

# What Happened to my Rule Change Proposal for 2025?

These are the results of the Z8 Rules Committee review of Round 1 of the Rules Proposals for 2024. The accepted proposals will be presented for review and comment in Round 2 in a separate document.

Concours .....	2
Concours Proposal #1 – Consolidate Classes – ACCEPTED w/ Minor changes .....	2
Concours Proposal #2 – Judging School Requirements -- ACCEPTED WITH CHANGES .....	6
Concours Proposal #3 – Judging Experience at National Events - REJECTED .....	8
Concours Proposal #4 – Judge Advancement - ACCEPTED .....	10
Concours Proposal #5 – Event and Team Head Judge Qualifications - ACCEPTED .....	11
Concours Proposal #6 – Protest Time Frame - REJECTED .....	12
Concours Proposal #7 – Service & Judging Points for Judges - REJECTED .....	13
Concours Proposal #8 – Tutoring points - ACCEPTED .....	15
Concours Proposal #9 – Eliminate Repeat Judging School requirements - REJECTED.....	16
Concours Proposal #10 – Remove all Requirements for Judges to Maintain their Ratings - REJECTED.	18
Concours Proposal #11 – More realistic judging times and division splits-REJECTED.....	20
Driving Events .....	22
Driving Event Proposal #1 – Open Wheel Cars at Autocross - REJECTED .....	22
Driving Event Proposal #2 – Passengers at Autocross- REJECTED .....	24
Driving Event Proposal #3 – Minors in Drivers Ed events - REJECTED .....	25
Driving Event Proposal #4 – Equal Restraints and factory seats – ACCEPTED w/ PROVISIONS.....	26
Driving Event Proposal #5 – Boxster Spec BRI is too high - REJECTED.....	29

## Concours

### Concours Proposal #1 – Consolidate Classes – ACCEPTED w/ Minor changes

#### Comments from the committee

Proposal parts 1, 2 and 3 were accepted as is.

For Proposal part 4, the alternative was accepted, combining the two Unrestored divisions. The committee is concerned that eliminating these Divisions altogether would alienate too many potential entrants.

Additional consolidation was also approved, combining the three SC Division classes into one class.

Comment #1's concern about over-consolidation was dismissed because we are only reducing the number of classes by 25% and this was not felt to be excessive.

#### Rationale:

Because this is a long proposal, with four parts, the rationale will be listed first. It is: There are too many classes for current participation numbers to support. Frequently there is only one car per class and that results in everybody getting a trophy which, in effect, makes them worthless as there was no competition. Also, it drives up the expense of hosting a Concours, which is hard enough as it is, considering the attendance numbers. Finally, the number of divisions increase the number of judges necessary, which adds additional obstacles to running the event. Reducing the number of divisions will assist there.

#### Current Rule

39 Existing Classes:

##### FULL CONCOURS-VINTAGE DIVISION

CV-1	356
CV-2	911, 912, 912E (1965-1989)
CV-3	911 Carrera (964, 993)
CV-4	911 Carrera, GT2, GT3 (996, 997)
CV-5	914-4, 914-6
CV-6	924, 928, 944, 968

##### UNRESTORED-VINTAGE DIVISION

UV-1	356
UV-2	911, 912, 912E (1965-1989)
UV-3	911 Carrera (964, 993)
UV-4	911 Carrera, GT2, GT3 (996 1999 – 2004)

*Future: 996 2005*

*997-coming 2025*

UV-5 914,914-6  
UV-6 924, 928, 944, 968

STREET-VINTAGE DIVISION

SV-1 356  
SV-2 911, 912, 912E (1965-1989)  
SV-3 911 Carrera (964, 993)  
SV-4 911 Carrera, GT2, GT3 (996, 997)  
SV-5 914-4, 914-6  
SV-6 924, 928, 944, 968

FULL CONCOURS-MODERN DIVISION

CM-1 986/987 Boxster & Cayman  
CM-2 981/718 Boxster & Cayman  
CM-3 911 Carrera (991,992)  
CM-4 Cayenne, Macan, Panamera, Taycan

