

2018 Rule Change Proposals for 2019 Implementation

Proposals that are presented here are open to further review and comment. Please send your comments to the Zone 8 Rules Coordinator at ruleproposals@zone8.org

After this review period ends on August 10, 2018, the Z8 rules committee will deliberate and determine which proposals to move forward with. The second review and comment period will begin around September 1, 2018.

AX, DE, & TT	2
Driving Event Proposal #1 – Add CC17 Class for Cars Whose Total Points Add Up to Over 1124.....	2
Driving Event Proposal #2 – Points Assessment for Late Model Rear Wheel Steering	4
Driving Event Proposal #3 – Eliminate Cayennes and Macans from the CC Classes ...	5
Driving Event Proposal #4a – Required Issuance of Zone 8 Solo Permit for Solo Qualified Drivers	7
Driving Event Proposal #4b – Zone 8 Solo Permit Endorsement for “DE Qualified Only”	9
Driving Event Proposal #4c – Zone 8 Solo Permit Endorsement for “Electronic Aides Required”	12
Driving Event Proposal #4d – Drivers Using Electronic Aids Must Place an “N” Across the Rear Window	16
Driving Event Proposal #5 – Separate Performance Package Points Assessment for 997.2/991 GT2RS and GT3RS	19
Driving Event Proposal #6 – “E” Suffix Required for All Classes When Using or Required to Use Driver Switchable Electronic Driving Aids.....	21
Driving Event Proposal #7 – Add CC17, CC18 Classes at 75 Point Increments	24
Driving Event Proposal #8 – Allowing Different Restraint Systems for Driver and Passenger.....	26

AX, DE, & TT

***NOTE:** The title of Proposal 1 has been revised at the request of the submitter.*

Driving Event Proposal #1 – Add CC17 Class for Cars Whose Total Points Add Up to Over 1124

Description of Issue or Problem:

Currently if you classify a 2016 GT3RS with some better tires then the factory stock tires it puts the car into a CC16 class with total points adding up to 1070 (1049 is the cap for CC15 so only 20 points over). This is a stock car purchased at the dealer not a race shop without any engine or performance upgrades other than changing out the tires to a lower tread wear rating. The problem is the 2016 GT3RS is now forced to go against cars that is way out of their league. For example, Rick Levenson car which is also classified as a CC16 car but the car is a full-blown race car built at a race shop that weights 700lbs less then the GT3RS and has 2 turbos total points adding up to 1258 (188 pts over the GT3RS with better tires) which does not feel like a fair playing field. If you look at the total points for the CC16 cars they range in total points as high as 1406 and since cars have really evolved over the last few years I don't think CC16 is a high enough cap class to keep things fair. Currently if the car is a factory race car like a Cup Car or a Club Sport those cars automatically go into X class but some of these CC16 cars actually have more power and weight less than they do.

Proposed Solution:

Make a CC17 class with a 75-point variance from CC16 being (1050 - 1124 points).

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This would help to make a more level playing field for these cars. You currently cannot classify a 2018 GT2RS since it is not listed but that is a car I believe would fall under a CC17 class due to the power rating of the car. Also, with all the new and exciting cars coming out over the next few years at your local Porsche dealer Zone8 will stay ahead of the curve with the classes because it is only a matter of time before Porsche makes more cars that from the factory will fall under the CC17 class.

Comments:

I am in agreement that the additional classes should be added. CC16 was originally created, I'm sure, as an unlimited class for highly modified cars without the foresight that Porsche would someday be building showroom stock cars that would wind up in the category. Adding a CC17 and CC18 class with 75 point intervals probably makes sense.

~0~

I reluctantly agree that we probably need to add higher classes to account for the much higher performance potential of modern cars. Perhaps the classes above CC15 should be expanded to a 100pt spread to create room for future models as well.

Driving Event Proposal #2 – Points Assessment for Late Model Rear Wheel Steering

Description of Issue or Problem:

There is currently no points assessment for cars with intelligent rear wheel steering, however this feature is a definite advantage in both AX's and TT's.

Proposed Solution:

Create a 5 point assessment for all late model cars with intelligent rear wheel steering.

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This change would create a fair points adder for those cars with this advantage.

Comments:

I own a car with rear wheel steering and am fine with adding 5 points for that advantage.

Driving Event Proposal #3 – Eliminate Cayennes and Macans from the CC Classes

Description of Issue or Problem:

A couple of years ago Cayennes, Panameras, and Macans were added to the CC classes base points listings, allowing members to enter modified versions of these cars to compete in Zone AX's and TT's along with other vehicles in CC classes. To date, NO ONE is doing this. The time spent keeping track of the new versions of these cars as they come out is basically a waste of time. As it is, hardly anyone runs in SS10, the stock class for these three vehicle types.

