

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------------------|---------------|--------|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| 2 | 5.1 | body and chassis | Grant Johnson | Oct-08 | BODYS AND CHASSIS ABLE TO BE MIXED MANUFACTURERS | pending - feedback requested | B | <p>_____ I have no problem with mixing body's and chassis I have not discussed this with any competitors yet to see how far we go with this rule eg. do we allow half of one chassis and half of another?</p> <p>_____ Must be a production chassis, so you can't use half of one and half of another. I also think there shouldn't be restriction on altering the chassis. It doesn't make any difference whether you shift the axles and cut the chassis off or if you just cut a piece out of the chassis. I don't think you should be allowed to lengthen a chassis though otherwise everyone will just get a really light (Suzuki) chassis and make it longer and put wider axles with lots of power. Great fun but not really in the spirit.</p> |
| 2.1 | | | | | | | B | <p>..comments continued..</p> <p>_____ not excited about a mix and match of manufacturers as it will confuse the original concept of being able to relate a vehicle to a manufacturer (getting brownie points for supporting 'brands' such as gained by Bruce Hughes from Toyota) If it is agreed then a note to require the donor vehicles to have been only of MC class. (no Mini bodies on a Nissan chassis etc).</p> <p>_____ 50/50 Yes/No.</p> <p>_____ I think definitely needs to be discussed and should maybe have been on the "B" list just to highlight the fact that feedback is needed. Not so much on whether or not it's a good idea, but more so how far we should go with this rule change – what mods we will or wont allow to a chassis. As an example, personally I think we should allow people to cut and shorten a lwb chassis to achieve a mwb, and also joining the rear of a surf chassis to a Hilux chassis to gain a coil sprung rear end seams fair as well.</p> |
| 3 | 5.5 | aftermarket panels | Grant Johnson | Oct-08 | DROP EQUIVALENT STRENGTH | pending - feedback requested | B | <p>_____ Shouldn't door's and maybe windscreen surrounds be required to remain of "equivalent strength" to ensure the safety of the driver/co-driver?</p> <p>_____ Equivalent strength is needed for many of the components allowed to be duplicated. Even an engine 'bonnet' needs to have adequate strength to allow effective securing and containment of items and liquids, as well as itself. Rather than evaluate every design, the use of the word equivalent provides a distinct guide.</p> <p>_____ 50/50 Yes/No.</p> |
| 4 | 5.10 | wooden doors | Grant Johnson | Oct-08 | JOE KESSLER HAS WOOD COVERED WITH F/GLASS | pending - feedback requested | B | <p>_____ Are Joe's door's not considered to be fibreglass doors?</p> <p>_____ Joe's doors are wood cored fibreglass and have been accepted over many years as a fibreglass laminate.</p> <p>_____ clarify to permit wooden cored fibreglass doors - Yes.</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|--------|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| 5 | 6.3 | radiator placement | Steve Reed | Sep-08 | Hi, I would like to submit a request for a rule change regarding the placement of the main engine cooling radiator; I would like to mount mine behind the cab on my Safari tray back, as I already have a radiator there at the moment for my intercooler it would only mean increasing the capacity of what I already run, the driver/co driver will be protected from a possible leak in the system as the Ute has a totally sealed cab and all pipes running from the engine to the radiator would be solid pipes (steel) running under the cab to the rear and so not exposing the crew to any increased danger. As a lot of the trucks currently running are using large rear mounted Trans coolers and/or intercoolers mounted in this way I can't see how allowing trucks to mount their main cooling radiator will change the overall look of the truck. Many Thanks, Stephen Reed. | pending - feedback requested | B | <p>_____ I don't think this should be allowed myself even though I could make this modification there are full body trucks that would not and I don't think we can make rules that give any type of truck any type of advantage over another.</p> <p>_____ I agree. I think there is a place for it but it would be in a new Outlaw type class not in a club or challenge classes.</p> <p>_____ to allow rear mounted radiators would create a separate class of vehicle as it would only be applicable to tray-back conversions or utes. A disadvantage to full body vehicles. A 'no' from me.</p> <p>_____ only two people supported this.</p> |
| 5.1 | | | | | | | B | <p>..comments continued..</p> <p>_____ I agree with Fluffy – allowing rear mount radiators will give some teams a pretty big advantage over others with full body vehicles for whom a rear radiator is not an option. As a bit of history, this rule was created when we were first starting to mock up the Hilux. Uncle Gary and I had convinced dad that a rear mount radiator was the way to go and had already started to set one up on the back of the cab. But after giving it a bit of thought, dad decided that rear mount radiators weren't in the best interest of the sport, giving a big advantage to a few teams, and also taking things away from the production based concept that our rules are centred around. And soon after rules committee at the time wrote the rule we have now.</p> |