UNRESTORED-MODERN DIVISION

UM-1 986 Boxster (1997-2004)  
*987 Boxster & Cayman-coming 2025/2026*  
UM-2 *Future: 981/718 Boxster & Cayman-coming 2033/2037*  
UM-3 *Future: 911 Carrera (991, 992)-coming 2032/2040*  
UM-4 Cayenne 2003-2004  
*Future: Cayenne 2005+*  
*Panamera-coming 2030*  
*Macan-coming 2035*  
*Taycan-coming 2040*

STREET-MODERN DIVISION

SM-1 986/987 Boxster & Cayman  
SM-2 981/718 Boxster & Cayman  
SM-3 911 Carrera (991,992)  
SM-4 Cayenne, Macan, Panamera, Taycan

DETAIL & SHINE DIVISION

D&S-1 356  
D&S-2 911, 912, 912E (1965-1989)  
D&S-3 911 Carrera, (964, 993)  
D&S-4 911 Carrera, GT2, GT3 (996, 997, 991, 992)  
D&S-5 914-4, 914-6  
D&S-6 924, 928, 944, 968  
D&S-7 Boxster, Cayman  
D&S-8 Cayenne, Panamera, Macan, Taycan

SPECIAL CATEGORIES DIVISION

SC-1 Special Interest  
SC-2 Current Competition  
SC-3 Limited Production: Factory Exotics and Factory Race Cars

**Proposal Part One:**

Combine the air-cooled 911 classes; that is, merge CV2 & CV3, SV2 & SV3, UV2 & UV3, and DS2 & DS3.

This would reduce the total by four classes

### **Proposal Part Two:**

Combine the water-cooled 911 classes, merging CV4 with CM3, SV4 with SM3, and UV4 with UM3. (Obviously, these mergers would require that all of these cars follow the “modern” division rules.) Because UM3 doesn’t contain any cars yet, this will result in a reduction of 2 classes at this time.

### **Proposal Part Three:**

Combine all the Boxster and Cayman classes: merge CM1 & CM2, SM1 & CM2, and UM1 and UM2. Because UM2 doesn’t contain any cars yet, this will reduce the class count by 2 at this time.

### **Proposal Part Four:**

Eliminate the two Unrestored Divisions. This would eliminate 8 classes.

Alternatively, combine the two divisions, using the same class structure as Detail & Shine. This would eliminate 2 class trophies and 1 Division trophy. (Obviously, these mergers would require that all of these cars follow the “modern” division rules.) This would also eliminate at least one judging team and if we reduce the judged areas to that of Details & Shine, it would eliminate the need for another judge.

The rationale for just eliminating the unrestored divisions is as follows: They currently follow the “Street” division rules for judging. Essentially that means that Street has two flavors, unrestored older cars and restored older cars combined with newer cars. However, Full Concours does not have two separate divisions along these lines. If we don’t need this at the Full Concours level, then why do we need this at the Street level? Also, judging for all divisions in Zone 8 events is supposed to be on preparation only, not originality. This means that demerits should not be given for restorations and alterations. Therefore, there is no need for unrestored cars to have a separate division.

### **Result:**

Implementing all of these proposals would result in this structure with only 24 classes. Depending on the disposition of the Unrestored Divisions, there could be an additional 5 to 7 classes; still less than the current 39. It will also reduce the number of divisions by 1 or 2

#### FULL CONCOURS-VINTAGE DIVISION

- CV-1 356
- CV-2 911, 912, 912E, 964, 993
- CV-3 914-4, 914-6
- CV-4 924, 928, 944, 968

#### STREET-VINTAGE DIVISION

- SV-1 356
- SV-2 911, 912, 912E, 964, 993
- SV-3 914-4, 914-6
- SV-4 924, 928, 944, 968

#### FULL CONCOURS-MODERN DIVISION

- CM-1 Boxster, Cayman, GT4
- CM-2 911 Carrera, GT2, GT3 (996, 997, 991,992)
- CM-3 Cayenne, Macan, Panamera, Taycan

#### STREET-MODERN DIVISION

- SM-1 Boxster, Cayman, GT4
- SM-2 911 Carrera, GT2, GT3 (996, 997, 991,992)
- SM-3 Cayenne, Macan, Panamera, Taycan

#### DETAIL & SHINE DIVISION

- D&S-1 356
- D&S-2 911, 912, 912E, 964, 993
- D&S-3 911 Carrera, GT2, GT3 (996, 997, 991, 992)
- D&S-4 914-4, 914-6
- D&S-5 924, 928, 944, 968
- D&S-6 Boxster, Cayman, GT4
- D&S-7 Cayenne, Panamera, Macan, Taycan