Proposed Solution:

Eliminate Cayennes and Macans from the CC class listings. Leave the Panameras in, as the PCA Club Racing Rules do allow for these cars to participate if they so choose.

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This change would eliminate unnecessary tracking of vehicles which never compete in Z8 AX's and TT's in CC classes; stock versions of these vehicles would still be allowed to compete in SS10.

[Editor's Note: A review of participation data reveals that no SUV's (or Panameras) have ever run in TTs. Only one (1) modified Macan ran in CC class AXs in 2015-2016; no modified Cayenne has ever run in a Zone 8 AX.]

Comments:

Where would a non-stock Cayenne or Macan be classified?

Specifically my 2015 Macan has aftermarket steel springs and I've ran it in CC09 or CC10 at previous A/X events.

Would this proposal completely prohibit the use of non-stock versions of these cars or would they just be classified as "X" cars?

~0~

This really comes down to the amount of work that there really is to track these vehicles. If no one is running modified versions of these cars then it probably makes sense.

~0~

I understand the paperwork involved in keeping these car models up to date but if we do have them running in Z8 AX events we probably need to retain a class for them.

NOTE: Proposals 4a-4d are intended to be considered incrementally, with each built on top of the previous proposal, in the order shown. The wording change submitted by a given proposal is shown in **RED**. The wording changes caused by the preceding proposal(s) are shown in **ORANGE**. They are being submitted incrementally rather than combined into one proposal in order to avoid all-or-none consideration.

NOTE: The suggested rules wording in Proposals 4c and 4d have been amended by the submitter to include a definition of electronic driving aides, shown in UNDERLINE.

Driving Event Proposal #4a – Required Issuance of Zone 8 Solo Permit for Solo Qualified Drivers

Description of Issue or Problem:

While the Zone has a formal credential for recognizing solo qualified drivers, it is not specifically codified in rules and thus unnecessarily difficult to identify these drivers as they enter events in the various Regions of the Zone.

Proposed Solution:

Codify the Zone 8 Solo Permit.

ADDITIONAL WORDING for proposed rule change:

“VI TIME TRIAL AND DE ENTRANT PROCEDURES

.
.
.

C. To encourage the learning of the criteria listed in Section VI Part A, entrants will be considered “Novice” until they have completed all of the following:

.
.
.

Upon completing the Time Trial prerequisites the entrant shall be considered qualified to drive solo. **As evidence, the entrant shall be issued a Zone 8 Solo Permit, either in paper or electronic form, stored in the records of the granting Region.**”

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

Pursuant to the Zone 8 rules, Section VI, Part E, the Zone accepts credentials from certain other PCA Zones as well as appropriate non-PCA organizations. It therefore makes sense to reciprocate by having a similar credential that introduces drivers as solo-qualified when signing up for events with various Regions within Zone 8, within other PCA Zones, as well as outside PCA. While Zone 8 has such a Permit, it is not codified in the current rules implementation, and thus most Regions neither issue them nor have a formal record of qualified solo drivers who meet all of the necessary criteria specified in Section VI, Part A of the rules. Implementing the above rule change will 1) allow for easier recognition of driver qualifications as drivers sign up for events both in and outside of the Zone, and 2) hopefully improve the diligence upon which drivers are deemed qualified to move to the "Experienced" category via the formality of a credential issuance.

Comments:

Ok. That makes sense.

~0~

A-D inclusive: I think these have the best of intentions with the worst of outcomes and I recommend we don't go down this road for a few reasons. It will not improve safety and it will deter participation by new members with newer cars.

We already use the Z8 Log book as verification of a drivers experience and Solo permit. The driver is required to present this to organizers on request so another Z8 Solo card seems unnecessary. If a region wishes to keep electronic records of Solo permit holders for ease of future verification they are free to do so. We don't need another rule here.

~0~

This proposal should be rejected as written. As these are ZONE permits, the ZONE should have responsibility to maintain the permits and own the procedures as such. Decentralizing ZONE permits to the regions will cause inconsistent storage, records management, processes, and transition issues. Additionally, it is likely the event chairs would begin a separate database as to avoid having to check with each region on the status of the entrants. I understand the intent but it needs to be re-written.

Driving Event Proposal #4b – Zone 8 Solo Permit Endorsement for “DE Qualified Only”

Description of Issue or Problem:

Zone 8’s special permission from the PCA national office to conduct its unique form of Time Trial event, with live posting of times from all sessions, was granted contingent on maintaining significantly higher standards for entrants than what Driver Education events allow. However, the solo standards in the existing rules do not differentiate between TT and DE qualifications. Thus it is possible to qualify to solo at DE – and thus TT – events and yet not even meet the intended TT entrant standards with respect to prior experience.

