

ASSOCIATION OF LAND ROVER CLUBS

President: Mr Denis Bourne



Please Reply to: Simone Birch
1A Duncan Avenue
Huncote
Leics
LE9 3AN

E-mail: tonybirch@btinternet.com
0116 286 7913

Scrutineering & Off Road Committee Meeting

21st November 2015 starting at 13:00. (1 o'clock pm after the EGM)
The Oaks Farmhouse
NFU Insurance HQ, Tiddington (near Stratford-upon-Avon).

AGENDA

1. Open the meeting.
2. Apologies for absence.
3. Acceptance of minutes the previous meeting.
4. Ongoing Topics.
5. Rule change Proposals
6. ALRC Competitive Events Consultation.
7. Enquiries received since the last meeting.
8. Any other business this meeting.
9. Date and location of next meeting.
10. Close the meeting.

For those who have not been there before:-

The NFU Insurance HQ is in Tiddington, just to the East of Stratford-upon-Avon.

If you cross the Avon Bridge in Stratford-upon-Avon heading South East, take the very first left turn off the end of the bridge, signposted Tiddington, B4086. This becomes Main Street in Tiddington. It's one mile to the prominent rectangular building set well back on your right on the Western outskirts of Tiddington near the junction with Knight's Lane. If you get to Knight's Lane, you've just gone past the building!

If you're coming in from Wellesbourne heading West, drive carefully through the narrow Tiddington village towards the Western outskirts where NFU HQ is on your left just past Knight's Lane.

We now use the separate building to the left of the main Head Office so turn left off the main driveway just before you get to the main building.

Please sign the register in the entrance area so the security staff know who is in the building in the event of an emergency.

ASSOCIATION OF LAND ROVER CLUBS

President: Mr Denis Bourne



Please Reply to: Simone Birch
1A Duncan Avenue
Huncote
Leics
LE9 3AN

E-mail: tonybirch@btinternet.com
0116 286 7913

Minutes of the of Scrutineering & Off Road Committee meeting of 4th July 2015

Distribution:-

Via club secretaries who forward them accordingly to their club members, Scrutineering & Off Road Committee members, Log Book Scrutineers, Club Representatives, Council members and other interested parties.

Note:- Recipients of these minutes need to ensure that these matters are discussed at club committee meetings and also to publicise any concluded issues in their club newsletters. In the majority of cases, the minutes are sent by post and e-mail to the secretaries of all competitive clubs, S&ORC, Log Book Scrutineers, club delegates and members attending the meetings.

There were 20 attendees and 11 clubs were represented with apologies from a further 3 clubs. There are 27 competitive clubs within the ALRC. Present were 7 members of the S&ORC plus a further 3 log book scrutineers.

The accuracy of these minutes will be confirmed by their acceptance at the next meeting.

Those present - Taken from the NFU attendance list.

NAME	CLUB
Mark Whaley (S L CM)	North Eastern RO
Ian Whaley (G)	North Eastern RO
Dennis Wright (S L CM)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Simone Birch (CM)	ALRC
Tony Sinclair (S L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Andrew Sinclair (L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Andy Dennis (L)	Breckland LRC
Steve Kirby (S L R CM)	Hants & Berks LRO
Dave Canham (SLRCS)	Southern ROC
Debbie Darby (CM)	Southern ROC
Charles Darby (G)	Southern ROC

NAME	CLUB
Colin Gaukroger (R)	Lancs & CheshireLRC
Mark Neale (L)	Essex LRC
Belinda Neale (G)	Essex LRC
Matthew Fullwood (G)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Tim Linney (S CM)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Derek Spooner (CM)	ALRC
Frank Champion(SLCM)	Lincs LRC
Paul Barton (CM)	Dunstable SSS
Chris Barnes (G)	Anglian LRC
Ed Barnes (G)	Anglian LRC

S = Scrutineering Committee member. R = Club Representative. L = Log-book Scrutineer.
CS = Chief Scrutineer (of the named club) G = Guest CM = Council member.