#### SPECIAL CATEGORIES DIVISION

- SC-1 Special Interest
- SC-2 Current Competition
- SC-3 Limited Production: Factory Exotics and Factory Race Cars

### **Comment #1**

My only proposal comment relates to your first proposal to consolidate a number of classes in the interest of reducing the time and logistics involved. I caution that move, and ask that you bump that against our goal to increase participation in our various events. If you followed the proposed fix to its logical conclusion, you would only have one class, period. An alternate approach might be to limit trophies to those classes having at least 2 entrants, rather than eliminating the class. I submit that classes with one entrant, are often cars that have special appeal to attendees-an opportunity that would be lost under the current proposal. In my experience in running shows for years, with the biggest complaint being that the classes were combined too much, that folks stopped participating.

### **Comment #2**

I agree with this proposal

## Concours Proposal #2 – Judging School Requirements -- ACCEPTED WITH CHANGES

### Comments from the committee

Approved but make it four events in two years, not six

Also, move this to a separate section (for clarity)

All judges must attend a Concours Judging School at least once every three years or their judging privileges will be suspended

And Change “suspended” to “inactive”

### Current Rule:

Any judge with a Zone 8 or higher classification who wishes to be promoted or to maintain their classification must do either:

A) Judge at least one event each year and show a car in a judged class at least once every two years

Or

B) Judge at least six events every two years

Additionally, a Master Judge must attend at least one Zone 8 Judges School every two years or he/she will be reclassified as a Senior Judge.

Any judge who fails to do the above will have his or her classification reduced by one level each year these requirements have not been met. A demoted judge will have their old rank restored at the beginning of the next season, if they start judging and showing again in accordance with the rules for the remainder of the current season.

All judges must attend a Concours Judging School at least once every three years or their judging privileges will be suspended.

### Proposed Rule:

Any judge with a Zone 8 or higher classification who wishes to be promoted or to maintain their classification must:

A) Attend at least one Zone 8 Judges School every two years.

and

B)

1) Judge at least one event each year and show a car in a judged class at least once every two years

or

2) Judge at least six events every two years

Any judge who fails to do the above will have his or her classification reduced by one level each year these requirements have not been met. A demoted judge will have their old rank restored at the beginning of the next season, if they start judging and showing again in accordance with the rules for the remainder of the current season.

All judges must attend a Concours Judging School at least once every three years or their judging privileges will be suspended.

**Rationale:**

All judges, not just master judges, should have to attend a judging school every two years or be reclassified.

**Comment #1**

Agree, except should be a school every three years, not every two.

## Concours Proposal #3 – Judging Experience at National Events - REJECTED

### Comments from the committee

Rejected, see Comment # 1

Also, there is no way of reliably knowing who is judging at these events.

### **Current Rule and the Problem:**

*All judges will be classified using a judging point system based on their levels of experience and judging education obtained at Zone 8.*

*Judging points are awarded according to the following schedule:*

<i>Working as Event Head Judge</i>	<i>100 judging points</i>
<i>Attending a Zone 8 Judging school</i>	<i>100 judging points</i>
<i>Judging at a Zone 8 Concours</i>	<i>100 judging points</i>
<i>Teaching at a Zone 8 Judging School</i>	<i>100 judging points</i>
<i>Tutoring about judging at an Event</i>	<i>50 judging points</i>

Many judges travel at great cost of both time and expense advancing not only their experience but all of PCA and in fairness should be acknowledged for that. We have judges in our zone who go above and beyond, benefiting both the zone and the National organization, and should be recognized.

### **Proposed Change:**

All judges will be classified using a judging point system based on their levels of experience and judging education obtained at Zone 8 and/or Judging at a PCA nationally sanctioned event such as Porsche Parade or Werks Reunion. Judging points are awarded according to the following schedule:

Working as Event Head Judge	100 judging points
Attending a Zone 8 Judging school	100 judging points
Judging at a Zone 8 Concours	100 judging points
Judging at a PCA Parade or Werks Reunion Concours	100 judging points
Teaching at a Zone 8 Judging School	100 judging points
Tutoring about judging at an Event	50 judging points

### **Rationale:**

The problem with the rule as written is that judges who judge and train at PCA nationally sanctioned experiences, such as PCA parade and Werks Reunion, are not given judging points for the experience and education they are obtaining at these excellent events.