Proposed Solution:

Endorse the Permit with “DE qualified only” unless the driver has met the stricter TT experience standard.

ADDITIONAL WORDING for proposed rule change:

“VI TIME TRIAL AND DE ENTRANT PROCEDURES

.
.
.

C. To encourage the learning of the criteria listed in Section VI Part A, entrants will be considered “Novice” until they have completed all of the following:

.
.
.

Upon completing the Time Trial prerequisites the entrant shall be considered qualified to drive solo. ***As evidence, the entrant shall be issued a Zone 8 Solo Permit, either in paper or electronic form, stored in the records of the granting Region. The Permit shall be endorsed with “DE qualified only” unless the driver has met the stricter TT experience standard.***

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

Right now it is possible to be moved to the “Experienced” category by participating in as little as 4 performance driving days (Section VI, Part C(1)(a)(i)). However, TT participation is not allowed until a “...driver is qualified to solo OR has at least 8 days of total event experience comprised of Autocross, Driving School, or Driver’s Ed events (or the equivalent) within the previous

24 months." While it makes sense that a minimum of 8 performance driving days are required to enter a TT, and the entrant would then be considered a "Novice" or student, it is technically possible for a driver with just 4 DE days to meet the current rules and drive solo at a TT. This both violates the national office's requirement and is unsafe and thus should not be allowed. The proposed endorsement will rectify this issue.

Comments:

Currently you cannot solo drive unless your instructor gives recommendation and signs you off, and CDI goes on a test drive with you which I believe has been a good way to make sure a driver is ready for solo driving since we have very good instructors and excellent CDI's.

Response to Comment: This comment misses the point of the proposal, which is to address an inconsistency in the current rules document that allows someone who has been signed off for solo at a DE event to drive solo in a TT event, even if they do not otherwise even meet the TT entrant criteria. Doing so would be a direct violation of a clear mandate from the PCA national office that could jeopardize Zone 8's special permission to run its unique TT format and thus needs to be addressed, regardless of how members may feel about the quality of PCA's instructors and CDI's (which I agree are very good and excellent, respectively).

~0~

Ok. That makes sense.

~0~

This again is an unnecessary rule. A DE event is open to any PCA member with no experience in essentially every PCA region in the country. They are required to have a classroom ground school and are assigned an instructor to keep them safe as they learn performance driving skills on a track.

Entry to TT requires a Solo permit which must be signed off by at least 4 qualified instructors and the CDI. I completely trust the instructors sitting in the right seat to decide if this new driver is ready to safely share the track solo with other drivers and I trust they will only sign them off when they are ready. This may be as little as 4 track events for someone with 10 years of Kart Racing or Moto GP racing experience or it may take much longer depending on how well they progress and play well with others. We already hold a higher qualification level to participate in TT events and do meet PCA National standards as our rules read now. Another unnecessary layer of bureaucracy will not improve track safety and will only diminish participation by newer members.

~0~

This proposal should be rejected as written with regard to my comments related to #4a and rejected because it conflicts with other sections of the current Zone 8 rules. Current zone 8 rules allow for Novices to drive at time trial events as per section VI.C.1.a.i "Driving Experience." To quote the zone 8 rules, "A minimum of 4 days of instructor signed-off DE or Time Trial days..." shows that a novice is allowed to drive during time trial events with instructors. This conflicts with the proposal that states, "The Permit shall be endorsed with "DE qualified only" unless the driver has met the stricter TT experience standard." Read as written, this proposal would not allow "DE Qualified Only" to drive with instructors at TT events." I understand the intent but it needs to be re-written.

Driving Event Proposal #4c – Zone 8 Solo Permit Endorsement for “Electronic Aides Required”

Description of Issue or Problem:

Late model Porsches have extremely sophisticated electronic driving aids that enable even the least experienced driver to pilot the car in a fashion that potentially gives a false sense of driving skill. Combined with the ever increasing horsepower of these cars, this false sense can lead to very dangerous situations if the driver and/or Event Chairperson are unaware of the driver’s true capabilities.

Proposed Solution:

Endorse the Permit with “Electronic aides required” unless the instructor signed-off DE or Time Trial days used to qualify for the Permit were completed in a vehicle either without electronic aids or by turning off all electronic aids that can possibly be turned off.

ADDITIONAL WORDING for proposed rule change:

“VI TIME TRIAL AND DE ENTRANT PROCEDURES

.
.
.

C. To encourage the learning of the criteria listed in Section VI Part A, entrants will be considered “Novice” until they have completed all of the following:

.
.
.

