

ASSOCIATION OF classic trials clubs

please reply to:

The General Secretary
Anne Templeton
The Coach House
Chivers Road
Stondon Massey
Brentwood
CM15 0LG

Tel: 0277 823173

A meeting of the Council of ACTC will be held on Sunday,
March 29th 1992 at 2.00 pm prompt at the Pelican Public
House, Chew Magna, near Bristol. (MR 172/576632)

Delegates will be able to purchase lunch from approximately 12.30 pm. Tea will be provided at the meeting.

AGENDA

Those officers whose names are listed below are requested to submit written reports for circulation; this will permit more time for discussion.

1. Apologies for Absence.
2. Minutes of previous meeting. (AGM on September 22nd 1991).
3. Matters arising therefrom other than detailed later in Agenda.
4. To receive nominations and to elect:-
(a) President ✓
(b) Vice President/ Vice Presidents. ✓
5. Financial Report -
Report on Income and Expenditure - Janet Mattin
6. To receive a report from Roger Pole, ACTC delegate covering the work of the RAC MSA Trials and Cross Country Committee.
7. To decide on the recommendations of the Technical Panel dated February 1st 1991
i). **92/1/T.**
Discuss and vote on of the options listed . (Seperate page attached)

- ii). 92/2/T
Discuss and vote on adoption of tyre size grid (Seperate page attached)
8. To receive a report from the ROW Officer - Nick Ryle
11. Dates of Classic Trials in 1993
12. Any Other Non Championship Business.
13. Championship Reports -
(a) Report from Hon. Secretary of ACTC Championship, including review of number of contestants and income and expenditure account; review of both drivers & passengers leagues. Richard Dawe.
(c) Report from Championship Quality Controller including review of comments and advice given to organisers from observers' reports. Recommendations concerning additions/deletions to championship qualifying rounds - Jim Templeton.
14. Any Other Championship Business.
15. Date, time and place of next meeting.

THE USE OF UNLISTED TYRES

1. Regulation M.6.7.3 states that all vehicles must use standard tyres currently in lists IA or II (Appendix 'R') or previously listed (with named exceptions). Appendix 'R' List II includes (last sentence) any make of Highway pattern retread/remould tyre to quoted specifications.
2. In both PCT's and our events, this Regulation has been interpreted liberally: scrutineers have normally taken the view that if the tyres look like a Highway pattern, then no objection is raised, regardless of M.6.7.3.
3. In this year's Exeter Trial, the unlisted ATS yearling tyre was identified at scrutineering as having a block tread which went beyond being a Highway pattern, although it had been accepted in events in 1991 and has been condoned in other trials in 1992. The Exeter is a matter for the MCC, but for the future it is clearly undesirable for any tyres to be acceptable in one event but not in another.
4. Member Clubs are requested to consider the following options with the object of attempting to reach a decision on the 29th March which can be put to RACMSA Trials and Cross Country Committee. For the immediate future, potential problems in Class 2 have been overcome by the MSA amending M.6.7.5 to permit unlisted crossply tyres of a Highway pattern. Nonetheless, the longer term still needs to be considered.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL FEBRUARY 1ST 19

92/1T

OPTION A - Continue as now, amending the Blue Book to reflect established practice.

Pros:

- * very wide range of tyres available.

Cons:

- * current interpretation problems continue.

OPTION B - As OPTION A, but blacklist agreed 'iffy' tyres.

Pros:

- * reduces interpretation problems.

Cons:

- * tyres may be in use before blacklisting

OPTION C - Enforce M.6.7.3.

Pros:

- * everyone knows (almost) where they are

Cons:

- * costly to competitors with stocks of unlisted tyres

- * restricts range/price of available tyres

- * leaves remoulds undefined

OPTION D - As OPTION C, but hold (say) 2 meetings of the Technical Panel in Spring 1992 (tyre parties!) to which competitors may bring tyres for consideration for inclusion in a 'List IV'. Yearly update.

Pros:

- * widens choice and reduces costs.

Cons:

- * a lot of work - need for a new ACTC officer to do the task effectively....volunteer?

- * leaves remoulds and crossplies unlisted.

OPTION E - As OPTION D, but ban remoulds.

Pros:

- * easy to enforce.

Cons:

- * increases costs to some competitors.

OPTION F - As OPTION D, but list remoulds (and crossplies).

Pros:

- * everyone knows where they are;

- * easy to enforce.

Cons:

- * even more work;

- * regional production of remoulds;

- * (as new crossply moulds are probably not being made, listing these tyres may not be worth the effort involved).

but not for 2.

TYRE SIZES

1. Regulation M.6.7.2 now states that in all Classes 1-8 (except Class 2) the maximum permitted difference between front and rear tyres shall be two sections. No wheel/tyre may be smaller than that recommended by the car manufacturer
2. The term is 'maximum', thus there is no justification for competitors using tyres with a difference of 3 sections simply because a particular size is not available. The onus remains with competitors to comply with the Regulation, even though it may mean that the maximum permitted size difference cannot be used.

TECHNICAL PANEL RECOMMENDATION (92/2/T)

3. The Technical Panel RECOMMENDS the adoption of the 'grid' set out below for determining the comparative sizes of tyres in the 3 systems used for those with an aspect ratio of more than: 80%:

CUSHION

5.20
5.60
5.90
6.40

RADIAL

145
155
165
175
185

HIGH PRESSURE

(4.50
(5.00
5.50
6.00
6.50
7.00
7.50

BRAS (Goodyear only)

*5.20
5.60
5.90*

In the high pressure marking system, the 0.25 and 0.75 sizes are ignored. The 4.50 size has been bracketed with the 5.00 in order to allow older cars to retain, eg 4.50 x 17 front tyres with 165 x 15 rear tyres.

4. Member Clubs are requested to consider this object of APPROVING the 'grid', with any agreed amendments on 29th March 1992.

SUGGESTION FOR CONSIDERATION FROM MG CAR CLUB

1. PREAMBLE.

- 1.1 Most organisers select entries in order of receipt and, in the case of popular events, one's chance of running depends therefore on the vagaries of the postal system.
- 1.2 There is a migration of competitors towards classes 7 and 8.
- 1.3 Classic Trials are getting "rougher" and less attractive to owners of production cars because of this, (or vice-versa?)
- 1.4 It is sometimes said that more should be done to encourage entries in classes 1 (the only kind of everyday car one can buy today), and 2 (good for the image of the sport).

2. SUGGESTION

- 2.1 The number of "places" available should be equally divided among the 8 classes.
- 2.2 At the closing date entries should be allocated to each class, in the order received.
- 2.3 Any vacant places in under-subscribed classes should be re-allocated to over-subscribed classes, again by equal division.
- 2.4 Repeat steps 2.2 and 2.3.
- 2.5 Reject those left over when the maximum number of entries has been reached.

3. ALTERNATIVES FOR DEBATE

- 3.1 The places available in each class should be in proportion to their existing popularity, but with a minimum of, say 5, in each.
- 3.2 A form of "seeding" based on the previous year's championship results might be developed to guarantee entries to established championship contenders, (good luck!).
- 3.3 Alternatively, places in each class could be allocated by random selection after the closing date
(2.2)
- 3.4 Consideration might be given, at the same time, to extending eligibility for class 2 to include vehicles of pre-war design (eg MG TC, Ford Popular etc). Perhaps this is as simple as including "any production car fitted with a solid front axle, manufactured before 1955".

*Report for
next year*