

## ANSWERS TO 2012 ALRC COMPETITIVE EVENTS THE CONSULTATION

### 1.0 Events

#### 1.1. Are the Events promoted within the ALRC sufficient or require expansion to suit the current interest of the membership? Is there a need for an event that bridges the gap between RTV and CCV to allow progression of members through events?

- a. Probably for existing members they are but with numbers dwindling do we need to find a new group to appeal to. I don't feel there is a need for a gap event. RTVs are already too tough for many to take part in and with the popularity and capability of the 90 this is very difficult to counter. I know from competing in my P38 that even a moderately tough section for me will be a walkover in a 90. We should look to put on different events to encourage more people such as tyro (maybe renamed to be more meaningful) and orienteering type events. Freelanders are now becoming the cheap Land Rover and events need to appeal to those owners.
- b. We believe that the current RTVs do this well enough. Those who require a less challenging event have the TYRO to take part in, however, our experience is that the TYRO is very poorly supported compared to RTVs as people want the more demanding event that we promote at RTV level. We endeavour to make RTVs non damaging but this does not mean they have to be easy. Sections can be very challenging before they become dangerous to driver or vehicle. The inclusion of another level of competition would be at the expense of those we already run as people cannot afford to do everything.
- c. No - the rules and regulations will become even more complicated. Clubs struggle to find land and people to organize events, another discipline will add to the burden.
- d. No intermediate events needed. Current events low on entries so cannot justify the overheads of an extra "layer" of competition. See 1.2.d.
- e. Show room class RTVT (as RTVT's used to be) as Tyro is too easy. Other than this, extra disciplines should not be added as it would only thin out the existing member base. We have witnessed it with off-road clubs.
- f. I do not think trying to put a new group between the RTVT and CCVT would necessarily resolve the current issues with aggressive RTVT's. This may require a new class that is below the RTVT group that will be more available for newer vehicles.
- g. No.
- h. Not really, a lot of RTVT cars are already very capable and sometimes are laying out and doing sections very similar to CCVT sections.
- i. I think it would be better to leave that level as is but promote Tyro. You already have an event that is idle.
- j. As technology improves, RTV's have become more difficult and challenging as have CCV trials  
The area that needs attention is between Tyro and RTV as the progression between these events is now quite large and off putting for beginners who after a few events become very competent at Tyro Trials
- k. The gap is between Tyro & RTV. The RTV's are getting more 'challenging' so an RTV driver could more easily progress onto CCV. But the step from Tyro to RTV for some, is too large
- l. RTV is too damaging and the rules need to change to make damage a rarity not the norm.
- m. I would be in favour of maintaining RTV as a non-damage trial and introducing another trial type between this and CCV. Reason – rules already exist for RTV as non-damage so less work re-writing rules. RTV could be restricted by insisting that only 'All Terrains' are acceptable on a standard motor for example.  
The new trial type could allow for modified road legal vehicles on mud terrain – example.
- n. I think that RTVT is now too advanced for entry level to the sport. Tyro will never be a form of "motorsport", just a bit of fun before the BBQ. Show room class RTVT should be established, no mud tyres, no lifts, cut away panels etc.

- o. With RTVTs becoming more demanding which deters drivers of newer vehicles from entering, a new type of trial should be introduced to cater for owners of 'everyday' standard LRs only. The new type of trial would be potentially much less damaging to vehicles and would bridge the gap between a TYRO and RTV trials.
- p. There is not a gap between CCVT and RTVT. If a gap exists at all it is between Tyro and RTVT. We feel that creating another type of trial would just dilute what we already have and increase the difficulty in laying on appropriate events. Some clubs have a A20 class. This is a non-competitive class and is a CCVT vehicle that always goes last at an RTVT. This allows a novice to try the event without risking a car to drive home in.
- q. There should be no need for a bridging event if TYROs, RTVTs and CCVTs are set out well. In all cases there is guidance to C-o-C's which asks them to make the general severity suitable for the vehicles entered, and to make the sections get progressively harder towards the 1 gate – if they did that there would be no problem and the best vehicle/driver combinations would win while the less competitive entrants would still enjoy their day.
- r. There is a need for an additional event that bridges the gap between FVT and RTV. Since the RTV has become more serious there is no gap to bridge between the RTVT and CCVT. For example the tree stump in section 11 of the 2012 Nationals was clearly not non-damaging. However, this isn't an issue if there was an event between a FVT and RTVT.
- s. No but there should be no bias against members who have ALRC spec roll cages so there can be a logical progression into CCVT. We need to highlight the fact that while CCVT motors do not need to be road legal, they can be.
- t. No. there is the option for CCVT vehicles to complete a RTVT as a A20 to get used to the vehicle and ground before competing in a CCVT.
- u. I personally think the events are sufficient but then I am only interested in CCVT and Comp Safari.
- v. The RTVT and CCVT are enough events for clubs to hold and I feel that there is no need to increase the number of event categories. But in order to expand we need to consider the 17 to 30 year age group whose membership of our club at present are few and far between. Need to think of more ways to be more inclusive.
- w. No need for extra events
- x. Following discussion with the membership we believe the current situation is suitable.