The proposed rule changes would allow the judges in Zone 8 to benefit from their Concours judging experiences on the national level and bring that experience and expertise to bear on their zone judging.

**Comment #1**

Judging criteria at these national events may be different. Then should only be adopted for events with similar judging criteria to Z8 events.

## Concours Proposal #4 – Judge Advancement - ACCEPTED

### **Current Rule:**

Judges advance one level per year regardless of points earned, levels cannot be skipped.

### **Proposed Rule:**

Drop this rule.

### **Rationale:**

This goes against historical precedent. Also, experience is experience - whether gained in many shows in one year, or over time; and more concentrated experience in a shorter time is a better learning experience.

### **Comment #1**

In favor of the proposal, why slow a judge down if they are having an active year.

## Concours Proposal #5 – Event and Team Head Judge Qualifications - ACCEPTED

### **Comments from the committee**

Approved, with more concise language: Just change 'must' to 'should'

### **Current Rule:**

To participate in the role of team head judge on a judging team at a Zone 8 Concours a judge must have a "Zone 8 Judge" or higher classification.

To be the Event Head Judge at a Zone 8 Concours a judge should be a Master or a Senior Judge

### **Proposed Rule:**

To the extent possible:

To participate in the role of team head judge on a judging team at a Zone 8 Concours a judge should preferably have a "Zone 8 Judge" or higher classification.

To be the Event Head Judge at a Zone 8 Concours a judge should preferably be a Master or a Senior Judge

### **Rationale:**

Judges at either or both of those head judge levels positions' "required" levels may not be available for any or all of them, but the Event organizers need flexibility to fill out their judging staff based upon what is actually available to them. Some events have a limited number of judges available for their particular date for a variety of reasons; and may be particularly difficult for the smaller and the more distant Regions

### **Comment #1**

Seems reasonable to allow some flexibility

## Concours Proposal #6 – Protest Time Frame - REJECTED

### **Comments from the committee**

The logistics of this proposal are problematic, too many people leave right after the ceremony, or even before it if they learn they are not getting a trophy, which is why the rule was changed in the first place. About giving the sheets back before the scoring committee is done with them, that is not what the rules say. They say to return them as soon as scoring is finished. Scoring doesn't have to return them if they are still working on them. The intention of the current rule is just to return them as soon as possible; that is, do not hold on to them arbitrarily unnecessarily.

### **Current Rule:**

Individual score sheets will be returned to the entrants immediately after all scores for that Division have been recorded by the scoring team.

Written protests shall be filed with the Event Head Judge within 30 minutes of all score sheets being returned for the Division.

### **Proposed Rule:**

Revert this rule to the previous one, of the protest period being after the awards ceremony.

### **Rationale:**

Historically score sheets were returned after the awards so that scoring had plenty of time to deal with corrections. Also, for large divisions, judging may not be complete until just before the awards ceremony begins.

### **Comment #1**

Difficult issue, as entrants often leave as soon as the awards are over, or even sooner if they don't trophy. If a protest is then lodged, they aren't around to deal with it. And it means recalling trophies if the protest is upheld. How can you do that if the trophy has already left with the entrant? Anyway, the current rules just say (paraphrasing) return the score sheets when you are done with them. If you are not done with them (making corrections, re-judging, etc.) you can hold on to them until you are done. Perhaps this could be reworded to clarify the intent.

## Concours Proposal #7 – Service & Judging Points for Judges - REJECTED

### Comments from the committee

The submitter is making too much out of the procedure. First of all, the Zone staff person determines judging and service points, not the region hosting the event. Secondly, there is no reason for the region to prepare multiple lists for each event. The region merely needs to submit a list of volunteer names and the jobs they performed. The zone staff will take it from there.

