October 2017

Results of RRB Voting on Proposed Rules Changes

At the October 12 Road Rally Board meeting we voted on the proposed rules changes that will take effect January 1st. There was a total of 16 proposals which passed initial RRB scrutiny and were released for public comment. A number of you provided comments or simply indicated your support or non-support for the proposals.

Thank you for your comments and positions. I can share with you that the input we received from the rally community was shared with the entire RRB as we began to discuss each proposed change. In one case, proposal 10, several board members voted against their personal opinions and voted as the rally community voted and this made the difference in the adoption of this proposal. Your input mattered.

The rules process is not completed. Each of the proposals approved by the RRB will be forwarded to the "big board", that is the SCCA Board of Directors who will give their approval or disapproval of these proposed changes. Although rare, they have in the past overruled the RRB's position on the proposed change. Following BOD action in December, these changes will be reflected in the 2018 Road Rally Rules.

Only 7 of the 16 proposals were approved by the RRB.

Below you will find the proposals and the results of the RRB's vote.

Administrative proposals:

1. Remove the restriction that a region may have a maximum of 4 equivalents per series within a 7 day period. (Article 4.C). Rationale: Rulebook simplification. With expanded (Divisional) minimums for course length and number of controls there is no danger of the previously feared "10-rally weekend" occurring.

Not Approved: 0-5 (0 votes for, 5 against)

Operating rule proposals:

2. In the Article 13.C.2 list of recommended (but not required) rally equipment, remove the reference to night events. Rationale: Suggested equipment is also useful during day time events.

Approved: 5-0

3. In Article 16 C, add the following language for clarification and safety: If a control immediately follows a traffic control device such as a traffic light, blinker, stop sign, or yield sign, a pause must be given or the average speeds set so that the contestant shall not be

required to exceed the legal speed limit following a typical delay at that traffic control device in order to recover any time lost prior to that control.

Approved: 5-0

Class definition proposals:

4. Change the descriptions of Classes L and S as shown below. The reasoning and intentions for these changes is:
    a. Class S is for cars that calculate using the stock tenth reading odometer and for cars that are not calculating at all.
    b. Calculating with apps that use GPS for mileage will be in Class L. These apps report mileage to a resolution of 0.01 or 0.001 mile and this gives them a distinct advantage over teams using the stock tenth reading odometer. Yet they are not competitive with the dedicated rally computers in Class E that measure distance by using pulses generated by movement of the car.
    c. Cars using GPS solely as a map or as an odometer and not doing any timing calculation with that distance information may still run in Class S.

    Proposed Class definitions:

    Class S (Stock): Any distance information used for timing calculations must be visually acquired from the vehicle's stock, non-adjustable odometer in the stock location. Any calculating device may be used as long as the distance information from the vehicle's stock odometer is manually entered into the device. GPS odometers may be used in this Class only if their information is NOT used for any calculations.

    Class L (Limited): If distance information is derived from either the car's electronic system, from the car's speedometer cable, or from pulses generated by the movement of the vehicle (for example, magnets mounted to the drivetrain), then calculating devices are limited to those that require manual entry of this distance information. Examples: Curta calculator, tables, laptop computer, programmable and non-programmable electronic calculators. If the distance information is derived solely from GPS signals, then any electronic app may be used. Examples: Richta apps, Michael Young apps.

    Class E (Equipped): There are no restrictions on calculating equipment in this Class. Typical calculating devices in this Class include: Alfa, Chronar, Timewise, and Zeron rally computers.

Approved: 5-0

5. Change the descriptions of Championship Classes to:
    A) Class E: No limit is placed on the equipment permissible for use
    B) Class L: Use of the following devices is prohibited: Alpha Elite, Chronar, Timewise 797A, Timewise 798A, Zeron 660, Zeron 770, Zeron

880, and any devices similar to those listed that that have an external display capable of showing earliness/lateness. Other than prohibition of those devices listed, no further limit is placed on the equipment permissible for use.

C) Class S: Distance measuring equipment is limited to stock odometer(s) in the stock location(s) and/or a factory installed GPS device(s). Computation equipment must not receive a direct input from any distance measuring device. Distance information must be visually acquired from a distance measuring device and must be manually entered into calculating equipment (if any).