**1.2 Is the severity of events at the correct level for individual events? Are the current standard of RTV sections too challenging? Are new members and existing discouraged from competing in their day to day vehicle because of this?**

- a. As 1.1.a really, we have such a wide range of vehicle types now that challenging for one vehicle will be impossible for another. However there is a wide disparity in the skills of C-o-Cs and this is difficult to control and get right even for experienced C-o-Cs. Perhaps the Association could have a roving assessor who could visit Clubs unannounced and assess the severity and compliance with regulations and then feedback?
- b. No, RTVs are fine as they are. As previously stated in 1.1.b, we believe that our RTVs are very challenging. We believe we would lose more members than we would gain if they were toned down. People who have very new and shiny vehicles are able to test themselves in TYRO events. Our RTV numbers have gone down in the last few years but this is more due to the economic climate than the severity of events. We occasionally get complaints from members about an individual section, but rarely about severity in general.
- c. Yes – C-o-C's have to accommodate CCV type vehicles. Drivers of these types of vehicles need to be encouraged to compete in CCVT.
- d. No "standard" exists for RTVT – the point of which was a non-damaging trial for the family vehicle in road-trim.
- e. As 1.1.e is the reason for a showroom class RTVT I feel RTVT's are too damaging and as they are as hard as CCVT it stops progression in the sport. However it is now too late to downgrade RTVT so an entry level Show Room RTVT I feel is the way forward.

- f. I believe that this could easily be the case and a Tyro is often seen as too tame or not challenging enough as it can be too “gymkhana like”.
- g. Our club events are ok but other clubs are too severe, including National Rallies.
- h. Probably Yes and Yes. I think the way to go would be to have an event that is kept more easy than the RTVT, maybe called a FVT (Family Vehicle Trial) for the family road car that comes on standard tyres, no cage or lift kit etc. etc. These could be run with say Tyros, reasonably easy and totally non damaging for these cars, well away from trees, sharp banks, rocks etc. Would also suit the new or novice driver to get confidence.
- i. Some interclubs yes e.g. Baskerville Challenge.
- j. See comments in 1.1.j– m. What is required in RTV Trials is compliance to ALRC rules for laying out trials, typically trail sections are too tight, and gates are not a minimum of 3m wide.  
Trials set out for short wheel base vehicles limit the enjoyment and value for money of long wheel base drivers when they are allowed 1 shunt and need more than 2 to complete a section. Drivers should only fail at the 11 to 8 gates due to driver error and not tight follow the sheep trial sections.  
Tight trials also limit progress when the ground breaks down which results in the lucky drivers getting through and the rest all get the same score irrespective of driver skill, this become follow the track rather than a test of driver skill off road.
- k. Yes, especially when RTV’s are being setup with modified motors or even logbooked vehicles. Plus the gates are far too narrow on many events. Clerks of course seem to be hell bent on making the canes the obstacle, not the ground. Wide gates, with lots of options, making people think rather than just follow tramlines is far more enjoyable and in the end will be less damaging. If a trial is merely a ‘follow my leader’ then it is obvious those with better tyres or modified suspension will always get further. That’s not a test of skill, that’s getting to be a test of how much you can spend on your vehicle to improve it – isn’t the ALRC all about retaining the sport at ‘club level’?
- l. C-o-C / Layers-out should be restricted to use a vehicle that is allowed to compete in that specific trial – should mean that aggressive tyres are not used to lay out an RTV that would compete on All Terrains.
- m. See 1.1.n. Most regular RTVT’rs have just as capable motors as my 80” coli CCVT motor, just without a cage and I fear entering my 86” Series I due to risk of damage.
- n. The severity of all permitted events has increased over the years and many members are now dissuaded from entering even an RTVT. (See comment under 1.1.o)
- o. We feel that the trials vary greatly from club to club and there is no standard trial. This is partly influenced by the ground available to clubs. Are there many if any RTVT trailers who use their everyday vehicle?
- p. Regulating severity of events would be extremely difficult if not impossible. If the objective is to allow D2 etc. to compete without damage, then in my view TYRO is the answer rather than interfering with RTVTs. Much easier RTVT’s would discourage drivers of more capable RTVT vehicles just as much as harder RTVTs may discourage D2 drivers. And what happens when a 109” arrives?
- q. Yes, the RTVT is now at a difficulty level that is acceptable to existing drivers but most will therefore not use day to day vehicles to compete in, due to its damaging nature. This does mean however that new drivers are discouraged as the leap from a FVT upwards is too imposing.
- r. RTVT sections can be (and should be) challenging but not at the expense of safety e.g. No motor should be in a position where it can roll or even fall on its side. Also if the driver goes through a bush or scrubs s tree to make a turn he shall be deemed to have stopped at that point. C-o-Cs need to mark out with this in mind. This way the driver who doesn’t want to ride about in a “battered shed” isn’t penalized. I idea I grew up with, of buying a vehicle and using it for the next 20 years is totally alien to most these days so preserving re-sale values is high on most people’s minds.