### Current Rule:

Judging points are awarded according to the following schedule:

Working as Event Head Judge	100 judging points
Attending a Zone 8 Judging school	100 judging points
Judging at a Zone 8 Concours	100 judging points
Teaching at a Zone 8 Judging School	100 judging points
Tutoring about judging at an Event	50 judging points

Service points will be earned according to the following schedule:

Event chairperson	300 service points
Event head judge	200 service points
Assistant chairperson	100 service points
Event judge	100 service points
Other worker	75 service points

### Proposed Rule:

For judges and head judges, the judging points should be the same as the service points and therefore the workload will be reduced by not having to do a separate accounting of the two kinds of points (for judges).

Also, add a new category: Asst. Event Head Judge, with 150 service points.

### Rationale:

Reduces the workload by not having to track multiple points schemes for judges and head judges.

### **Comment #1**

It's not entirely clear to me exactly what the new points structure would look like. The problem that this change was intended to deal with was that people were becoming senior and master judges based on points for chairing an event, working as timers or runners and so on, activities that played no role in making people more competent judges, because no distinction was made between service points and judging points. I am fine with any system which avoids that problem.

### **Comment #2**

I agree with this proposal

## Concours Proposal #8 – Tutoring points - ACCEPTED

### **Comments from the committee**

Option one was accepted. A definition will be added to the rules

### **Current Rule:**

Judging points are awarded according to the following schedule:

Working as Event Head Judge	100 judging points
Attending a Zone 8 Judging school	100 judging points
Judging at a Zone 8 Concours	100 judging points
Teaching at a Zone 8 Judging School	100 judging points
Tutoring about judging at an Event	50 judging points

### **Problem:**

Tutoring is not defined. Either define it or eliminate it.

### **Comment #1:**

I think tutoring points can be eliminated

## Concours Proposal #9 – Eliminate Repeat Judging School requirements - REJECTED

### **Comments from the committee**

The committee strongly feels that a refresher is a good thing. Additionally, it creates camaraderie amongst the judges and promotes uniformity in judging.

Finally, classes by Zoom are possible, which will make it easier for those that can't travel to a class.

### **Current Rule:**

All judges should have attended at least one judging school before judging at any event.

Additionally, a Master Judge must attend at least one Zone 8 Judges School every two years or he/she will be reclassified as a Senior Judge.

All judges must attend a Concours Judging School at least once every three years or their judging privileges will be suspended.

### **Problem:**

There are not enough judging schools to support these rules. Additionally, experienced judges don't need this and if they ever feel the need, they can review the material on the Z8 website. Finally, actively judging is the best teacher. Ensuring they keep judging is more important than requiring them to attend schools.

### **Proposal:**

Eliminate the requirement for repeating Judges Schools every 2 or 3 years. After all, the Parade doesn't have any qualifications to judge other than being "known" as a judge. So why do we need them to maintain a rating once achieved?

### **Comment #1:**

Disagree! What if things change, either in the rules or the judging guidelines? How else will judges know?

### **Comment #2:**

I agree with this proposal

### **Comment #3:**



I agree with this proposal

## Concours Proposal #10 – Remove all Requirements for Judges to Maintain their Ratings - REJECTED

### **Comments from the committee**

The committee strongly feels that a refresher is a good thing. Additionally, it creates camaraderie amongst the judges and promotes uniformity in judging.

Finally, classes by Zoom are possible, which will make it easier for those that can't travel to a class.

Requiring judges to show also has benefits:

- Encourages more people to show cars
- Ensures judges have skin in the game
- Ensures they know what contestants experience

Finally, many judges wouldn't show up to work events if they were not also entering a car

As to the concern about favoritism, while it may happen from time to time, the committee feels that most judges are usually tougher on each other, not more lenient.

### **Current Rule:**

Any judge with a Zone 8 or higher classification who wishes to be promoted or to maintain their classification must do either:

A) Judge at least one event each year and show a car in a judged class at least once every two years

Or

B) Judge at least six events every two years

### **Problem:**

Entering a car for judging has nothing to do with the proficiency nor ability of any judge's performance in judging. In fact, most car clubs and organizations bar an active entrant from judging, and an active judge from entering due to the inherent dangers of a conflict of interest and quid pro quo problems. (Judges trading "favors" in more lenient judging of each other's cars.)

Additionally, many very experienced judges who may otherwise be willing to help out with judging at events, are no longer willing to put in the time and effort to prepare and enter their car in order to be an active judge and therefore we are losing judges.

Moreover, preparing a car is not the same as judging a group of cars - and anyone can technically meet the enter a car requirement by entering with a totally unprepared car that is dirty, unkempt, etc. So what's the point!?

