

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

19th March 2016 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 21st November 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 23 attendees and 12 clubs were represented with apologies from a further 5 clubs. There are 27 competitive clubs within the ALRC. Present were 8 members of the S&ORC plus a further 4 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
Tony Lockwood (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Simon Saunt (S L)	Peak & Dukeries LRC
Simone Birch (CM)	ALRC
Tony Sinclair (S L)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Antony Birch (G)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Steve Limb (G)	Leics & Rutland LRC
Andy Dennis (L)	Breckland LRC
Steve Kirby (S L R CM)	Hants & Berks LRO
Dave Canham (SLRCS)	Southern ROC

NAME	CLUB
Debbie Darby (CM)	Southern ROC
Charles Darby (G)	Southern ROC
Mark Baitup (G)	Southern ROC
Malcolm Wilson (S L)	Lincs LRC
Mark Neale (L)	Essex LRC
Belinda Neale (G)	Essex LRC
Fraser Parish (L)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
Guy Cashmore (G)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
Peter Alexander (R)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
Mykul Jones (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Paul Barton (CM)	Dunsfold SSS
Alex Moore (G)	Somerset& Wilts ROC

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
Frank Champion (SLCM)	Lincs LRC
Tim Linney (S CM)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Matthew Fullwood (G)	Chiltern Vale LRC
Allan Roberts (L)	Breckland LRC
Simon Kerfoot (L)	Red Rose LRC
Richard Smith (L)	Midland ROC

NAME	CLUB
Colin Gaukroger (R)	Lancs & Cheshire LRC
Pete Garlick (L)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
David Jeffries (L)	Cornwall& Devon LRC
Ray Godwin (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Adam Godwin (L)	Wye & Welsh LRC
Pete Lugg (L)	Somerset& Wilts ROC
Andrew Sinclair (L)	Leics & Rutland LRC

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.

(Tony Lockwood was added to the March 2015 minutes as being present as that had been missed)

3. Review the minutes of the previous meeting (4th July 2015)

The minutes were proposed by Dennis Wright, seconded by Andy Dennis 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 sent 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.

No reply has been received so this is to be followed up by Simone Birch sending another letter. This is to be sent to John Ryan and John Symes.

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

Nothing further heard from the MSA.

CLOSED

c. 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.

Following the meeting the following clarification was issued by the ALRC Council on 7th August 2015. Additional wording in bold.

b. Clarification To ALRC Regulation B19.1 – Recovery Points. T

B.19. RECOVERY POINTS.

B.19.1. Adequate front and rear recovery attachments must be provided for recovery purposes in all events. Bumpers, tie-down rings, lifting rings or Range Rover / Discovery "tow fittings" are not adequate. Factory specification (or better) trailer hitches are acceptable. If a tow-ball is fitted, welding alone is insufficient - high tensile nuts and bolts must be used for attachment. If the recovery point is attached to a bumper, the bumper must be attached to the chassis with high tensile nuts and bolts. A clevis and pin fitting or pair of Land Rover chassis-shackles (not spring shackles) are recommended.

Factory specification recovery points, when installed and used as vehicle handbook, to the following generations of vehicle are deemed suitable for recovery up to and including RTV Trials:

- **Range Rover P38A and subsequent generations**
- **Discovery 3 and subsequent generations**
- **Freelander, all generations**

Towing balls, jaws and pintles used for recovery must be rated as a minimum to the capacity of the vehicle being recovered. E.g. a 3.5Te towing ball fitted to a Freelander is compliant: a 2.25Te combined ball and jaw hitch fitted to a Defender is not compliant.

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. You can use over capacity but not under capacity tow hitches. See above clarification (4.c).

CLOSED

5. Rule Change Proposals

Proposed Event specific Rule Change for RTVT (Section E)

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. It was then amended by the S&ORC at the meeting held on 4th July 2015. At today's meeting it will be down to the S&ORC to decide if they should recommend that the proposal be either acceptable or non-acceptable to go forward to the member clubs for voting on and their decision will then be considered by the ALRC Council for ratification. (See Changing the Rules page 138, 2015 ALRC Handbook). The rule if accepted and voted for would be implemented in 2017.