- s. Yes in some cases. The committee should oversee C-o-C's to make sure that they understand the regulations.
- t. The severity of CCVT and Comp are about right.
- u. Events at some clubs are too severe and do put off potential members from taking part in events. But if the rules in the handbook are followed this shouldn't be the case. Our National RTVT's are too severe and this means club members do not enter the event for fear of damaging their vehicle.
- v. At club level some clubs set events to allow showroom vehicles to compete in RTVT's without damage but still be challenging enough to give wide range of results. At National level 2012 some sections set too difficult / damaging early in sections.
- w. Following discussion with the membership we believe the current situation is suitable.

### **1.3 Should severity of events be regulated to allow a broader range of vehicles and experiences to compete? How can we adapt events at all levels to allow Discovery 11 and Freelander to compete without severe damage?**

- a. Orienteering events allow the driver to decide which bits to drive rather than being guided into damage by a section.  
SRs to prevent handbrake use to turn.
- b. To answer the second part of the question; You can't. You cannot set up a CCV for a Discovery II or Freelander that won't cause severe damage to the vehicle if the event is to remain challenging to heavily modified class vehicles. And an RTV will become pointless if it is set up especially to accommodate these vehicles. How many people even wish to use these vehicles in competition. Is it worth changing a tried and tested formula to accommodate so few. The only real event for these is the TYRO.
- c. Tyro is the only event for a Freelander otherwise you can't expect people to enter in uncompetitive vehicles.
- d. Ideally, these need separate events or different sections, as not built to have same capabilities. Greater entry numbers could justify this but less-aggressive RTVT's could cover it.
- e. Again, start a showroom class RTVT, it would be a good way of introducing new members to the sport.
- f. All the Land Rover products are very capable off road including the additions like the Evoque, however this is a different level to a coil sprung 80". The events will need to be more specific to the type of vehicle that they are intended for. For instance an event that would allow a Freelander to compete is likely to need less extreme break over angles, shallower approach angles and shallow ruts in the course. This should all be possible particularly if a new group is added below RTVT. This group may need to have a specific tyre category / severity with a max tread aggressiveness of "All Terrain".
- g. They can already if guidelines are followed but the Freelander is limited by having no low box.
- h. I think the way to go would be to have an event that is kept more easy than the RTVT, maybe called a FVT (Family Vehicle Trial) for the family road car that comes on standard tyres, no cage or lift kit etc. etc. These could be run with say Tyros, reasonably easy and totally non damaging for these cars, well away from trees, sharp banks, rocks etc. Would also suit the new or novice driver to get confidence.
- i. Tyro is ideal. See 3.d.
- j. This is covered in section 1.1 and 1.2, a bridge trial between Tyro and RTV and make wide open sections so that people can choose their own line around or over obstacles.  
A new competition between Tyro and RTV could have a tyre regulation attached to reduce the capability and therefore the severity of the trial
- k. This is where a trial to fill the gap would be ideal - more challenging than a Tyro, but less severe than an RTV. I don't see how you can compare a Disco two with a Freelander anyway. One has a low ratio the other doesn't. Although a Disco two may not have a diff-

lock and relies on TC and even though it has less approach or departure angle than a Disco one It is still going to be more capable than a Freelander.