Furthermore, even the alternative method is no longer viable as the Concours schedule has shrunk considerably.

### **Proposal:**

Eliminate these requirements. After all, the Parade doesn't have any qualifications to judge other than being "known" as a judge. So why do we need them to maintain a rating once achieved?

### **Comment #1**

There is a big conflict of interest in the concours and judging. I don't agree that a judge can enter their car in any concours and be a judge at the same time at that same concours. That is a definite conflict of interest! Also, I see a lot of preferential treatment with cars that are being judged and the judges at the same event. This is unacceptable! A judge certainly has the right to enter their car at any concours, however, if they enter a car at a concours, they cannot and must not be a judge at that same concours!! This rule must change. I am happy to discuss this issue. I will no longer participate in any concours until this rule is changed.

### **Comment #2**

Fully agree, once a rating is achieved, it shouldn't require anything else to maintain it. Reality is, Head judges go to those they know and respect when they need judges. It is doubtful these requirements factor into judge selection.

### **Comment #3**

I think judges should have to show a car at least once every two or three years.

## Concours Proposal #11 – More realistic judging times and division splits-REJECTED

### Comments from the committee

There are not enough judges to do this

Also, we prefer to avoid judge-offs whenever possible. They introduce opportunities for error and unfairness for the entrant.

### Current Rule:

Divisions containing over nine cars may be divided into two groups.

Each area of the car will be judged for five (5) minutes.

### Problem:

In theory, on the average it should take 10-15 minutes to judge a car. Reality shows it is more like 25-30. Most events only allow 2 hours for judging. Therefore there isn't enough time to get it all done without running late. This is complicated by judges needing to take a break when their cars are being judged as well as the re-judging necessary for split divisions.

### Proposal:

Divisions containing a range of 4 to 6 cars or anticipating more than 2 hours of judging time may be divided into two groups.

### Rationale:

All things considered, in realistic practical terms, the total average time to judge a car is estimated as:

5 - 7+ minutes for judges' & entrant's intros, passing out scoring sheets & filling in Judges names, & explaining the judging process (& sometimes for the entrant to fill in their own info & name - especially newbies). (this varies by number of judges 2-6 per each Division)

1 - 2 minutes for the team head/exterior judge to do the 1 minute with the car closed w/ timer start/end

2 - 3 minutes for the Entrant to open their cars doors, hood, trunk lid/hatch, etc., & to open &/or put out whatever needs judging in each area

5 - minutes to judge the rest of the car in all areas

5 - 7+ minutes to debrief the entrant on each scoring area & explain the score sheets, fill out & check the score sheets & head judge master sheet, & send the runner off to scoring (varies by number of judges & areas judged)

2 - 5+ minutes to find & get to the next car (& plus same time at the start for the 1st car)

Therefore 20 - 30 +/- minutes total per car

**Comment #1**

I am in favor of the current rule, no need for this change.

## Driving Events

### Driving Event Proposal #1 – Open Wheel Cars at Autocross - REJECTED

#### Comments from the committee

See Comment #1

#### Current Rule and the Problem

##### Section XIII VEHICLE & DRIVER SAFETY EQUIPMENT

Part L. All parts of the tire which normally contact the road must be covered by the fender when measured from a vertical drop from the fender edge through the center line of the wheel. Cars must have fenders attached to the vehicle body at all four corners.

The issue is that as written this covers both AX and DE/TT. Open wheel cars do not present the same problem at AX because the vehicle spacing on the track and the design of the course should prevent any wheel-to-wheel contact. Additionally, the PCA national AX standards do not prohibit open wheel cars (unlike the national DE standards).

#### Proposed Change

Part L. **For DE/TT** all parts of the tire which normally contact the road must be covered by the fender when measured from a vertical drop from the fender edge through the center line of the wheel. Cars must have fenders attached to the vehicle body at all four corners.

#### Comment #1

Fenders are not required only to prevent tire to tire contact. They also limit the amount and direction of debris thrown into the air, both behind towards a following car, and especially for AX, up in the air and towards the sides of the track, as there are A LOT of corner workers standing by the sides of the track (often at least two at each corner and slalom). Anyone who has run frequently can attest that a car with sticky tires could easily pull up a rock-to-brick-sized

piece of asphalt and chuck it 20 feet away (usually to the rear). If fenders are no longer required, this could now be in any direction, including straight up.