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". (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 were 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.

Leics & Rutland LRC – 8 competitors. All named tyres from MSA listings – 3 competitors would move from standard class to modified. – Insa Turbo Special Track & Dakar, Marix Lion, Malatesta Kaimen, Colway C Track MT. Goodyear Wrangler MT.

Wye & Welsh LRC – all competitors use Insa Turbo Special Track – all would then be in the modified class.

Southern ROC – one of their competitors would remain in the standard class.

Cornwall & Devon LRC out of 35 competitors, 1 would be standard.

Mykul Jones said that at their taster day trial they had vehicles with Insa Special Track which made no damage to the ground but a Defender with normal road going tyres struggled to even get to the sections and cut up the ground. He had to be asked to leave at lunch time as the damage was so bad. It was felt that this rule would make an event like the Baskerville Challenge impossible to run.

Some clubs are governed by the type of tyres necessary by the land that is available to them.

The rule is not intended to outlaw tyres but put them into an appropriate class.

This rule would also have knock on effect on the National Rally Trophies, some of which are only presented to vehicles classed as standard.

If this rule were to be voted FOR then it was suggested by Guy Cashmore that clubs may then put out an SR for their event to say that this rule does not apply. This is not possible to do. An SR can be used to add to a rule but not to remove one.

It was also pointed out that at club level there would not be enough standard vehicles to form a class so they would end up being amalgamated with the modified class anyway.

It is unfortunate that there is no-one here from Chiltern Vale LRC to defend the proposal. Mark Whaley (as devil's advocate) said that in their particular area Chiltern Vale LRC have land where Insa special Track tyres are too aggressive and cause damage to the land. There is also a view that sections are now being designed to suit the vehicles that are being entered, often on more capable tyres than previously available, and this is what is resulting in more damage. Tyres have moved forward but the land has not changed. Would less aggressive tyres result in less severe trials which in turn may encourage new members to take part?

Andy Dennis said that some sites do not give you that choice. Vehicles have changed and the general capability of a coil sprung vehicle over a leaf sprung vehicle have added to the problem.

Steve Limb said that that if members have a standard vehicle and it is only the tyres that would move it into a modified class then this may encourage them to add further modifications.

Debby Darby said that if trials were to be made less severe to allow the use of standard tyres then others with more capable vehicles may then become bored and move away from the sport.

Simon Saunt said it would be better for clubs that have an issue at their sites to introduce an SR for their sites only.

Peter Alexander said that with the use of more capable tyres then some new sites are also able to be used.

This is the final discussion point for the rule by the S&ORC.

Vote from the S&ORC for recommendation for the rule to go forward to the clubs for voting on: 5 AGAINST, 2 FOR, 1 ABSTAIN. This will now be discussed by the ALRC Council.

ONGOING

6. ALRC Competitive Events Consultation Document.

The intention of this document is that it will take the place of the regulations in the ALRC Handbook.

A set of the draft proposed RTVT regulations was circulated to the meeting. These only apply to RTVT's. Another set will be available for CCVT and Comp Safari. Any rule highlighted in green is an existing one with no change. These comprise more than 50%.

There is no voting to be taken on these as they are only draft and are not rule change proposals. Members have been asked to come in person to give comments and answer questions. It is impossible to please everyone and the rules are meant for the majority and not a few vehicles or competitors. Some rules may result in some vehicles moving classes.

It must be remembered that we need to attract, develop and maintain membership and that numbers are shrinking.

A general discussion followed covering some specific points including roll cages and wing protection bars.

Alex Moore said that a letter should have been received from Somerset & Wilts ROC stating that they are against this rule change proposal document. Pete Lugg did send apologies this morning and also said that this was the case to Simone. There was very little that was liked in it.

Dave Canham said that there was nothing positive from Southern ROC about this document and there were grave concerns about some of the content.

Wye & Welsh LRC said that these rules are seen as alienating the current membership.