- l. Trial sections should be laid out without 'tram rail' mentality. Wide gates (the book mentions 3m min) and choices for drivers. This allows the competitor to think and allow different vehicles to make different choices. Disco / Freelander only compete against 100" so all in this class would maybe need different options to 80" / 88" / 90 classes.
- m. Showroom class, but not as far as people have taken it before (with non-standard brand tyres etc.).
- n. Regarding the comments under 1.1.n many more members would be encouraged to enter a less damaging type of trial which would boost club membership.
- o. It is not possible to regulate trials to allow for all vehicle types. As noted in 1.2.o trials vary across the country anyway. To allow for Freelander or newer discovery's would make the trial unchallenging for 90's.
- p. Regulating severity of events would be extremely difficult if not impossible. If the objective is to allow D2 etc. to compete without damage, then in my view TYRO is the answer rather than interfering with RTVTs. Much easier RTVT's would discourage drivers of more capable RTVT vehicles just as much as harder RTVTs may discourage D2 drivers. And what happens when a 109" arrives?
- q. A lower spec RTVT would cater for the less experienced and newer vehicles. A FVT is too low down to fill this void.
- r. Freelanders are at present a bit too new and shiny at present but who knows? Discos on the other hand are cheap and plentiful. If we get away from the idea that severe = tight then Discos are very capable. It is unfortunate that in the part of the country where I live most available ground is wooded and so "tree prints" are inevitable, certainly in CCVT. If the event is marked out using a Disco then these will have an advantage over shorter models.
- s. They can Tyro and RTVT and it should be made clear they can stop if they wish.
- t. I think CCVT and Comp are ok as they are, I wouldn't like to see them made easier to entice Disco 2 etc.
- u. Severity of events are regulated now by the handbook if the rules are adhered to then it is possible for Discovery II to take part in RTVT's. Freelanders are not true off road vehicles as they don't have a low box, they can, of course, compete but will never be as competitive as say a Defender 90. We should not change the actual rules as have as the course should be set to be undamaging but we should make sure that the rules we have are adhered to.
- v. Members think not possible for Freelander, due to no low box and ground clearance. Disco 2's have been used at some clubs RTVT's but no leading the field.
- w. Following discussion with the membership we believe the current situation is suitable.

## **2.0 Vehicle**

### **2.1 Is the current vehicle classification suitable for our current membership?**

#### **Should we reduce the number of leaf-sprung classes and expand coil-sprung classes by engine performance within the 90 class?**

- a. Leaf classes could probably be amalgamated maybe just to wheelbase?  
I don't think engine performance is the issue with the 90 it's just so capable!
- b. Our experience is that engine performance, i.e. V8 v diesel, provides no regular advantage in trials. We have diesels and V8s win competitions in both RTV and CCV. This would be an unnecessary and over complicating change.
- c. Possibly because leaf classes tend to be almost attendance awards. V8 or 3litre class would be interesting for 90 class but this class seems to always be won by a TDI car anyway.