Upon completing the Time Trial prerequisites the entrant shall be considered qualified to drive solo. *As evidence, the entrant shall be issued a Zone 8 Solo Permit, either in paper or electronic form, stored in the records of the granting Region. The Permit shall be endorsed with “DE qualified only” unless the driver has met the stricter TT experience standard. The Permit shall be endorsed with “Electronic aides required” unless the instructor signed-off DE or Time Trial days used to qualify for the Permit were completed in a vehicle either without electronic driving aids (defined as electronic control systems, intended to be driver-switchable, that when turned on have the ability to automatically alter the speed and/or path of the vehicle from what it/they would be if those systems were turned off, given identical driver inputs) or by turning off all electronic driving aids that can possibly be turned off.”*

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

Endorsing a driver's Zone 8 Solo Permit with a notation that they have been qualified to drive solo only if electronic aids are in place should enhance safety by avoiding the situation where a driver who has only driven with such aids attempts to drive a car without them. Drivers wishing to remove the endorsement will thus be motivated and required to re-learn performance driving skills from the ground up, which will improve the all-around skill set of those PCA members.

Comments:

To begin with how can you even enforce a rule like this since a solo driver at any time can turn off his TC/ESC without anyone knowing, and to encourage someone to drive without these safety features sounds like a recipe for disaster. People should be able to turn these safety features off as they feel more comfortable with the car not just to get a stamp in their log book.

Response to Comment: This comment misses the point of the proposal, which is strictly to enhance safety, and appears likely written by someone who the proposal would target. First, enforcement of nearly all Zone 8 DE/TT rules is on an honor system. Second, there is nothing in the proposed rule that encourages someone to drive without electronic aids. Pursuant to the proposal, that is an individual decision made by each driver in consultation with their instructor, for both new drivers and existing drivers who wish to learn to drive with their electronic aids off. Finally, allowing drivers who have never driven with electronic aids off to turn them off on a whim with no instructor present IS a recipe for disaster, especially in late model GT cars. Thus, a permit endorsement system that requires those who have only driven with electronic aids on to obtain additional instruction/sign-off to learn to drive with them off is a valuable and necessary safety enhancement.

~0~

As an owner of a 2015 GT3 with all of the electronic aides (aka "nannies"), and as an instructor who has instructed drivers with these types of cars, I actually see some validity to the proposal. However, I think that it doesn't get at the true problem. I think that it might be better if the rules were modified to require that all cars equipped with the nannies have the nannies turned on during any performance driving event unless the driver has been specifically checked out, and the permit endorsed, to drive the car with the nannies off. The permit should specifically state that the driver has been endorsed to drive the specific car with the nannies turned off. Also, I'm only suggesting that this apply to new drivers, or drivers with new high performance cars. I'm not suggesting that already permitted drivers of these cars, who have proven themselves, need to be checked out if they want to turn the nannies off. My concern is really focused on the new driver of a high performance car who

could pose a danger if the nannies were turned off and the driver was unaware of the potential changes in the behavior of the car as a result.

The way the proposal reads it would allow a driver that has been checked out in a lower power, non-nanny car, to jump into a GT3 or GT3 RS and drive it with the nannies off without proving that he or she is capable of doing so.

Thus, I am against the way the proposed rule is currently written.

Response to Comment: That is correct, but the same is true right now under the current rules. If members believe that there should be a rule that states that Solo Permitted drivers who increase horsepower (or some other measure or measures) by more than some specified amount should require re-certification, then those members should propose such a rule. The fact that Proposal #4c doesn't address this situation is not a valid reason to oppose it.

~0~

C&D. There is a belief among some in PCA that new drivers in powerful new cars are dangerous on track and are an accident waiting to happen. It sounds logical enough when you envision a very green driver with limited skills in a 500hp car and many believe this is true without ever checking for verification. PCA incident statistics tell a very different story.

I looked at this a few years ago and found that incidents involving damage or injury are about 10/1 more common on PCA tours than PCA DE/TT events. It turns out that our track events are the safest of any organization in the US, mostly because of PCA rules already in place to protect participants, and an excellent corps of instructors keeping folks safe from the right seat.

When looking specifically at PCA DE/TT incidents, there is a similar 10/1 ratio of Advanced drivers vs Novice drivers. Of the few on track DE/TT incidents we have, most by far are advanced drivers pushing the envelope and simply run out of talent. Novice-driver-in-a-powerful-car incidents are vanishingly low, but greater than zero over the last 10 years. They tend to be far more cautious as a student driver and are far less likely to take chances that might damage their very new \$200k GT car. In short... It is us, not them. It is our job as instructors to teach performance driving skills while keeping novice drivers reigned-in and well within their driving ability. Actual PCA incident stats suggest this is already being done well.

Rule proposal 4 A-D are attempting to fix a problem that does not exist. I recommend voting no on all. They will diminish DE/TT participation without significantly improving our excellent PCA DE/TT safety record.