To enable other vehicles to be allowed to enter it was suggested that a separate class could be introduced to allow for vehicles that were not currently compliant. This is done by some clubs where non-compliant ALRC vehicles but MSA compliant vehicles are allowed to enter but are not eligible to appear in the results. These entries are usually run at the end of each section. Clubs do need to be allowing entries from prospective members that do not currently fit in the rules as this can make a difference to club finances.

Simon Saunt said that the opinion of Peak & Dukeries LRC was that they wanted to keep the current standard and modified class as is but introduce a new one for super-modified.

A letter has been received from Essex LRC.

The Essex LRC would like to thank the members responsible for the RTV consultation review. It is an epic task and has produced some interesting ideas.

The Essex LRC members who drive RTV have the following responses that they wish the ALRC committee to consider when looking to move forward with this review.

We can see the addition of a further modified class to include vehicles that we regularly turn away from our events, is of paramount importance for the future viability of our club. The regulations proposed however do throw up some anomalies that would penalise member's vehicles that sit in the current ALRC classes. We have added some case studies to highlight our concerns. We would be happy to add our support to a super modified class or special class for vehicles that currently not eligible for ALRC events, creating three classes including the current standard classes, modified classes and an additional super modified class. We are looking for evolution of current regulations rather than revolution.

Case studies

Series 2 *parabolic springs, 7.50 x 16 diamond pattern tyres (currently the most cost effective 7.50 x 16 available.) currently standard class – new class would move to production modified due to parabolic springs and then up to modified due to tyre pattern.*

Series 1 *86" two leaf sprung examples, currently modified due to engine change, both would remain modified, but be could be competing against vehicles with 37" tyres.*

Series 2 *three examples, all standard engines, parabolic springs and range rover front axles with disc brakes. Currently modified class, new rules would exclude them as disc brakes cannot be fitted to drum braked vehicles.*

Wye & Welsh LRC have also sent a letter.

Wye & Welsh Land Rover Club welcomes a review of the rules covering Road Taxed Vehicle trials.

We appreciate the hard work seen in the document covering the new proposals and would like to thank all those that have spent their time collating all the suggestions.

However, there seem to be some contradictory rules in the document and we also feel that some of the suggestions will alienate those existing members who have built or modified their vehicles within the existing rules and have trialled with the ALRC for many years against similar specification vehicles in their class.

We are unsure whether your proposals are a complete revamp of the regulations or not.

Do they completely replace the existing vehicle classes and rules or are they meant to modify the existing?

Are classes still to be split according to a vehicle's suspension type and wheel base? If so, this would seem to

be complicating things further.

The ALRC has carefully retained the belief that we should compete in classes that ensure similar specified vehicles are used and that it should be a test of driver skill that determines the better competitor. We commend this and advocate this branch of 'motorsport' as the most cost effective. There is no need to spend lots of money on vehicle modifications to become competitive. But time moves on, there are now vehicle accessories that are easily available that will enhance the vehicle's performance and off road ability, tyres being an easy product to bear in mind.

Pay & Play days are becoming more popular and new clubs are being formed that allow all sorts of vehicle modifications, with little or no regulatory control to limit what can be done.

This is the market of prospective new members that we should be trying to attract, those that have fallen for the attraction of modifying their vehicle to 'look good'.

They have spent their money on some accessory that their friend has insisted they need, only to turn up at an ALRC trial and be told they can't compete as the vehicle has the wrong type of bumper, for example.

We are pleased to see that the proposed rule changes have included these, but are disappointed that it is at the expense of those members that have kept within the ALRC guidelines up to now.

We envisaged a rule change proposal that would create an extra class for those vehicles that do not comply with the existing ALRC regulations, yet still envelope the spirit of Land Rover ownership.

This solution would satisfy existing members but would also allow prospective new members the opportunity to compete if their vehicle was fitted with the many popular aftermarket modifications, such as Tubular bumpers, Limited Slip axle diffs or had Bobtailed the body.

So to simplify, keep the existing rules that we are all familiar with and create a new "Non-Compliant" or "Super Modified" class.