- d. Maybe using a handicap system would benefit leaf and/or standard vehicles and discourage handling and performance tweaks of the specials. Handicaps could also help with age of vehicles.
- e. I do not believe the number of leaf sprung classes need reducing as the current rules allow for class amalgamations. As for expanding the 90 class by engine power I do not believe that this is much benefit as having engine performance can be insignificant compared to traction gained from aggressive tyres. Therefore it would be much better to categorise by aggressiveness of tyres,
- f. A wide range of classification would encourage more members - ? open class.
- g. Not really.
- h. No, any engine 90 can win. Often V8's are out-classed. Intelligent driving of an N/A is a winner.
- i. RTV should mean exactly that, therefore all entries must display a valid tax disc for the vehicle being checked at scrutineering.  
It can still be brought to site on a trailer but it must be road legal and capable of being driven on the road.
- j. When people modify their vehicles, the first thing they tend to do is modify the suspension, so probably less leaf sprung vehicles are competing these days, but I don't think we should exclude them, certainly not in the standard classes. Engine performance is not the main reason why a vehicle will be better off-road (unless you are talking about comp safaris) The suspension is the governing factor to retain traction, therefore how can a 90 with non-standard springs and long travel shockers be classed as standard. Totally unfair if it's competing against a factory standard 90. So no, for TYRO/RTV trialing I don't see the point of altering the classes based on engine performance.
- k. Restricting leaf sprung might sound better for the majority as numbers are quite low – although we do not wish to stop the clubs who run specific leaf trials as these are much more likely to be standard. There may be a need for power classes within 90 / LWB for speed events but not for trials.
- l. Small events - Yes, large events, if you have the entries – No.
- m. Perhaps some trials could be restricted to leaf-sprung vehicles only to give a more level playing field for drivers competing in these models.
- n. Current classes are ok as they are.
- o. The time has come to review classes for CCVT. The national CCVT is hugely dominated by class 9 & 10 so these classes could perhaps be opened out. Engine performance does make a difference in CCVTs but is not reflected in the class structure.  
For RTVT, although it would be difficult to define, there should be a distinction in classes between the everyday road car and the road going trialer. I personally feel that vehicle/driver combinations that do CCVTs should not do RTVTs, but I don't have a workable definition to suggest!
- p. There is clearly already too many classes which has resulted in a complicated system of classification. The answer is to amalgamate some of the existing classes and not to introduce anymore.
- q. We should reduce the number of classes and while we are at it reduce and simplify the rules in the green book. I have recently done a few events with a local non-ALRC club and they have 2 classes – modified and unmodified. We would regard them as CCV and RTV respectively. Many of their members are ex-ALRC, Why? The most common answer I got was our rules are too silly and complicated. If you take a step back they have a point. Our rules have evolved to solve a problem (real or imagined) created by previous rules! Their motors, in most cases, are as Land Rover as ours. They just don't try to make them look like something they're not. E.g. A coil sprung Series I. We cut a Land Rover down till it matches the dimensions of a Series I then fabricate a body to make it look vaguely like the factory may have built it. Most of the ORC motors are exactly the same mechanically but then fit with enough bodywork to make it safe.

P.S. ORC vehicles can use any manufacturers parts, 90% contain as many Land Rover bits as ours.

- r. No.
- s. We need to have an open class that will allow vehicles that have been modified to compete in a class of their own. We need to make sure that the courses are set to the same standard as normal but allow the modified vehicles to compete – those which our club would normally turn away.
- t. A few years ago whilst off work ill I thought about this a lot and ended up reviewing the rule book which I saved a copy. I have attached the document as written at that time, I know things have changed but I think some of the ideas are still relevant, I perhaps would change a few things and add a few more in as I didn't consider construction and use regs for the road going vehicles and of course we should do so.  
I think we have big opportunity here as there are many vehicles outside the ALRC that are constructed from Land Rover parts or based on Land Rovers that are excluded from ALRC events under the current regs which with a few changes could be in our clubs.  
So please give it a read and feel free to use it as you see fit. Also please don't take it too literally, it is written as a presentation but is an early draft. I always intended to get some feedback on it and review the proposals before going any further but haven't got around to it as yet, other things have gotten in the way as they tend to do.  
*COMMENT FROM SIMONE – THIS DOCUMENT IS BASED ON THE 2007 ALRC HANDBOOK AND IS INCLUDED AS A SEPARATE BOOKLET.*
- u. Member view - to remain with existing classes.
- v. Classes to be more related to engine type and size, less emphasis on leaf sprung

## **2.2 How do we allow members to build vehicles which are competitive and remain legal to drive on the road? Within the changing requirements and regulation of the DVLA do we relax our silhouette requirements for those building special vehicles and allow 100" to compete?**

- a. Why not? There are so many well-made kits based on 100" that look like a land rover and will be a lot safer than a chopped down chassis. Could increase membership from comp safari drivers.
- b. In general this was thought to be a good idea though in need of more discussion. On the down side, this is in direct opposition to the ALRC's stated aim of moving toward more standard vehicles in competition. Does this signify a change in attitude? Also, how many vehicles and owners do we think this will entice into our fraternity?
- c. Numbers in Safari events would go up if 100" were allowed but obviously in their own class regardless of engine size. 100" trials cars get a shunt but if you have to declare at the start if section this immediately puts you at a disadvantage but 100" hybrid in RTVT would again increase numbers entering if that's favourable.
- d. Handicap scheme could work here, applied to power, capabilities, tyres etc. Competition needs to be on a more level playing field without multiple classes.
- e. Allowing 100" Tomcat style cars to compete would make putting on events more viable for clubs as it would open up ALRC events to lots of people. To the layman they would not know the difference as long as the silhouette did not alter.
- f. I see this as a good idea but it will need careful control with perhaps the approach and departure angles / overhangs to be less than that on a 90.
- g. A wide range of classification would encourage more members - ? open class.
- h. No.
- i. No.
- j. ALRC need to consider 100inch CCV vehicles to comply with the latest DVLA rules around modified chassis and vehicle I/D.
- k. Not sure, the trouble is if the ALRC start to allow too many modification, changes from 'standard or modified standard then those who can afford it will throw money at their