Apologies for absence received from:

NAME	CLUB
Andrew Flanders (S LCM)	Anglian LRC
Malcolm Wilson (S L)	Lincs LRC
Tony Lockwood (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC

NAME	CLUB
Allan Roberts (L)	Breckland LRC
Simon Kerfoot (L)	Red Rose LRC
Richard Smith (L)	Midland ROC

Note that the elected scrutineers committee members and log book scrutineers, marked (S or L) above, represent the ALRC as a whole; the club name is included for information only. Matters that are concluded will be marked CLOSED.

Any enquiries should be copied to Simone Birch, at the above address, so that they can be entered into the minutes of the meeting with the correct wording.

1. Open the Meeting.

The meeting was opened at 13:05 p.m.

2. Apologies for absence.

Apologies for absence were recorded. See table above.

3. Review the minutes of the previous meeting (14th March 2015)

The minutes were proposed by Dennis Wright, seconded by Steve Kirby and agreed unanimously. Signed by Mark Whaley.

4. Review of ongoing Topics.

a.MSA Off-Road Scrutineers. (23 March 2013)

A letter from the ALRC to the MSA has been written and is to be sent after this meeting to John Ryan

The wording is as follows:

As an Association which represents a significant number of members that arranges and manages competitive events which require Licensed MSA Scrutineering support the ALRC urge you to re-introduce the fast tracking of specialist off-road scrutineers.

We have observed that it is becoming increasingly difficult to attract scrutineers from the circuit racing and rallying community to support our events; as such we are becoming increasingly reliant upon a small number of dedicated officials from within the off-road motorsport community. We feel that this situation is not sustainable with many younger members being discouraged from becoming Licensed Scrutineers by the requirement to become heavily involved in areas of motorsport where they have no expertise or interest.

We urge you to reconsider your earlier decision and allow the re-introduction of the Fast-Tracking process for Off-Road Scrutineers once again.

ONGOING.

b. Scrutineering Seat belts, Andy Dennis, Breckland LRC.

Questions raised after the initial query was answered.

MSA diagram 31 (MSA 2015 Yearbook P188, ALRC 2015 Handbook P122) what is the 60cm vertical measurement that appears to be up to the driver's chin.

This is from the drivers chin to the knee. We are not sure if everyone meets this measurement. If this appears not to work with our vehicles then we will have to contact the technical department. We thought that the oval on the bottom of the diagram was the seat and not the knees.

It was thought that the 5cm clearance should apply to all parts of the roll cage, including side bars but it has been confirmed that the 5 cm clearance on roll cages only applies to the Main hoop. This was also changed from the top of the hoop to the bottom at some time with no explanation.

Unfortunately in the MSA Yearbook we can find no reference to the diagram 31 but it is referenced in the ALRC Handbook. Further information from the MSA is still awaited on this matter.

The following rule also appears in the MSA 2015 Yearbook P148, ALRC 2015 Handbook P208

J.5.3.4. *The seat cushion (i.e. the part on which the occupant sits) when uncompressed, must not be less than 15.25cm below the top edge of the adjacent body side or door.*

Some Series I with different seats may not comply with this, so scrutineers should be aware of this when checking vehicles. All vehicles must comply with this rule. If necessary the door may need to have something added to the top to make them higher.

The following text was issued the week prior to the ALRC National Rally at the request of Ian Davis, MSA who was grateful that the matter was raised so quickly.

The MSA has issued an instruction that all competition vehicles are assessed to ensure compliance with rules J.5.3.4 and 5.3.5. These are long standing requirements for Competition vehicles. The Rule in its current format and earlier iterations can be found in the current and previous versions of the ALRC Green Book dating back a minimum of 17 years.

Competitors: Vehicles (J)

5.3.4. *The seat cushion (i.e. the part on which the occupant sits) when uncompressed, must not be less than 15.25cm below the top edge of the adjacent body side or door.*

5.3.5. *Any other seats fitted must similarly comply and all seats must face forward.*

Competitors have raised concern over the interpretation of this rule. The issue arises due to the variable height of seat cushions where the rear most part of the seat is lower than the front of the seat cushion.