The fender requirement isn't just there to protect cars from each other, it's also there to protect other people, and at an AX, there are a lot of people standing along side the track. This proposal should be rejected as it creates increased safety risks.

## **Comment #2**

I totally agree with rejecting the proposed change to keep the workers and other event attendees safe.

## Driving Event Proposal #2 – Passengers at Autocross- REJECTED

### **Comments from the committee**

This is not in our jurisdiction, need to follow national rules on this

### **Current Rule:**

If two people are in a car, at least one must be an approved event instructor, and the other must be a registered entrant in the event, for the sole purpose of instruction. No other passengers are allowed, including back seat passengers.

### **Proposed change:**

Allow spouses to ride along (with all required safety equipment, of course).

### **Rationale:**

Participation would increase if spouses (also PCA Members) were allowed to be in the car with the driver at AX.

### **Editor's Note:**

At this time, these rules are controlled by National PCA, and they may not be modified by the local region or zone. That being said, two programs exist for event entrants which might meet the intent of this proposal: Demonstration rides and a Taste of Autocross, as outlined in Section I parts FF and GG of the Zone 8 Rules. These are sanctioned by national.



## Driving Event Proposal #3 – Minors in Drivers Ed events - REJECTED

### **Comments from the committee**

This is not in our jurisdiction, need to follow national rules on this

### **Current Rule:**

All participants must be 18 years of age

### **Proposed Rule:**

The CDI of the region should have the discretion to allow a minor to participate in their DE, if the CDI vets and deems it to be appropriate.

### **Rationale:**

Participation would increase if minors of PCA Members were allowed to drive in a DE.

### **Editor's Note:**

At this time, these rules are controlled by National PCA, and they may not be modified by the local region or zone.

## Driving Event Proposal #4 – Equal Restraints and factory seats – ACCEPTED w/ PROVISIONS

### **Comments from the committee**

National's DE Minimum standards allow the factory punchout to be removed for approved for 5 or 6 pt harnesses. This will be fixed in the Z8 rules with an administrative change for 2025.

That covers the literal proposal that was made. However, it does not cover the stated reason for the proposal. To Continue:

A clarification request was been submitted to national to see if a Schroth ASM system is considered to be equal restraints with respect to a FIA/SFI approved system.

The answer is "no." For the purposes of this rule, Schroth systems are considered to be equivalent to factory seat belts. If one side has an FIA/SFI approved harness system, both sides need an FIA/SFI approved harness system. (They just needn't be the same brand or model.)

A clarification request was also submitted to national about adding a sub-strap to a Schroth ASM system.

The answer to this is also "no." There is no indication in the Schroth documentation that a sub-strap may be added to a Schroth ASM system. As a reminder, all safety equipment must be installed according to manufacturer instructions. Until documentation can be presented that demonstrates this is an allowable option, this is therefore not a legal addition to a Schroth ASM system

The Z8 Rules and the Zone 8 Rules clarification document will both be updated for 2025 to reflect the above

### **Current Rule:**

From the Z8 Rules on safety equipment:

"Also, for Time Trial and DE the same type of restraint system is required for both driver and passenger. "

"Modification of stock seats is not allowed"

"These vehicles must be fitted with the original factory seats"

(Note: When using approved Schroth 4 point belts.)

**Proposed Rule:**

In a GT3, only the driver's side has the hole for a sub strap. On the passenger side, there is a punch out, but it has not been removed.

Allow the passenger side "punch out" to be removed so that a sub strap can be installed on the passenger side.

**Rationale:**

This is significantly cheaper than replacing the seat and would allow the addition of a sub strap to the Schroth 4 pt ASM harness system so that both the driver and passenger may have sub straps with a Schroth system.

**Editor's Note:**

The national PCA DE Minimum standards explicitly state that "equal protection" does not mean that driver and passenger need to have identical 5-, 6-, and 7-point harnesses. For example, the driver could have a 5-point harness and the passenger a 6-point harness. Unfortunately, they are silent on the matter of approved 4-point harnesses with respect to this.