~0~

This makes absolutely no sense to me, and is completely unenforceable. Not to mention, how do you learn to drive without nannies, without turning the nannies off. A new driver in a GT3 with their nannies off is no more dangerous than a new driver in an old 911 with no nannies. This feels like a pointless regulation that will alienate plenty of people that want to learn how to drive their car, or just want to go out and have fun.

~0~

This proposal should be rejected. First, it doesn't discuss either grandfathering or re-certifying current permits. It doesn't discuss reciprocity rules with other clubs or other zones or the permitting when first coming to an event in our zone. It doesn't discuss the process to re-permit when changing cars. If we are truly talking about safety, then a rules committee should be formed to determine all of the variations of theory and to create a permit progression (nannies on permit with specifics of number of events. THEN nannies off permit with this specific number of events, etc.) The instructor shouldn't have to analyze this for each student at each event and figure out if the student is on the nannie vs. non-nannie path.

Extending the authors theory, then a driver of a 911 with 180HP would not be safe driving a "Late Model" Porsche without driver aides. Especially when a 911 driver moves to a mid-engine car. 911s generally start going around easier but can be "caught" much easier than a mid-engine car. If the author cares about safety then the proposal should be to have nannies ON until a specific amount of driving experience. Who's going to volunteer to be the instructor of a brand new student with a 500HP GT without nannies? Reject and create a rule that provides more safety to the instructor and student.

Driving Event Proposal #4d – Drivers Using Electronic Aids Must Place an “N” Across the Rear Window

Description of Issue or Problem:

Drivers who have only learned performance driving skills in cars with sophisticated electronic driving aids are potentially dangerous should they disengage such aids without formal instruction and retraining.

Proposed Solution:

Require all Novice drivers using electronic aids as well as all Experienced drivers whose Permits have the “Electronic aides required” endorsement to place an “N” across their rear window.

ADDITIONAL WORDING for proposed rule change:

“VI TIME TRIAL AND DE ENTRANT PROCEDURES

.

.

.

C. To encourage the learning of the criteria listed in Section VI Part A, entrants will be considered “Novice” until they have completed all of the following:

.

.

.

Upon completing the Time Trial prerequisites the entrant shall be considered qualified to drive solo. ***As evidence, the entrant shall be issued a Zone 8 Solo Permit, either in paper or electronic form, stored in the records of the granting Region. The Permit shall be endorsed with “DE qualified only” unless the driver has met the stricter TT experience standard. The Permit shall be endorsed with “Electronic aides required” unless the instructor signed-off DE or Time Trial days used to qualify for the Permit were completed in a vehicle either without electronic driving aids (defined as electronic control systems, intended to be driver-switchable, that when turned on have the ability to automatically alter the speed and/or path of the vehicle from what it/they would be if those systems were turned off, given identical driver inputs) or by turning off all electronic driving aids that can possibly be turned off. An “N” will be placed across the rear window of all Novice drivers using electronic aids as well as all Experienced drivers whose Permits have the “Electronic aides required” endorsement.***

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

In the same way that Novice drivers are required to place an "X" across the rear window of their car per Section VI, Part D(5) so that other drivers are aware of their developing skill set, drivers with the "N" marking on the rear of their car increase safety by letting those around them know that they may not have the same skill set as a driver who is not utilizing or required to utilize electronic aids, should such aids fail, and, in the case of those with a Zone 8 Solo Permit carrying the "Electronic aids required" endorsement, that such electronic aids are required to be on at all times. Those who violate such endorsement will likely be easy to spot and report, thereby increasing safety for all. "N" (as in "Nanny") was chosen as it can be created easily with just three pieces of tape.

Comments:

You want people you drive with an N on their car because they use their TC/ESC? To begin with this is not a current issue and does not solve or help anything moving forward other than to mock people who drive with these SAFTEY features on. If anything, it should be the opposite where a car with NO TC/ESC safety features should have a big NO on the back of there cars since it seems those are the cars going off track more often and should be able to warn others of their danger. Let me also add that the N for "Nannies" is a derogatory term referring to a car that takes no driver skill to drive since the car is driving itself with the "Nannies".

Response to Comment: This is very much a current issue. In fact, it may be the single biggest issue the Zone has with respect to performance driving going forward, and is only becoming more significant as a greater number of increasingly high tech cars enter events. This comment appears likely written by someone who the proposal would target, i.e., someone who does not realize just how much of the driving is being done by the electronic aids. It is for this exact reason that cars with drivers who require these aids to be turned on at all times need to be identified, that way it will be extremely obvious if they are violating the rules. No one should be influenced by a marking on their car, but anyone who, for whatever reason, is uncomfortable with such identification on their car can simply request instruction to learn how to drive without electronic aids and remove the designation once signed-off.

~0~

This proposal is just plain silly. Let's not even go down that road.