The MSA have issued the following clarification of this rule:

As the regulation states, the measurement relates to that part of the seat squab that you sit on. For complete clarity that is that part of the body that is secured in position by the lap strap, whether a lap belt or part of a 3 or 4 point belt or harness. Perhaps tactfully described as the hips. The height of the forward part of the squab, that beneath the knee, is less important for the purpose of the regulation which is to ensure that the person is properly seated and satisfactorily restrained inside the confines of the vehicle.

Using the MSA statement as a base line, Scrutineering at the National will use the following criteria to assess vehicle compliance.

The usable area of the seat squab extending a minimum of 200mm (roughly 8 inches) from the base of the seat

back measuring forward should comply with the MSA rule. As stated in the MSA rule the measurement is taken with the seat empty and the seat cushion uncompressed.

No challenge to the proposed measurement method was received. The scrutineers at the National Rally saw no failures for the seat height test with the majority of CCV entrants having a seat to door top measurement well in excess of the required 6 inch minimum.

During the event measurements were taken from standard Series I motor thanks to the S1 club participants. It was found that the standard S1 seat configuration passed rule 5.3.4

ONGOING.

5. Rule Change Proposals

The following rule change proposal has been received from Chiltern Vale LRC on the 28th April 2015. Proposed by Matthew Fullwood and seconded by Tim Linney.

Proposed Event specific Rule Change for RTVT (Section E)

Current rule reads:

E.2. TYRES & WHEELS

E.2.1. Vehicles must be entered on their normal road tyres which must be UK road legal for the vehicle on which they are fitted.

Proposed change;

E.2. TYRES & WHEELS

E.2.1.1. Standard class vehicles must be entered on their normal road tyres conforming to the MSA designation of "All Terrain" or "Mud Terrain" or similar tread pattern. (See MSA table in Green book 2015 page 258 -260 – List 5(a) and 5(b).

E.2.1.2. Vehicles entered with tyres conforming to the MSA designation of "Aggressive" or similar tread patterns will be deemed modified class. (See MSA table in Green book 2015 page 260 – Lich 5(c).

E.2.2.3. Tyres must be UK road legal for the vehicle on which they are fitted.

Rational behind this rule change proposal:

On terrain where tyres make a difference, "aggressive" mud terrains such as Simex Extreme Trekker (and Insa Turbo Special Track copies) give **significant** competitive advantage compared to someone running a normal milder mud terrain such as a BFG Mud Terrain T/A KM2. There should be no reason to prevent people running these aggressive tyres. However the regulations clearly promote "standard" vehicles in the standard class. 2015 Green book page 70: "The Standard class regulations consist of practically no major "competitive advantage" alterations..."

Anyone wishing to run aggressive tyres should be in the modified class as the only reason for fitting such tyres is to "gain an advantage" with superior traction.

N.B. This only affects RTVT events and will not change the classes for CCVT events.

Council comment - The wording of "similar tread pattern" should be taken out and this was then discussed at this S&ORC meeting.

The wording of "similar" is seen as being difficult to enforce as proof may be needed that it is similar. The intention was not to exclude anyone who happened to have a tyre that was not on the MSA list but this was thought to be difficult to work with. The MSA website has more up to date listings for the tyres allowed.

It was also said that there are tyres available that are identical to other makes but have a different name.

By referring to the list we would then need to enforce that only those were allowed.

It could be that if the tyre is not on the listing then it could be classed as aggressive and put into the modified class regardless.

It is thought that for RTVT the principle parts that give the most competitive advantage are tyres and suspension and this rule would take this into account.

It must be remembered that this is a proposal that all member clubs will be asked to vote on at the ALRC AGM with the proviso that it is recommended to go forward by the S&ORC and ALRC Council following the S&ORC meeting in November.