Comment: Proposal 5 is an alternative to Proposal 4.

Not discussed, as passage of proposal 4 obviated the need.

6. Art 11.B - Remove restriction on direct input of GPS-derived mileage in timekeeping calculations in Limited class. Rationale: Allow for proliferation of new "tech" devices, which, because of limitations of GPS-based mileage estimates, are not currently competitive with dedicated rally computers in Equipped class. These devices should be competitive with skilled teams using wheel-sensor derived mileages and semi-automated hand calculations.

Comment: This change is included in Proposal 4. Proposal 4 also includes changes to the definition for Class S.

Not discussed, as proposal 4 was approved and included this change.

Championship Series proposals:

7. In 2017, Article 8D of the RRRs (Championship awards) was changed to say that in the event of a tie in the year end Championship standings, the next position _would_ be vacated. It is proposed that this rule be changed back to the way it was prior to 2017, that is, in the event of a tie the next position would _NOT_ be vacated.

Approved: 5-0

8. The current rule is that at the end of the year people who are ineligible for a year end award (are not an SCCA member, did not compete in a National rally) will be removed from the standings. It is proposed that everyone remain in the standings at year end regardless of whether they are eligible for a year end award.

Not Approved: 2-3

9. Delete Article 8.F that states: "If event results are not received within 45 days of the event, or December 31 (whichever occurs first), the event shall not count toward the SCCA RoadRally National Championship Series."

Not Approved: 0-5

10. Remove the requirement for a competitor to enter at least one National rally to be eligible for a year end award in a National Championship. Rationale: Elimination of unnecessary obstacle to participation in National Championship. Last year's elimination of the "70 Point" rule was a good start. Finish the job.

Approved: 4-1. Input from the rally community made the difference.

11. The RRRs state that worker's points are limited to 20 points per Series (Course/Tour/GTA) per year. It is proposed that the rule should be changed to allow 20 worker's points <u>per class</u> in each series per year. For example, a person could earn 20 worker points in both Class E/Course and Class S/Course.

Approved: 5-0

12. Current procedure allows a competitor to move their worker points to a different class/series by approval from the RRB. It is proposed that the Points Keeper be the person to authorize moving worker points rather than the RRB.

Not Approved: 0-4, with 1 abstention

13. The RRRs do not specifically state how worker points are to be assigned on concurrent rallies that are offered in a choice of different Series. For example, a rally that can be run as either a Course rally or as a Tour rally. It is proposed that workers (chairman, rallymaster, and pre-checkers) receive worker points for <u>each</u> rally. If a National rally is offered as both a Course and a Tour, each worker (up to a max of 4 workers) would receive 20 points for the Course rally and another 20 points for the Tour rally. If a National rally was offered as a Course, and a Tour, and a GTA, each worker would receive 60 points. The reasoning is that it is more work to put on these combination events and the workers should be rewarded for the extra effort.

Not Approved: 2-3

Proposals 14 through 16 are clarifications that would bring the RRR's into agreement with current policy and practice.

14. Update the aspect of Article 9.C that says General Instructions must be mailed via First Class mail to say that General Instructions may be sent via email rather than first class mail.

Approved: 5-0

15. In Article 8.B, clarify that a person must <u>compete</u> in a National rally rather than just <u>work</u> a National rally in order to be eligible for a year-end award. This is not a change from the way it has been interpreted in the past; it is merely a clarification of current procedure.

Not discussed, as the passage of proposal 10 made this proposal moot.

16. Add the word 'ten' in Article 8 B 4 so that it reads: "contestant may count the best ten (10) of their first fourteen (14) equivalents entered in each series with at least two (2) of those **_ten_** equivalents coming from a National event. This is not a change from the way points have been calculated; it is merely a clarification of current procedure.

Not discussed, as the passage of proposal 10 made this proposal moot.

You may be wondering why the RRB voted to release some of the above proposals for public comment but then failed to adopt that proposed rule change. The answer is that the while the RRB may not have been in favor of the change, they felt collectively that the proposal had merit and the RRB was interested in the opinion of the broader rally community.

As always, I welcome your comments on this topic or any other item of interest to the rally community.

~Rich Bireta, Chair, SCCA Road Rally Board