~0~

Again this doesn't make sense. Why do we need to denote whether a driver is using nannies or not? If they are using them, they will likely be predictably

on line much of the time. If anything we should note all of the cars NOT using nannies as they are considerably less predictable when someone makes a mistake.

~0~

Seriously? This proposal is makes me sad. I don't even know where to begin. Let's not create a caste system. Reject please.

The author states, "...drivers with the "N" marking on the rear of their car increase safety by letting those around them know that they may not have the same skill set...." All skills sets are different because of the varying amount of seat time. It is the overtaking driver's responsibility to be safe regardless of X or N or fill in the blank. Shouldn't we then put a "US (Un-safe)" on the back of cars without driver aides when they make a mistake and have an off? Or do a 360 spin? And we've had experienced drivers total their cars that had driver's aides. Big fat red X all over their next car please!!!!!!

I guess the author will never drive outside of our region because it is unsafe to go to an event without an "N." I can see the author running around and event outside of our region putting "N" on cars after they interview the drivers because the author couldn't be safe without the "N."

NOTE: Some of the text of Proposal 5 has been amended by the submitter to include some clarifications, shown in UNDERLINE.

Driving Event Proposal #5 – Separate Performance Package Points Assessment for 997.2/991 GT2RS and GT3RS

Description of Issue or Problem:

Section III, Part FF levies 60 points for the factory performance packages included in the 996/997/991 Turbo, GT2, GT3 and the 981 GT4. However, the 997.2 and 991 GT2RS and GT3RS versions have more track-oriented upgrades than all the other models but gets the same points assessment as the lesser cars. In both series, the “RS” versions have enhanced downforce (both front and back) as well as shorter final drive gearing (3.89 vs. 3.44 for the 997.2 and 4.19 vs. 3.97 for the 991), which enhances acceleration.

Proposed Solution:

Create a separate 100 points assessment for the 997 and 991 GT2RS and GT3RS.

“III ASSESSMENT OF POINTS

.
. .

FF. Cars equipped with a 996/997/991 Turbo/GT2/GT3 **(exc. 997.2/991 GT2RS/GT3RS)**

.
. .

GG. Cars equipped with a 997.2/991 GT2RS or GT3RS performance package (to a 997.2 or 991 respectively) (springs, struts/shocks, sway bars, brakes, aero, gearing) in its entirety with original factory parts (at the factory or after the fact). (Not applicable if equipment is removed and replaced with aftermarket parts. If any of the suspension/brake/aero/transmission components [sway bars, springs, shocks, brakes, splitters/wing/body components, transmission components] are replaced with points-assessed parts, the performance package points assessment may not be taken, and separate a la carte points for any upgrades over the base model must be taken.)

100

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

The "RS" versions of these cars has more downforce-creating aero (in the form of front-end modifications and a larger and higher rear wing) and shorter final drive gearing than the standard versions. The aero package is much closer to a pure track car with aftermarket aero (which would be a 40 point assessment). Lower gearing would normally be another 40 point assessment. Assessing these cars 100 points instead of 60 points would make the "discount package points" fairer for the cars with less factory upgrades.

Comments:

To begin with there is no differences in gear ratio which can be looked up on Car and Drive where it shows all gear ratios for both cars. The down force on the 991.1 RS is fully achieved at 150mph and since we don't go to many tracks where we can even hit 150mph, it is a moot point. Actually one could argue that the larger wing on the RS might even create more drag compared to the GT3 which would not be a positive add to the tracks we go to.

There really isn't that much different between a GT3 and a RS, 0 to 60 on a GT3 is 3.1, on an RS, it is 3.0. The main difference between them is 25HP, and there is only a 20lb difference in weight. A GT3 is a class lower then the RS at CC14 where a stock RS is CC15, and with better then stock tires are CC16 so according to zone8 point system the RS is already considered a higher level car then the GT3. One major advantage the RS DOES have over the GT3 is being able to put bigger tires on them, but get penalized for the wider tires by quite a few points.

~0~

If the GT3 RS is already classified, under the classification system, as a higher point car than the equivalent GT3 then there really is no reason to add additional points.

Driving Event Proposal #6 – “E” Suffix Required for All Classes When Using or Required to Use Driver Switchable Electronic Driving Aids

Description of Issue or Problem:

Late model Porsches have extremely sophisticated electronic driving aids that enable even the least experienced driver to pilot the car in a fashion that potentially provides an advantage so great, no amount of Performance Equipment Points can compensate fairly for this advantage, thus making the current classification system unfair when such aids are utilized in competition. Complicating the issue even more is the fact that the less experienced the driver, the more valuable the electronic driving aids are in terms of effective performance boost.

Proposed Solution:

Require appending an “E” suffix to classes SS01-10 and CC01-16 for drivers in cars with such systems either required to be or optionally turned on.