vehicles to be competitive. This is specifically what the ALRC have tried to stay clear of, isn't it? I believe we should retain the wheelbase/body shape factory specifications. If a 100 inch vehicle is to compete, then it should have the body on it that it was built with.

- I. We should either go down the 'STANDARD' route as previously stated or allow more modifications to assist with the changing road rules. – However – be aware that we are all concerned about the severity of trials, so should we allow more aggressive mods to make 100" more competitive, then we do nothing about the severity of competitions! Stick to STANDARD and the sections then need to be more compliant for the bodywork of the standard vehicles – which are in different classes.

**Look to the MSA for this – many other motor sport events allow mods but many are not road legal!**

- m. Yes, this the only way to keep comp safaris alive within the ALRC. As long as components are Land Rover as per current regs it should be fine. A 100" Tomcat is more Land Rover than a 80" Tomcat.
- n. There should be a move towards the use of standard vehicles in CCVTs. These events should be seen as a more demanding type of RTVT – not events for modified/built vehicles.
- o. We are not the AWDC. We need to keep to Land Rover wheelbases and silhouettes. 100" vehicles exist as Range Rover and Discovery.
- p. This goes against the previous principle that further deviations from Land Rover standard specs would not be allowed (I forget the year it started, but this was the principle applied when the ARC changed the basis of vehicle regs from listing what's banned to listing what's allowed). That said, with so few newly-built "special" vehicles using Land Rover panels, it may do no harm to review the wheelbase tolerances so that longer wheelbases are acceptable in each class (e.g. a 100" vehicle with other dimensions like a Series One could be class 10).
- q. Anything that increases the number of people able to compete is a good thing. The silhouette requirements should be relaxed but kept as a guide to the overall shape. For example, bikini tops on Series vehicles should be allowed. 100" vehicles should definitely be allowed to compete in the LWB category.
- r. I have recently heard that new EU regulation requiring all vehicles to only use original factory parts, this will make not only our competition vehicles ineligible but many members daily road transport as well. I hope ALRC will fight this tooth and nail! The silhouette rules in many cases are just plain daft ( See 2.1.q). E.g. Only a few 88" Series I were made, they were a halfway between 86" and Series II but there are a great many competing.
- s. No, this will open a can of worms.
- t. We still need to keep to the Land Rover silhouette or we become the same as any other off road club / organization. It is still possible to build vehicles which are road legal and competitive.
- u. Members view – Yes but within strict silhouette limits. We believe could help encourage new members with mildly modified vehicles.
- v. Agree to above, need to amend vehicles to stop 'grey' vehicles such as historic registered 90 for example

### **2.3 Should the vehicle regulations become more specific? Should certain specific vehicle builds be specified, e.g. 80" coil sprung vehicle?**

- a. Aren't they already? They are just built to the minimum requirements given now.
- b. No. We feel the current rules are adequate in this respect. They allow for a certain amount of 'flair' by the vehicle builder without giving them total free reign to be overly exotic and extreme.
- c. If we were more specific new club members would understand and potentially it would raise the profile of our events because "the class system" means nothing to general Land Rover owners.
- d. Maybe simplify the regulations to encourage 1: Safety, 2: Practicality, 3: Sustainability,



#### 4: Affordability.

- e. I see no benefit of this and in fact could easily push people away from the clubs – ensure that basic rules are in place and reduce the opportunity for significant advantage like the use of hand brakes to effectively reduce the length of the vehicle and creating a tighter turning circle. We should not reduce the opportunity for people to experiment with their own ideas as long as they maintain the foot print of the intended model.
- f. Already covered in classes, no change needed.
- g. Aren't these class 9 vehicles?
- h. Unsure about what you are aiming to achieve.
- i. Probably a good thing, however additional consideration will also be necessary to ensure smaller clubs with limited members can amalgamate classes
- j. I guess this is aimed at allowing 80" coil sprung trials only? I.E. this is not allowed to compete in other disciplines and the full spec of the vehicle is specified.
- k. Amalgamations are the only way here – once you start on specifics you will only be able to keep adding more specifics either to a vehicle or more vehicles.