It was pointed out by Charles Darby that sometimes vehicles can have tyres fitted that have been allowed in the past on a previous MSA list. It must also be remembered that the lists are being constantly changed and tyre manufacturers are bringing out new variations.

Proposed change by the S&ORC

E.2. TYRES & WHEELS

E.2.1.1. Standard class vehicles must be entered on their normal road tyres conforming to the MSA designation of "All Terrain" or "Mud Terrain". (See MSA table in Green book 2015 page 258 -260 – List 5(a) and 5(b).

E.2.1.2. Vehicles not entered with tyres complying with E.2.1.1 will be deemed to be modified.

E.2.2.3. Tyres must be UK road legal for the vehicle on which they are fitted.

(Up to date listings are available from the current MSA listing that can be found on their website. Scrutineers should have a copy of these at their events)

All club scrutineers are asked to check the tyres that are currently being used on RTVT vehicles so that we can be made aware of any potential issues raised by this rule change proposal. The information is required for the November S&ORC meeting. This request is to be added to the letter that Simone will send out with the minutes to highlight the matter to all competitive clubs. **ONGOING**

6. ALRC Competitive Events Consultation Document.

With the support of the ALRC Council a copy of the RTVT Regulations as worked out by the working party group was circulated for member clubs to discuss. The intention is to have the regulations ready for the 2017 ALRC Handbook. There is a lot to read and digest so further discussions will take place at the November S&ORC. A copy will be sent to all clubs with the minutes and they will be available for any club member who wants one. Any comments from clubs and their members need to be made in person at the meeting so that questions can be asked and answered from all sides.

A great deal of effort has been taken to ensure that the rules do not exclude anyone who currently trials from taking part but some may have class changes.

It is difficult to include leaf sprung vehicles and coil sprung vehicles in the same regulations so the regulations could perhaps be split if thought necessary. This is to be further discussed at the next meeting.

7. Enquiries received since previous meeting:-

The following report has been received from Richard Banks following the scrutineering at the ALRC National Rally CCVT motors and it is unfortunate he is not here at the meeting to discuss them in person as they have a bearing on enquiries received.

28 vehicles failed when first presented to scrutineering. A summary of failures is as follows: (some vehicles exhibited multiple failures)

- *Loose suspension joints or fixings – 7*
- *Inappropriate rope – 2*
- *Bent or incorrect bumper – 3*
- *Fuel cover seals inadequate – 2 (one vehicle was leaking fuel from a breather due to over filled tank)*
- *Loose Brake and fuel lines – 1*
- *Poor seat belt fixings – 6*
- *Worn prop shaft or loose prop bolts – 3*
- *Loose/worn steering components/joints – 7*
- *Poor recovery points – 2*
- *Holes in bulkhead – 2*
- *Inner wing missing – 1 (direct damage to brake master cylinder was possible from debris off front wheel)*

In general the vehicle standard was good. The main concern from vehicle inspection was the poor attitude to safety from some competitors. Seat belt issues were generally due to inadequate fixings and the use of multiple belts attached to one fixing point with short and poorly fixed bolts. A number of competitors also had short lengths of chain to extend seat belts. These were failed since no evidence could be provided for the integrity or strength of the chain.

RTVT Motors

24 vehicles failed when first presented to scrutineering. A summary of failures is as follows: (some vehicles exhibited multiple failures)

- *Loose suspension joints or fixings – 7*
- *Bent or incorrect bumper – 4*
- *Loose Seating - 1*
- *Worn prop shaft or loose prop bolts – 2*
- *Loose/worn steering components/joints – 8*
- *Poor recovery points – 2*
- *Holes in bulkhead – 1*
- *Wheel Spacers – 3*
- *Tyres – 2 (vehicle required a re-check after changing to competition tyres)*
- *Loose Battery – 4*
- *Sharp protrusions from bent bodywork - 2*

In general the vehicle standard was good. Again the main concern from vehicle inspection was the poor attitude to safety from some competitors. It is frightening the number of vehicles with poorly fixed suspension components and loose/excessively worn steering components. The two vehicles that presented sharp damaged bodywork were fit for scrap and nothing else. With the advent of paperless legislation for MOT and TAX the ALRC will need a method for ensuring road legal vehicles only are allowed to compete in RTV events.