ADDITIONAL WORDING for proposed rule change:

“II DRIVING EVENT CLASSES

.
. .
.

F. Drivers either choosing to use electronic driving aids (defined as electronic control systems, intended to be driver-switchable, that when turned on have the ability to automatically alter the speed and/or path of the vehicle from what it/they would be if those systems were turned off, given identical driver inputs) or required to use them per an endorsement on their Zone 8 Solo Permit, shall have their own classes and be required to register for one of these classes, appending an “E” suffix to what would otherwise be SS01-10 or CC01-16, as appropriate.

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

Recent advances in electronic control systems now allow drivers with very little performance driving experience to achieve lap times that are mere seconds away from a professional driver in the same car driving without such systems. If these systems were turned off, but the inexperienced driver received no additional instruction, their lack of skill would immediately become evident (potentially in a dangerous way) and their lap times would fall dramatically at

best. This is especially true in the most recent Porsche GT models, which run in high classes even in a stock configuration. These cars compete directly in classes that also have, for example, heavily modified early model Porsches with no driver-switchable interventional control systems whatsoever.

Section II, Part B begins as follows:

“Car classification serves two purposes. The first is fairness in competition through grouping together cars with similar performance characteristics.”

The intent of the classification system is therefore to group cars within a class that are supposed to perform more or less comparably. This leaves only driver skill as the remaining variable, with skill level being determined for competitive purposes via lap times. However, since actual skill level is potentially masked in a dramatic way in late model Porsches with electronic driving aids turned on, there is simply no longer any fair way to compensate via Performance Equipment Points for the advantage these systems provide to a less experienced driver, who otherwise may very well not even be able to complete a single lap safely at competition speed.

Ask yourself, if the same late model GT car were available with a fully self-driving option, but the same performance characteristics otherwise, would you consider it fair to run it in the same class it would run in without the self-driving option? Clearly the answer is no, as a well-programmed self-driving car would beat the competition every time, when put up against an otherwise identical car without any driver-switchable electronic driving aids. While a full self-driving option intended for track use is not currently available, the technology that is available has now evolved to such a level that our existing classification system can no longer achieve its goal of fairness in competition by simply grouping together cars with similar performance characteristics, because with late model electronic driving aids in place, lap times no longer necessarily reveal actual driver skill. As a result, drivers running in cars with these systems either required to be or optionally turned on need their own classes so they do not unfairly disadvantage those who are driving without such aids.

While this proposal would potentially double the number of classes, it is expected that most “E”-class drivers who decide to commit to a competitive driving series within the Zone will wish to undertake additional instruction in order to migrate to the non-“E” classes. This is because of both the larger number of participating drivers and the truly fair competition that only the non-“E” classes can provide. A positive side effect of this is that the Zone’s competitive driving programs will be brought into alignment with PCA National’s mission statement for high performance driver education. From <https://www.pca.org/driver-education> (emphasis added):

“The mission and purpose of the Porsche Club of America's Driver's Education Program is to provide a safe, structured and controlled teaching and learning

environment. The PCA DE Program is designed so that participants can improve their driving abilities and acquire a better understanding of vehicle dynamics and driving safety. Participants will experience first-hand the capabilities of high performance automobiles in a controlled, closed-course environment and acquire skills that will enhance safer vehicle operation in all driving situations."

Comments:

This rule should be rejected as written. This rule doesn't take into account the differences between the various generations of driver aides. For example, we should all be able to agree that electronic aides in a early 2000s car are much different than in a 991. Most of the early generation aides actually slow the car down when they engage. Additionally, this cannot be enforced. I could get my non-aides permit and turn the aides on during timed runs. Would it be fair? No, but other rules can be protested. This could never be protested.

Just separate the classes completely regardless of button on or off if you want to have different classes for "E" vs "non-E".

NOTE: Proposal 7 has been revised at the request of the submitter. New/replacement text is shown in UNDERLINE; deletions are not shown.

Driving Event Proposal #7 – Add CC17, CC18 Classes at 75 Point Increments

Description of Issue or Problem:

Currently if you classify a 2016 GT3RS straight off the showroom floor you are at 1029 points (CC15) but with slightly larger Hoosier DOT track tires (A very easy and popular option for cars coming to the track) it puts the car into a CC16 class with total points adding up to 1130. 1049 is the cap for CC15 so it is already 81 points over and 6 points into the theoretical CC18 class. This is a stock car purchased at the dealer not a race shop without any engine or performance upgrades other than changing out the tires to a lower tread wear rating and adding a few millimeters in width. When I decided to write this proposal to augment an existing CC17 proposal I thought we would need a CC17 and a CC18 class upgrade to be proactive because Porsche only makes cars that go faster than the previous ones, not slower. Then there is the factor about the modifications that these cars are receiving at an alarming rate. But looking at the actual classes in competition this is something we needed in 2018!