Existing members carry on competing in their present vehicles and new members that turn up with a Bobtailed Discovery with tubular bumpers and Limited Slip Diffs or Diff-locks can enter the competition.

The accompanying "Rule Change Proposal" document has been modified to include our comments alongside your suggested changes.

In it, you will find the contradictions pointed out earlier and some comments added that indicate our preferred decisions on your proposals.

Cornwall & Devon LRC have similar thoughts to the above.

Chiltern Vale LRC are in favour of the new structure and content of the document.

It was pointed out that the current rule change proposal on tyres was included in the draft document. This had been rejected by the S&ORC and if this decision was ratified by the ALRC Council then it would be removed from the document.

Steve Limb raised the issue of what happens when more super modified vehicles enter events and the events become more severe to accommodate more capable vehicles.

If events are laid out by more capable vehicles then they are going to become more severe.

It was the intention of this document to show every possible scenario that could be allowed but not necessarily accept them all as an association.

Paul Barton asked whether the membership in the room considered this draft document to be suitable to be discussed in its current form?

There was official representation from 11 out of 27 clubs. The following question was asked – *Instead of this draft document who is in favour of keeping the existing regulations but adding an additional super modified class to allow new members that do not currently comply with the regulations. This class would not be eligible to win.*

This was voted by 9 FOR, with 2 abstentions.

The format was liked but a lot of the changes were not. The tick boxes format was liked.

Debby Darby wished to say that all the hard work of the working party had been appreciated and that this result must be upsetting but the floor were in agreement that this had brought about very useful debate and the outcome was positive. Thanks should be given for all the work that has been done already.

This will now be further discussed by the working party.

7. Enquiries received since previous meeting:-

a. Handbrake query - Simon Saunt, Peak & Dukeries LRC

I would like to ask the S&ORC for clarification on a green book regulation.

The reg in question is A.3.1. "Those modifications necessary to comply with safety regulations are authorised."

Now as I understand it the purpose of this rule is to allow competitors to make alterations to their vehicles which aren't allowed otherwise in the rules if they are necessary to comply with safety regulations.

My vehicle has Discovery 2 axles and a PG1 gearbox and as such has no provision for a handbrake. I know some people fit early Rang Rover front callipers on the rear and use two pistons for the service brake and two pistons for the handbrake, I did not want to do this for a number of reasons. First I would need to cut off the existing calliper mounts which I would prefer to keep standard as they were designed and rigorously tested by the factory to mount the callipers which are attached to them. Secondly the Discovery 2 rear calliper was designed by the factory to match the front callipers that I am using albeit on a different vehicle but again from a safety point of view it is a

good starting point, the Range Rover callipers have different size pistons and don't match the fronts. Furthermore with only two pistons working with the brake pedal the brake pads will wear unevenly which could potentially compromise efficiency. Finally I wanted to fit a totally independent hand brake system and not one that shares a calliper with the service brake then if ever the service brake seizes and overheats it won't affect the hand brake apart from a hot disc.

So taking into account regulation A.3.1. I searched around and acquired a pair of callipers that fitted the rear discs correctly (which happen not to be Land Rover or Rover parts) I then fabricated mounting brackets and welded them on and constructed a hydraulic handbrake.

I have subsequently been told that this arrangement doesn't comply with the regs and despite A.3.1. I still need to comply with A.2. and only construct the hand brake using pre 2001 LR or Rover parts.

I don't think my handbrake is against the spirit of the ALRC regs, indeed I feel it would be perfectly reasonable to allow it using A.3.1. nor in any way is it a competitive advantage, the important thing is that it holds the vehicle in a safe manner whilst parked.

So is my handbrake acceptable or do I need to cut the callipers off and try and find some LR/Rover ones that fit?

The question was asked is a handbrake seen as a parking brake or a secondary brake (safety)? Brakes are not listed under Safety for Competitors in the MSA Yearbook. It is thought to be a standard feature on all vehicles.

ALRC Regulation

C.7. BRAKES.

C.7.1. Any type of braking system may be used except fiddle brakes.