TYRO and COMP presented no issues.

It was mentioned at the ALRC EGM held this morning that it is possible to check if a vehicle has tax and therefore the necessary documentation by going to the gov.uk website but it must be remembered that by signing on competitors are saying that they comply and that this should be taken on face value.

It is felt that the scrutineers job at an event is to ensure that the vehicle is firstly safe to compete, then is it eligible to take part? It was said that the fact of having an MOT does not necessarily mean that vehicle would be safe to compete at an off road event.

Richard has said that he would like some clarification of rules regarding steering joints and cage joints in particular.

a. Roll Cage enquiry - Chris Barnes, Anglian LRC

The following letter has been received and Chris and Ed Barnes were both present at the meeting.

I am writing to seek your help in resolving a scrutineering issue that arose at the CCV event at the weekend. I am the owner of "Robin", a green trialer driven by my son Ed. Ed was told by the scrutineers that the centre roof bar on the vehicle was bent and that there was corrosion. The vehicle's logbook was confiscated but he was allowed to compete. I understand this happened to a number of other competitors although I also know that some vehicles with bent cages were allowed to pass without comment. I wish to make the following points.

- 1. The vehicle was logbooked by Andrew Flanders and Alan Wood, both highly experienced scrutineers who took their time to give the roll cage a proper inspection. It has not sustained any damage since then and it has passed scrutineering at three National Rallies without comment. Now your scrutineers have overturned that decision during a cursory inspection and under pressure to check some 120 vehicles. I think this undermines the whole log booking procedure. What is the point of having a logbook if it can be second guessed at scrutineering?*
- 2. There is only light surface corrosion visible on the bar. It would need to be cut off to check. Moreover it is not deformed. It was made like that as part of the roof structure.*
- 3. Ed was told that he could compete but that his logbook would be withdrawn. When he complained he was told by Andy Dennis that he (Ed) had agreed to this deal. This is nonsense. There was no "deal". Who would not compete if they were allowed to do so?*
- 4. I have a real worry about safety. If the cage was unsafe Ed should not have been allowed to compete. The fact that he was allowed to do so indicates that the scrutineers thought the cage was safe, in which case they should not have withdrawn the logbook. Mr Dennis commented that "we can't ban everyone". This indicates a cavalier attitude to safety on his part. Had there been an accident involving a vehicle without a logbook the ALRC would have had some very difficult questions to answer from the MSA.*
- 5. I am most concerned about the high handed and aggressive attitude of some of the scrutineers. Of course they have a difficult job and their time and commitment is appreciated by competitors. But people come to the National to enjoy themselves and this should not be spoilt by inappropriate behaviour by the scrutineers.*
- 6. I strongly believe that the rules should be applied consistently. This has clearly not happened here.*

We are now left in a difficult situation. The trialer is used regularly but we do not have the logbook. We are willing to replace the centre roof bar and get the work inspected. Please return the logbook so that it can be noted or advise us if we need a new one. I hope this can be settled satisfactorily. If not I will have no option but to refer the whole sorry episode to the MSA. I am sure we would both prefer not to go down that route. I look forward to hearing from you soon.



Following receipt of this letter Richard Banks confirmed that this was one of the vehicles he wished to further discuss and included these two photographs to support his findings.

He reiterated that the centre bar is clearly bent and not in line with the socket into which it fits. It is not overly apparent from the photo but the bar is also corrosion pitted. In my experience if the steel is corroded outside it will also be corroded internally. I have the tag and log book for this cage. This was to be sent to Dennis Wright but he has not received it as yet.

From the pictures you will see that the connecting tubes and centre bar are bolted to the rear hoop. I wish to ask the SORC if this is ALRC compliant because it does not fit my reading of the rules.