Numbers of current cars registered on the Zone-8 classification site that would fall into the CC-16 through CC-18 proposal.

Proposed Class	Total Points Range	Number of cars represented on the Z-8 classification site as of 6-30-18.
CC16	(1050-1124) points.	26
CC17	(1125-1199 points).	16 cars
CC18	(1200 points and greater).	23 cars

Cars currently competing in Zone-8 and their points totals in CC16 and above

<u>Proposed Class</u>	<u>Total Points Range</u>	<u>Points totals for cars competing in CC16 under 2018 rules.</u>
<u>CC16</u>	<u>(1050-1124) points.</u>	<u>No cars</u>
<u>CC17</u>	<u>(1125-1199 points).</u>	<u>1130, 1143, 1146, 1170,</u>
<u>CC18</u>	<u>(1200-1274 points).</u>	<u>1258, 1268</u>

Proposed Solution:

Make a CC16 class with a 75-point variance from CC15 being (1050-1124).
 Make a CC17 class with a 75-point variance from CC16 being (1125-1199).

Make a CC18 class with a 75-point variance from proposed CC17 being (1200≥ points).

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This would help to make a more level playing field for these heavily pointed cars. Currently CC16 cars in Zone 8 have a 643 point spread in class; that is the same as CC01-CC09! You currently cannot classify a 2018 GT2RS since it is not listed but that is a car I believe it would end up with about 1225 points due to the power rating of the car; which would be CC-18 for this 100% stock car. Also, with all the new technology coming out over the next few years Zone8 will stay ahead of the curve with the classes because it is only a matter of time before Porsche makes more cars that from the factory will fall under these additional classes; and that is not even speaking of the modifications people can't resist from making.

Driving Event Proposal #8 – Allowing Different Restraint Systems for Driver and Passenger

Description of Issue or Problem:

Currently the PCA Rules State that For Time Trial and DE, both Student and instructor shall have the same type of restraint system (Page 25 XIII A).

This is a great in theory. Ideally we would like our instructors to have the same level of safety as our drivers. However, in reality this is not the case. And unfortunately wearing a harness that is positioned incorrectly can be extremely dangerous.

There are at least three concerns with installing a race seat and 5/6 point harness in a passenger seat to match the one installed for the driver.

1. Mounting of the Restraints to the Vehicle and the Positioning of the Restraints on the Driver/Passenger.
2. Seat Mount Range of Forward/Backward Movement.
3. Lack of Neck Restraints with wearing a harness.

There are many articles written about installing the restraints and how to properly position them. There are multiple ones from the manufactures of the seats/harnesses (Simpson, Sparco, Schroth, etc.) We can assume they have spent considerable time and money analyzing data to provide drivers a safe product. We should be able to trust their research. Bottom line, the positioning of the shoulder strap is critical. If too low they can compress the drivers spine. If too high, the driver can slide up if the car is overturned. When a seat/harness is installed by a professional company it is fitted to the driver. This includes a variety of factors, not just the shoulder strap. Obviously, this is not the case of the passenger. Most often the passenger is an instructor. They are jumping in an unknown car set up most likely the same as the drivers. Obviously, instructor/driving pairing is not done by physical size matching. The driver should not be penalized for upgrading his/her seat and harness by limiting the instructors that can fit safely in their car.

The Seat Mount/Rails: Most Porsche owners do not want to drill holes in the body of their non-race car. Thus the seat bases for after market seat bases must be installed in the existing factory holes. If you are short, the seat needs to be able to go as far forward as necessary. If you are tall, the seat needs to be pushed back as far as possible. Lucky you, if you are average height. If a larger person manages to squeeze themselves in the passenger seat, they are extremely uncomfortable. This is not an ideal situation for concentrating on a track. In addition, their knees are bunched up touching the glovebox. One good sudden brake and it will be catastrophic for the knees.

There is data that supports that racing harnesses are very unsafe without the use of a proper neck restraint. A well know driver, Dale Earnhart Sr, died from a crash without wearing a HANS type device. The harnesses keep your body in place in a crash, but your head is forced forward at the speed of the crash which is can be deadly with the hyper extension on your neck.

Proposed Solution:

PCA should allow the driver to add his/her safety seat and harness without requiring the same configuration for the passenger.

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

Porsche has obviously spent numerous hours developing a seat that fits a variety of body types. You can move the seat forward and backwards to utilize the maximum allowable space. This works in conjunction with the airbag. Factory seat belts have a bit of give in the event of a crash, so you can go into your air bag and your neck doesn't hyper extend. This configurations would seem to be safer than a race seat/harness that has not been adjusted safely. It would also allow instructors of all sizes to right seat.