| 17 | 25.15 & 26.20 | hazards | Darin Neeley | Oct-08 | Interpretation of hazard vs control hazard - control hazard is the same as ours but on a standard hazard you can have as many goes as you want as long as there is no track damage. Slight difference but huge change in the way you would drive! ...It is a tough one. I like the idea of being able to have a few goes as that is what happens in the real world but it then needs a better marshal to control it. 1 attempt makes marshalling easier but takes some fun out of it. Obviously track conditions play a HUGE part in what is and isn't possible. | pending - feedback requested | B | <p>_____ Yes 25.15 is a redundant rule, and one I've tried to get removed on several occasions. It was kept as it was thought it described the 'spirit of the event'. At present it has no actionable value as there's no penalty assigned to it. Rules 26.21 and 26.22 make things very easy to compete to, and to marshal - you can drive till you hear a horn and then if you don't stop you get a penalty - simple. For those areas that will cut up badly, the controlled hazard makes sure the teams only have one attempt. In other areas, its best to keep things moving and we certainly don't want teams to be winching unnecessarily. It seems Darin may have mis-understood rule 25.15 as being a penalty as what he says he would like is exactly what we have now - controlled hazards are the one-attempt areas, everywhere else you can keep driving till you hear the horn. Removing 25.15 may stop anyone else from having this same mis-understanding.</p> |
| 17.1 | | | | | | | B | <p>..comments continued..</p> <p>_____ we could add a penalty rate to 25.15 but it may be simpler to remove it and use the controlled hazard to manage specific areas.</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|----------|---|---------------|--------|--|--|---|---|
| 18 | 26.25 | handling winch cable (under tension) | Darin Neeley | Oct-08 | SI run the same cable rules as Oz. ie cable live you can touch but cable under tension you can't. Worth discussing, as there is little point us being different to everyone else. The argument about best practice doesn't wash when everyone does something different. | pending - feedback requested | B | _____ and also referred to in the Rule Interpretation section. _____ I think our rule is much safer, and simpler to enforce. We had the oz rule originally, but changed it to make things easier for everyone (marshals and competitors). _____ as Jeremy points out our existing rule is the simplest to manage. |
| 19 | 26.30 | stowing winch cable | George Palmer | Oct-08 | At Rotorua there was a problem regarding rule 26.30 stowing cable, the marshal was penalising competitors for handling the cable when they were stowing the final meter, I believe that our intent was that this was permissible. An explanation may need to go in the rule interpretation. | pending - feedback requested | B | _____ we need a better definition of the term 'stowing' - the aim of which would be to eliminate the rule being interpreted as Grant McFarlane did down in Rotorua, penalising teams for handling the cable while spooling the rope onto and off the drum. The original intention of the rule was to only prevent winch operation when wrapping cable onto the horns or any other cable stowing system. I can write a new draft rule as a suggestion if you like? _____ Suggested new rule... "Winch operation is not permitted any time the winch cable is being manually stowed on cable horns, a spring, the recovery hook, or any other cable stowing system. Handling the winch cable while spooling on and off the drum is not considered to be stowing the winch cable." |
| 19.1 | | | | | | | B | ..comments continued.. _____ the stowing rule is to avoid bits of anatomy being wound into a winch while the attention is diverted by another task close by. It was not aimed to stop a cable being held as it is being wound onto a drum directly. A simple wording change should fix that. (should we look at requiring a short rope or fabric 'tab' on the winch hook to keep hands fully clear of the drum in the last stage of winding in a cable?). _____ Replace existing 26.30 was what I was suggesting, but a glossary or rules interpretation entry for 'stowing' probably could do the same job? |
| 20 | new rule | battery isolation switch | George Palmer | Oct-08 | Pending rule change from the 2008 competition rules - our intention is to make it compulsory to have a main battery isolation switch on all winch challenge vehicles. This must be accessible to both the driver and co driver when they are seated in the vehicle with their full safety harness on. The isolation switch must be clearly marked and it's on and off positions easily recognised. | approved change for 2009, but feedback is needed on exactly what needs to be isolated | B | _____ I agree that this should be in the cab accessible for both driver and co driver and should kill electrics and motor. Case in point Darren's moment at Norwest. _____ no question it is a must!!!! _____ yes bring the isolate switch in and require a full circuit kill. There is a risk that an electric winch brake may fail but is outweighed by the peril of a shorted winch running uncontrolled. _____ Most people are OK with an engine kill switch although there are some issues with actually making this work and not blowing up alternators. To put a battery switch in that kills the winch as well would make the cables about two metres longer for the guys with electric winches with associated voltage drop. The other issue is a switch for a twin motor set up would cost about \$1,400! _____ you can set something up for much less than this - perhaps we should publish a recommended set-up which would be accepted to pass this? |
| 22 | 18.1 | roll cage specs | Darin Neeley | Oct-08 | I think we should accept a truck with a roll cage built to Mainland rules spec, as long as it is 6 point. They are modified ORANZ rules anyway. | pending - feedback requested | B | |