#### **The more specific you go – the more difficult it is to scrutineer**

- l. I can't see the point. The specs and regs are already there. It's the personal customisation that adds to the competition.
- m. 2.3 One-model only trials would result in competition based on drivers' skill rather than on their vehicles' capability. (See comment under 2.1.m.)
- n. Ok as is.
- o. No need for this.
- p. Yes. It needs to be clearly stated both what members can and can't do to modify their vehicles. This will allow drivers to undertake modifications in a fully informed manner.
- q. I think we have too many classes now. I can't quite see what you are getting at with this one. Why have we changed the green book to say something along the lines "Standard motors less than 84"" then in brackets "Only applies to 80s". Why complicate something for the sake of it?
- r. No, the green book needs to be brought up to date (re-written so it can be better understood).
- s. We have enough regs and don't need any more.
- t. Members view – no change requires.
- u. Allow more modifications in RTV class but keep within spirit of road going vehicle. Modifications allowed by MSA but excluded by ALRC SR's should be allowed (dislocation cones, lift kits etc.)

### **3.0 Any other suggestions?**

- a. Raise the profile of the ALRC.
- b. There has to be a limit on aggressive tyres in competition. Land is hard to find and unnecessary damage loses it for good. Grass roots club motorsport needs to be sustainable and have good public relations.
- c. The current push for more and more efficient vehicles means that people look at all sorts of engines for the vehicles. I suggest that a class is added to each category of event to enable people to compete with a non-standard / Land Rover engine (as defined in the current rules). Land Rover themselves have used a number of different engines dependant on the market. For instance a Discovery 3 had a 4ltr V6 in the US and Defender got a 2.8i6 in SA. This trend is likely to continue to expand into the enthusiast market place as people look for more efficient engines to power their pride and joy. I feel that one class to accommodate vehicles with non-standard engines would enable more people to enjoy our events and not compromise the current classifications. This should not be extended to non-standard traction aids like locking diffs however because these types of changes give significant competitive advantage and could lead to events getting more aggressive.

In other areas of motorsport 14 year olds are able to compete in aggressive and challenging events like circuit racing. Would it not be a good idea to enable people of 14 and older to do such events as RTVT and CCVT. This may require them to hold a permit that shows that they have a level of competence behind the wheel.

- d. Push Tyro harder. Keep the National Rally at its current level of severity. Penalise clubs for roll overs in RTVT's that should never happen.
- e. Minor body work modifications to long wheel base vehicles for RTV trials should not alone make the vehicle a modified vehicle.

Consideration should be given to separating vehicle with lifted springs over standard as these modifications give drivers significant advantage over standard height.

Ride height provides significantly more of an advantage that cutting the body work between the rear wheel and the bumper to prevent further panel damage higher up the vehicle.

- f. The rules need simplifying so that they can be understood better, some of the wording is so difficult to understand, no wonder people don't bother, a simple rule seems to be written in such a complicated manner and can be interpreted in more than one way, causing confusion.

What is defined as 'a modified vehicle in the RTV trials needs to be revisited. Just because a Disco has had its rear wheel arch slightly reshaped to avoid damaging it if it's got bigger tyres, doesn't make it modified. It's the bigger tyres or the suspension lift or the oversized coil springs and shocker fitted that makes it modified. You may have two Discos with the same uprated suspension one has chopped its rear arches to avoid damage and the other has left the arches intact and has bent arches due to the wheels touching. Yet the Disco which is bending its arches with each articulation is classed as Standard and the Disco with cut arches is modified – stupid rule. The ALRC needs to look at the non-standard suspension before the cutting of a wheel arch when deciding if it's modified or not.

Shunts in the LWB classes are being exploited. Shunting back because they've failed to negotiate the route is not a reason to shunt. A shunt should only be allowed if one front wheel is between the gate. Wasn't a shunt allowed if a driver is negotiating a gate? If so, then they should be in the gate or at least within a foot of a cane to shunt. Many drivers purposely drive passed the canes, not even attempting the gate to gain an even bigger advantage then shunt back.