C.7.2. Bias braking (front to rear) is permitted but the ability to alter the settings from the driver / passenger compartment, or whilst the vehicle is being driven, is prohibited.

C.7.3 A hand brake must be fitted. The hand brake lever may be altered or changed in order to meet the requirement that the hand brake is operable by the driver whilst wearing a seat belt. No other additional linkage to operate the hand brake is allowed." (Implemented 1st January 2013).

We have already allowed the 'X brake' to be used for years – this is not a Land Rover part so sets a precedence which clouds the issue under A.2.

The movement of callipers has been done before - front callipers are already being used on the back.

The handbrake lever is still the same.

It was felt that C.7.1 was compiled with. Whilst it is a like for like component it is not felt to be a direct replacement for a Rover part number and also it is not Rover sourced but it could also affect all the 'X brakes' that are already being used. Disc handbrakes are allowed under the rule.

Vote from S&ORC – 6 FOR, 1 AGAINST, 1 ABSTAIN. It was agreed that this could be used.

CLOSED

b. Engine Class - Charles Darby, Southern ROC

I have twice now been asked whether a 300 TDi automatic 90 should be in the special class.

This is answered under ALRC Regulation B.18.1. All types of Land Rover gearboxes and their component parts may be interchanged.

This means that the vehicle should be left in the Standard class.

CLOSED

c. Engine cut off dates - Charles Darby, Southern ROC (Tim Simon, Somerset & Wilts ROC)

Debby Darby was rung yesterday about the engine cut-off date by Tim Simon of Somerset and Wilts ROC. It would appear that some people are reading it to mean only Rover group engines but feel the BMW 4.4 engine as fitted to the later Range Rover could be allowed. The particular engine discussed has come out of a car but was the same as fitted to the Range Rover. By looking at the specifications on the internet there is a considerable difference in the horsepower. (It was pointed out by Mark Whaley that there can be a difference in horsepower between the other 4.6 engines and the standard 4.6 Range Rover engine).

It was agreed that any Rover / Land Rover engine up to 2001 or any Land Rover engine after 2001 can be fitted. As this engine has been fitted to a Range Rover it is allowed in a Range Rover only.

You could fit a L322 BMW V8 into a Land Rover. You cannot fit a V12 5 litre BMW engine into a Land Rover as that has never been fitted by Land Rover. A transit TDi engine could be fitted to a Land Rover vehicle as that has been fitted by the company. This is covered under ALRC Regulation A.2. but the engine must stay in the vehicle model it was manufactured in.

CLOSED

This may now need reviewing in the future as 4.6 as V8s are getting harder to find.

For the ALRC 2016 National Rally any vehicle with a BMW V8 engine in a 88" comp safari vehicle will be allowed to run but will be excluded from the results under eligibility.

d. Steering at the National Rally – Andy Dennis, Breckland LRC



There seems to be the impression that you can disassemble a steering coupling to change its length.
I thought items should be used as manufactured not modified.
The centre is also cut out, where the strength is.
The rules do not state that this is permitted. This is not allowed.
CLOSED

e. Military Steering Components - Andy Dennis, Breckland LRC

The use of Military only steering components, i.e. parts with an 'M' on them. These are Land Rover parts which have an "M" after the number which means they are only available for use to the military. Can these be used?
Will this also extend to kits provided for the military, e.g. power steering for Series motors in the standard class?
Yes, these would be eligible for use provided they were known to be direct replacements or alternatively proof of the Land Rover part number would need to be given.

CLOSED

f. Roll cages at the National Rally & Baskerville Challenge. Andy Dennis, Breckland LRC

Message sent to Alex Moore, Somerset & Wilts ROC via facebook
Looks like we might have made a mistake over your roll cage mounting. In my opinion I think 8.2.1. in the yearbook clarifies the issue. In the following drawings, the rectangle identified as "Chassis" can also be taken to be an outrigger. Are you still going to the ALRC meeting this month? Would you like me to write in your log book then? Alternatively you could send it to me and I will post it back to you. Are you happy with this or would you still like it clarified at the meeting?