This socket arrangement is in the MSA Yearbook but it we cannot see if it welded continuously all the way around. Chris Barnes stated that the vehicle had been log booked by two experienced log book scrutineers. Nothing has happened to the vehicle since that time. It was built with one of the centre bars slightly bent because one of the sockets was bent out slightly – this is how it was made originally.

Dennis Wright stated that roof bars are allowed to be bent in manufacture and the type of sockets is also mentioned in the ALRC Handbook but is only applicable to rear stays. This design of socket can be use in a vertical plane but not a horizontal one.

Frank Champion stated that there were two issues here – the first being that a logbook is fine when it is first done but we are unable to confirm that a vehicle is still as presented. Event scrutineers must act on the current state of the vehicles and not go solely on the logbook. It does say in the rules that the tubes must not be pitted and perhaps the corrosion could be seen as evidence of this.

The vehicle was allowed to enter the event as it was deemed to be safe for that particular event and the log book was taken off the competitor afterwards with the tag being removed then so that this issue could be sorted out; this was to ensure that the vehicle was compliant to current regulations for future events.

The MSA regulations were met as they do not differentiate between RTVT and CCVT on their trial permits. It is an ALRC supplementary regulation requirement that CCVT vehicles have a log book and a roll cage.

Chris Barnes said it would be helpful if the whole process could be made clearer to the competitor. Dennis Wright said that the vehicle may need to be issued with a new logbook and tag as the original one is now null and void.

On checking the ALRC Handbook and the MSA Yearbook a vehicle is not allowed to have roof bars that are welded onto the front hoop and then only bolted onto the back hoop via a sleeve, There is no drawing that shows the current arrangement as an approved design so it was correct to state that the roll cage is none compliant.

The 2015 MSA Yearbook states in section *K 1.3.7 that demountable joints must not be used as part of a main, front or lateral rollbar because they act as hinges in the principle structure and allow deformation.*

In the 2015 ALRC Handbook the correct method of attaching the roof bars is shown on page 122 and the meeting was sure that this vehicle does not have a compliant roll cage to ALRC regulations which is a requirement under out supplementary regulations. The regulations in the ALRC Handbook are the ones that should be used for roll cages on CCVT vehicles as it is an ALRC requirement that vehicles have a roll cage for the event.

If the vehicle had a certificate for the roll cage that was acceptable to the MSA then it would be allowed. This is not the case for this vehicle.

It will be possible to change the roll cage so that the roof bars are welded onto the rear hoop.

We do need to find the log book so that a comment on remedial works competed to meet ALRC Regulations and the new tag number can be added to it, Simone will chase this up after she has been on holiday. As the complete roll cage does not need replacing one signature will be required to sign that the roll cage is now compliant and a new tag issued.

Chris Barnes agreed to do the necessary work to the vehicle.

It was correct that the tag was removed after the event as the vehicle was not compliant but safe to compete.

Should a roll cage become damaged and unsafe during an event then the tag should be immediately removed.

This should be explained better to competitors at future events – sometimes at events problems with vehicles are not always clear cut and after a National Rally it is usual that any queries are discussed at the next S&ORC meeting.

This issue has also highlighted the importance of log book scrutineers attending S&ORC meetings and this is part of the criteria of being a log book scrutineer. This is so they can keep abreast of current issues and cascade this information to other club scrutineers. There is a difference between being safe and being compliant.

At future events part of the role of the competitive liaison officer could be to explain to the competitor the scrutineer's decision. Comments should also be written on the log books so that checks can be made that any necessary work is carried out before using the vehicle at another event.

CLOSED

b. Spreader Plate – Richard Hibbert, Peak & Dukeries LRC



The chief scrutineer at the National Rally advised me to fit a spreader plate on the rear tow hitch on the inside of the rear cross member. I have now fitted one, the plate is 6mm thick. The vehicle reg is YVF 984A.

This was deemed acceptable but a follow up reply is to be sent by Mark Whaley asking for longer bolts to be fitted so that they protrude beyond the nyloc nuts.

