.4.

#### DATES OF THE COURT

The National Court of Appeals (COA), JoAnne Jensen (Alternate), Dick Templeton and Robert Horansky, Chairman, met on September 11, 18 and 25, 2008, to review and render a decision. Regular member David Nokes was unavailable to participate.

#### DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Original request letter from Mr. Smith dated June 20, 2008.
2. Findings of the First Court, received September 3, 2008.
3. Email from Dave Gomberg, member Club Racing Board, received September 18, 2008.
4. Copy of email from Deanna Flanagan, Club Racing Manager, SCCA, Inc., advising Mr. Smith of the Decision of the First Court, dated September 5, 2008.
5. Copy of email from Mr. Smith to Deanna Flanagan, requesting that the second step - hearing by the Court of Appeals - be completed, dated September 13, 2008.

#### FINDINGS

With regard to Mr. Smith's first question regarding the crankcase, the COA finds that the crankcase does not exist solely to perform lubrication system functions. The crankcase provides structural functions, such as locating and supporting the crank, rod and piston assembly, cooling functions, as well as lubrication functions. It is not permissible to choose just one of those functions as justification for the modification in question.

As to Mr. Smith's second question regarding the lower surface of the piston, it is clear that pistons perform several functions other than oil containment, and the underside of a piston can not be separated from the rest of the piston. The provisions of GCR 9.1.1.B.3. D., 9.1.1.B.3. F., and 9.1.1.3.B.4., b., c., and d. state the permitted modifications to pistons, which do not include anything with regard to the lubrication system.

#### DECISION

The Court of Appeals agrees with the Decision reached by the First Court. Mr. Smith's request for an agreement with his interpretation of the GCR rules cited previously is rejected.

# SOLO EVENTS BOARD MINUTES

SOLO EVENTS BOARD | SPORTS CAR CLUB OF AMERICA, INC. | Sept. 24, 2008

## SOLO EVENTS BOARD

The Solo Events Board met by conference call September 24th. Attending were SEB members Dave Whitworth, Tina Reeves, Steve Wynveen, Jason Isley, Erik Strelnieks, Chris Dorsey, Ron Bauer, and Donnie Barnes; Lisa Noble and Bob Introne of the BOD; and Doug Gill, Howard Duncan, and Brian Harmer of the National Staff. These minutes are presented in topical order rather than the order discussed.

Unless noted otherwise the effective date for all rule, class, and listing change proposals herein is 1/1/2010.

### GENERAL

- SEB positions will be open at the end of 2008. Interested members are invited to submit their qualifications in writing to the SEB and BOD via the National Office.
- The following Divisions will have openings at the Divisional Solo Event Steward position for 2009: Central, Great Lakes, Midwest, and Southeast.
- Committee position openings are anticipated in various category-specialty subcommittees (e.g. SAC, SPAC, MAC, etc.). Interested members are invited to submit their qualifications in writing to the SEB via the National Office.
- The SEB approved the distribution of a post-Solo-Nationals survey to event participants.
- No decision has been made at this time regarding the location of the 2009 Solo Nationals.
- Nominations are requested for the Rookie of the Year, Driver of the Year, and Divisional of the Year awards. Descriptions of these awards are found in Appendix V of the Solo rule book.
- Vern Maxey will be stepping down from the MidDiv Solo Events Steward position, and the SEB thanks him for his service to the Club.
- Heyward Wagner will be stepping down as the SEDiv Solo Events Steward. The SEB thanks Heyward for his service to the Club.
- Jason Tipple will be stepping down as the GLDiv Solo Events Steward. The SEB thanks Jason for his service to the Club.
- The rules package forwarded by the SEB to the BOD, which was approved at the BOD's September meeting was in error. Specifically, under the STOCK CATEGORY heading, Item 8 is incorrect. The correct wording, is as follows:

#### ITEM 8)

Move from DS to GS: Chevrolet Cobalt SS Supercharged

Move from GS to HS: Honda Civic del Sol VTEC

This was simply a clerical oversight, and the SEB apologizes for any distress this may have caused the membership.

### STOCK

- The SAC has submitted the following rule change proposal for member feedback: Add to 13.0, at the end of the first paragraph: "A Canadian-market vehicle is legal for Stock competition if it is identical to the US counterpart except for the allowed comfort and convenience modifications."
- The SAC is revising its previously-published 2010 class structure reorganization proposal (published as "Option 1") to remove the portion which splits CS and moves Miatas to ES.
- Per the SAC, the following class change proposal is published for member feedback: Move the Mini Cooper S from GS to DS.
- At this time the SAC withdraws the following previously published class change proposals:
  - Cobalt SS Turbocharged - DS to GS
  - Mazdaspeed 3 - DS to GS
  - Integra Type R - DS to BS
  - Lotus Elise SC - Exclusion List to SS
  - Dodge Viper 08+ - Exclusion List to SS
  - Lotus Exige S - Exclusion List to SS
  - Porsche 996 Turbo - Exclusion List to SS

### NOT RECOMMENDED

- MR2 wheels in Stock (ref. 08-493) The SAC would like to maintain a consistent rule set across the entire category, without exceptions for individual models or years. Stock wheel size is a basic tenet of the stock category. See 13.4 first paragraph.
- Noble kit cars in Stock (ref. 08-522) Per SAC: This is a kit car—customizable on customer request including any engine.



- Saleen Focus in Stock (ref. 08-530) Per SAC: Saleen currently has OEM status. However, when the S121 Focus was built, Saleen was not a recognized OEM. Not enough cars were built to meet the Stock production guidelines.

#### **TECH BULLETINS**

1. Stock: Per the SAC, add to the end of the second paragraph of 13.10.E: "Removal of a portion of the stock exhaust can be considered a substitution. The resulting cat-back exhaust system is not required to exit in the stock location. However, the requirements of section 3.3.3.B.15, and 3.5 must still be met." (ref. 08-539)
2. Stock: Per the SAC, add to the end of 13.5.A.2: "Aftermarket strut housings are allowed, provided that they meet the Stock category shock requirements defined herein, i.e. that no suspension geometry changes result. This includes the position of the steering arm in the case of struts with integrated steering arms."
3. Stock: The following new listing, effective immediately upon publication, has been recommended by the SAC and approved by the SEB:  
Mercedes C63 AMG SS (ref. 08-410)

## QUICK LINKS

The following items have been removed from regular inclusion in FasTrack News and can be found on SCCA's Web site at the following links:

### CLUB RACING

**Accredited Driver Licensing Schools:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=39>

**Forms:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=45>

**Technical Forms:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=74>

**Scrutineer's Forms:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=77>

**Vehicle Homologation Forms:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=79>

**General Competition Rules (GCR):** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=44>

### SOLO

**Forms:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=60>

**Rulebook:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=61>

### RALLY

**Forms:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=49>

**Rulebook:** <http://www.scca.com/contentpage.aspx?content=50>

### SCCA NATIONAL CONVENTION

**Event page:** <http://www.scca.com/event.aspx?hub=6&event=11083>

**EVENT CALENDAR:** <http://www.scca.com/events.aspx?hub=10>