ALRC Handbook page 127, 8.2.15. Above is the type of mounting enabling the roll cage to be removed leaving only the socket in situ in the vehicle. This is under the sub-heading 8.2 which is titled "Methods of Securing Roll Cages to Chassis" which appears under the main heading of Main Hoops.

Rule 7.8.2. page 125 shows the method of attaching the roll cage to the outrigger.

The rear foot mounting on this vehicle has been done the same way as the front mounting.

This topic has been discussed previously and on the 17th Nov 2012 it was agreed that the additional method shown in the diagram 8.2.1b could be applied to either the front or back hoop as a base foot mounting.

The ALRC Handbook is to be updated to show this information in the next edition. This clarification is to be issued in the letter which will go out with these minutes

The log book is to be updated today confirming acceptance of the rear foot mountings.

CLOSED

g. Suspension at the Baskerville Challenge, Andy Dennis, Breckland LRC

There was a vehicle entered with a Rear A frame joint spaced away. I thought it had already been clarified at a previous meeting that suspension should be fitted as a complete set.

Under C.5.1 only the mounts on a suspension system may be modified. It does not state that this A frame modification can be made so it is not allowed.

CLOSED

h. Roll Cage Damage, Mykul Jones, Wye & Welsh LRC

Letter sent to a competitor after damage to a roll cage happened at the Baskerville Challenge. Mykul Jones was going to remove the tag and write in the log book but this did not happen after the event.

Following discussion with the competitor by letter and emails from Wye & Welsh LRC and a telephone call from Simone Birch, it has been confirmed that the vehicle is due to be checked by Andy Dennis in January - this has been delayed from the previously planned visit in November due to family commitments. He also confirmed that he would not be entering any ALRC events until the matter was sorted out. We have no authority at other events and if he chooses to use a damaged vehicle then that is beyond our control.

When the damage occurred there was one remaining section to be driven. This was not thought to present any danger of a roll so it was decided that the competitor could drive this section and the tag would then be removed. Unfortunately this did not happen

Letter sent to Tim Mackley from Wye & Welsh LRC. 23rd September 2015

I have been asked to write to you as we have tried several times to contact you by phone. I am writing to ask you to urgently contact either myself or preferably our Chief Scrutineer, Mykul Jones.

Your vehicle – UVG 51 having been rolled on a CCV section at the Baskerville Challenge this year, should have had its logbook & tag removed by Mykul. He had a conversation with you after the roll & after assessing the last section he decided to allow you to complete the last section but asked you to return to him after the trial, so he could collect the tag & logbook. Unfortunately you did not do this & left the site with the tag & logbook.

Mykul requires these two items urgently & needs you to know that the vehicle must not be used in CCV events & must be presented to him for re-logbooking once the repairs have been done.

No reply was received from Tim and Mykul did not feel that the ALRC had backed him on this. He was not aware of the action taken by Simone and Dennis Wright and further communication with the club secretary.

Reply sent to the club secretary by Simone. 25th October 2015

Sorry for not replying sooner but I have been away as Leics do seem to have different school holidays to the rest of the country.

This matter is to be addressed at the next S&ORC meeting as there does seem to be some ambiguity as to how to proceed in the ALRC Handbook, page 87.

It was not felt practicable for the vehicle to be returned to Mykul for checking. Given the nature of events and members travelling many miles sometimes to attend, it was felt that any log book scrutineer should be able to check vehicles, hence the importance of writing on log books when damaged has occurred. This would also then mean that the vehicle could not be used in the meantime.

When Andy Dennis has checked this vehicle I will hopefully receive confirmation that the work has been carried out and the vehicle repaired and I will confirm this with you.

When the letter was originally sent Tim Mackley was working away but he was made aware of the letter by his wife and he assured the ALRC that the vehicle would not be used at ALRC events until it had been repaired and rechecked. The information given by Tim Mackley was also confirmed with Andy Dennis.

Tony Sinclair said that one way to avoid this happening again was for competitors to hand in their log books at the beginning of an event and then collect them at the end. This makes it easy to write notes on them and is something that Leics & Rutland LRC has done successfully for many years, albeit on a small scale. It is planned to do this at the next Baskerville Challenge event but could easily be done at other club events.