The national PCA DE Minimum standards are also silent about the possibility of adding a sub strap to the Schroth 4-point systems. One might assume that it would be legal as long as it is a Schroth and Federal Motor Vehicle regulation approved enhancement, but at this point in time, that is merely an assumption.

The national PCA DE Minimum standards do say, however, that for Porsche GT seats with the punch out, it is legal to use this to add a sub strap to the passenger seat. The Z8 rules will be updated for 2025 to include this.

Comment #1

My understanding is that you can never add a sub strap to a Schroth ASM harness.

- The Schroth ASM (4 point) has a FMVSS209 rating which is for on highway passenger car.
- This is not an FIA or SFI homologated harness so modifying it to resemble or act like one is illegal.
- Harnesses must be used as described by manufacturer only. (Z8 rules & DE Minimum Standards)

## Driving Event Proposal #5 – Boxster Spec BRI is too high - REJECTED

### **Comments from the committee**

First of all, the BRI is not an official part of the Z8 rules

Secondly, factory tread wear ratings are a proxy for tire performance. It is true that because there is no enforced standard for these measures, it is problematic to compare these numbers across brands. This is a known issue. However, there is no other measurement of tire performance available at this time. The rules committee will not attempt to undertake developing another method of evaluating and quantifying tire performance. Doing so is beyond our scope and ability.

Third, the spec class rules we have adopted are those of PCA club racing. The committee has no desire to develop our own spec class rules.

If a driver doesn't like running in the spec class, they can always run in a CC class.

### **Problem:**

The Boxster Spec BRI is too high because the spec tire, the Toyo R, rated at treadwear 40, is not as good as the 40 rating would suggest. In fact, there are treadwear 200 tires that perform better.

Because of this, the Boxster Spec cars are not fairly represented in the BRI results. (Currently like a CC08 car.)

### **Proposal:**

Fairly handicap the Boxster Spec class by adjusting the value based on the tire's actual performance, not its treadwear rating. (Perhaps more like a CC06 car.)

### **Editor's Note #1:**

The Zone 8 Rules Committee will review the equipment requirements for Boxster Spec cars as well as the points assessments used to determine the class' BRI multiplier, but it should be noted that the BRI Index is not based on event results because of the extensive workload to analyze results for all drivers, classes, and events. The BRI index is determined solely by the performance points assessed.

### **Comment #1**

Requested change seems reasonable, noting that many times general rules are not accurate or useable for specific circumstances or cars.

## **Comment #2**

This proposal should be rejected. How exactly are we supposed to determine the tire's actual performance? Who exactly is qualified to design a test plan for different tires? This is impractical and financially not feasible.

A driver is not required to participate in the BoxsterSpec class. Obviously, she can simply mount a different set of tires and drive in a points class instead.

To quote our bench racer's index blurb: "One must remember that this is just fodder for conversation; while the goal may be to remove all variables except driver skill, it isn't realistic to expect these numbers to truly equalize the classes across the board. Have fun with it, but try to remember that it's just about bench racing."

## **Editor's Note #2:**

The Rules Committee has reviewed the points assessment estimate for Boxster SPEC (SPB) cars.

The BRI calculations are based solely on estimated Performance Equipment Points

The existing Performance Equipment Points assessment for SPB cars covers the following changes to a stock 986 2.5L Boxster:

245 Tires Front and Rear

Weight Reduction

40 TW Tires

Muffler Removed

Cats Removed

Adjustable Sway Bars

Aftermarket Springs

Camber increase (via GT3 A-arms)

Non-stock Aero (GT3 front splitter)

It should be noted that for the purposes of calculation the BRI factor, there are no other assessments to reflect that a SPB car is a completely stripped out race car with a roll cage (relative to a street 986 Boxster).

In the time since the BRI was last calculated for SPB cars, the following changes have occurred:

The size of the spec tires increased from 245 to 255.

The "free" weight reduction allowance in the Zone 8 Rules was reduced from 2.5% to 1.5%.

These two changes actually increase the previously estimated Performance Equipment Points by 23 points, which would indicate an increased BRI factor from .952 to .956.

Based upon this analysis, a reduction in the SPB BRI is not warranted.

In general, the Z8 rules don't make any special accommodation for the existence of 200TW AX "cheater" tires, except to exclude them from use in SS classes. Their use is a performance option/choice to anyone running in a CC class.