CLOSED

c. Comp Safari - Freelander without Tailgate, Andy Dennis, Breckland LRC

Following an eligibility question raised by the Staffs & Shrops LRC crew at the 2015 National Comp, could the following question be clarified and put to bed. A fellow competitor, I believe not from the same class asked the question. The Freelander silhouette is not correct as it is running without its tailgate? The car in question is not a new build and competed at the 2014 Nationals.

So I propose the following.

“A Freelander can run in either a CCVT or Comp Safari without its tailgate”.

I don't believe this affects the silhouette of the car, there are many other comp safari/CCVT cars running without full height rear bodies, so I believe a precedent has already been set.

The vehicle still complies as it is covered by 2015 MSA Yearbook regulation P.56.2.2. *Tailgates may be removed.*

ALRC Regulation E.1.3 requires the tailgate to be fitted and secured for RTV only, the above proposal is not required as it is covered within the combined ALRC and MSA regulations.

CLOSED

8. Any other business.

a. Recovery Points, Matthew Fulwood, Chiltern Vale LRC

For all events it is stated that welding is not sufficient and that Range Rover / Discovery “tow fittings” are not adequate (B.19.1) but there are now a lot more models available with factory fitted tow points. A P38 had turned up to an event with a lashing point fitted under the bumper and a recovery point on the bumper all fitted by the factory and nothing else is able to be fitted. Is this deemed sufficient for an RTVT?

This rule is to exclude the welding only of tow points on the rear cross member without the use of high tensile bolts and the use of lashing eyes fitted to Range Rover Classics, Discoveries and 90/110 variants (these are only intended as tie downs during transport)

Should we add Discovery I and Range Rover Classic only for this rule with later models being deemed suitable if they have factory fitted tow points? Yes.

A clarification from the ALRC Council is needed to be issued for B.19.1. Mark Whaley is to circulate suitable wording to the ALRC Council and after approval a letter will be sent to all clubs on this matter.

ONGOING

b. Seat Belt Fittings, Terry Buss, Southern ROC

A seat belt anchorage onto a roll cage being built using scaffolding joints was recently stopped. The anchorage point should be full wrapped around. It was thought that some other scaffolding joints may comply with the regulations. Anchorage points should be checked as it is believed that some vehicles may be being used that do not comply with the regulations.

A reminder was given that seat belts should be worn as designed. The minimum of a lap belt must be worn. If shoulder straps are attached as a one piece belt then they should be worn. If only a lap belt is wanted to be worn then it must be one with no shoulder straps attached.

CLOSED

c. Body Capping on Vehicles, Terry Buss, Southern ROC

When training is given to log book scrutineers they are instructed to measure vehicles from the body capping to the bottom of whatever is being measured. Body capping **must** be fitted; these are not allowed to be removed. Only items above the body capping can be removed.

The reason for this is to prevent sharp edges being present on a vehicle.

It could be that the capping may not have been removed but that when the vehicle was made they were not included in the build. The capping must be added.

Any vehicles found to not have body capping fitted should have a comment written on their log book so this matter can be rectified before they are allowed to compete again.

CLOSED

d. Recovery at the ALRC National Rally, Tim Linney, Chiltern Vale LRC

Some members had inadequate recovery points and were using straps and not ropes for recovery.

It was noted that there were at least three vehicles competing at the RTVT National Rally that did not have compliant tow hitches fitted, namely the ball and pin hitch that is only rated at 1.5tons which is not adequate for a Land Rover. These are not permitted. Scrutineers should be aware of this and a clarification is to be sent out stating that the minimum of a 3 – 3.5 ton rating should be used.

ONGOING

9. Date and location of next meeting.

Next Meeting – November 21st 2015

Dates for 2016 – March 19th, July 9th and November 12th.

The location will be The Oaks Farmhouse, NFU Mutual HQ in Tiddington, near Stratford-upon-Avon.

10. Close the meeting. Meeting closed at 15.20 pm.