This has highlighted the reluctance of competitors to give up their tag and log book – both of which do not belong to them but to the ALRC. Should any ALRC log book scrutineer ask for these they should immediately be given to them.

This has also highlighted some ambiguity in the wording on the Log Book implementation between competitors and log book scrutineers. Page 86-87, 2015 ALRC Handbook.

Under Tag Removal Issues it states that *“The tag should be removed when the cage is found to have been damaged in an accident to the point where all or part of it needs to be replaced.”*

Dennis Wright said that we do need to decide when the tag needs to be removed as there does seem to be some ambiguity between competitors and log book scrutineers. Some think that only when the main hoop is damaged should the tag be removed but this is not the case.

The log book should be written on so that the log book scrutineer who checks the vehicle after a repair knows which part he is supposed to be checking.

There is a paragraph at the bottom of the page that states *“Details of the problem are to be written in the log book and dated and the owner will then have six weeks from that date to rectify the problem after which the vehicle is no longer in compliance.”*

This paragraph refers to any problem, not just tag removal issues and is to be moved to under Stage 3 in the next ALRC Handbook.

When the front hoop is damaged, a single log book scrutineer can inspect the repair provided it is done within the six week period. Outside of that timescale it would require to be checked by two log book scrutineers and a full log book check will need to be carried out. Should the main hoop be damaged then the vehicle would require two signatures.

Only the scrutineer at the event may remove the tag and retain the log book, invalidating the vehicle. He must send the two items to the log book secretary stating his reasons and the competitor will then need to have the vehicle re-log-booked. This has been done in the past by some.

There is now some school of thought that the tag should remain with the vehicle for identification purposes and the log book written on only. This would help to keep a full history of the vehicle. This would identify the vehicles that can have certain roll cages due to the age of the vehicle. Some vehicles can compete in a comp safari with a pair

of parallel roll bar bracing bars. If the tags are removed and the history and identity is lost then these would need changing as well. This does need clarifying in the process.

It was suggested by Guy Cashmore that vehicles could be given two tags – one for identification that would always remain on the vehicle and one to show compliance and able to compete. This would be the one to remove in the case of damage.

This was thought to be a good idea and is to be further discussed by the ALRC Council to determine how to implement it. More tags are to be sourced. This could be perhaps started at next year's National Rally as a way of reaching many vehicles.

When new log books are printed the wording that the tags and log book remain ALRC property is to be added.

ONGOING

8. Any other business.

a. Dave Canham, Southern ROC – Is it allowed to cut axles and re-weld them to change the caster angles?

Some are cutting them at the end and putting different half shafts in to achieve this. Is this allowed? Currently undecided.

In September 2008 there was a draft proposal and part of this stated:

C5.1.3 Components shall not be cut, welded, bent or shortened or lengthened and shall each be a standard size and LR production design to match the appropriate LR part number.

The intention of this rule was to allow for interchanging of axles between suspension types and Steve Kirby suggested that the proposed rules show separate rulings for axles and for suspension types.

In January 2009 it was said that the whole proposal was put together to close loopholes. A case went to the MSA recently and it was found in favour of the competitor and against the ALRC. Technology must stay with the vehicle it was produced in.

The rules were not proceeded with in their entirety.

Current rules state:

B.6.3. states "Axle casings may have strengthened material welded to them."

C.5.1. Any Land Rover suspension system and components may be used on any model and the suspension mounts modified to accommodate the components, the use of air suspension is prohibited except in classes and periods where fitted as original equipment.

There are vehicles being used that do seem to not comply with these rules. The current rules do seem to focus on suspension and not the axles.

This is to be further discussed at the next meeting.

ONGOING

b. Dave Canham, Southern ROC – Is it permissible to move engine mounts on a chassis? This is allowed.

CLOSED

9. Date and location of next meeting.

Next Meeting – March 19th 2016

Dates for 2016 – 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 16.15 pm.