How do we ensure that' adult passenger/navigators who sit with 12 year old Tyro drivers are themselves experienced off-road drivers? An adult who has never driven off-road should not be allowed to sit with a youngster. But how do we 'police' this. Asking the question may get a negative response, 'how dare we challenge their capability. Someone who is not experienced navigating would have no idea how to ensure that child drives off-road safely, we all know it has no relation to on-road driving.' I have seen this happen at Tyros which are taking place when another event is on say an RTV or CCV. Dad goes off & does his event & leaves Mum & kids to have a go at the Tyro in the family disco, but Mum has never driven off-road herself.

I think the ALRC should introduce a day membership for passengers only. So if someone turns up & is expressing an interest in joining the club, but maybe is unsure, They could pay a day fee, sign –on like any other club member & passenger only. This may encourage more to join, once they have experienced the trial without having to go to the expensive of a full years membership. I **don't** believe a day membership should be introduced for drivers as this will reduce clubs income. Clubs need the yearly membership fee to pay for land for events, as the trial fees alone does not cover the rising costs.

- g. Main principles to consider:-
  - 1) Grass Roots – minimum costs – includes ease of prep and travel to/from events.
  - 2) More mods = more costs.
  - 3) Most potential members have standard vehicles.

The reason we do not see Disco 3's at trials is because they cannot get through tight gates – they have great off-road abilities as standard vehicles and will probably outperform Classic RR etc. given the room in the section.

- h. Throughout most ALRC clubs in the UK the severity of RTVT events as the vehicles have become more capable and tyres more aggressive in some clubs it is not uncommon to have a roll in an RTVT. This is very dangerous without a cage. I feel the tyre restrictions should be introduced on RTVT events to limit what you are asking drivers to attempt. The events would remain challenging but not dangerous. I would suggest a 5 year fade out of tyres. That way anyone who has just purchased nobbley tyres won't be penalised.
- i. The ALRC should move towards the use of 'standard class' vehicles as was the intention of the original 'building for the future' policy document. Modified class vehicles should not be allowed to enter TYROs or RTVTs as this results in the sections being more demanding to cater for modified class vehicle drivers.
- j. Regulations regarding clearance between head and roll cage should also apply to the side bars as on some vehicles the driver has to duck under them to see out. This tends to suggest there would not be much protection in a roll.
- k. I would like to see more timed trial events.

I also think there is an opportunity for a new format of Team Recovery, which does not rely on timing to determine the winners. This could be safer (no need to clip a seatbelt in against the clock), reduce the costs and make it more accessible. It could perhaps be judged on the number of times the towrope goes tight, or the number of changes of direction made by the cars – so the team with the best technique wins.

Finally, in CCVT, as a fairly competent (sometimes!) class 10 driver I am frequently frustrated by the habit many C-o-C's have of unnecessarily including tight turns which can only be done in a class 9 vehicle. This routinely happens from club level up to and including Nationals and Majors. It's OK if the obstacle involves using the ground or the right line beforehand to make the turn (e.g. tree-hooking, using a bank, deliberately breaking traction etc.) but frequently this is not so.

- l. In order to increase the number of club members involved in trial events, it should be permitted for prospective trailers who are current members to use non-compliant vehicles on events covered by a promotional permit. This will encourage them to take up the sport with compliant vehicles. They are unlikely to change vehicles or make modifications to ensure it is ALRC compliant if they end up not enjoying the sport.

We are concerned that the main ALRC committee is not making decisions for the good of all its members and are instead making them to suit their own agenda. For example, the issue regarding dislocation cones. The majority of ALRC clubs when consulted on the matter voted to allow dislocation cones and this was then approved by the ALRC scrutineering committee. However, the main ALRC committee then blocked the motion. This clearly shows a disregard of the members views.

- m. As I've said before (1.1.s, 1.2.r, 1.3.r, 2.1.q, 2.2,r,2,3,q) our big stumbling block is the sheer complexity of our regulations.

I've been competing in one or two ORC events of late. Many of their members are ex-ALRC. Why have they left ALRC and joined an ORC? The overwhelming answer is because of the complexity and nit picking regulations. Since I've been involved with Land Rover motorsport for 40 years I've evolved with the rules and thus can follow where it's all come from. Someone new to the game would have a lot more problem, and they have a point.

As an example, a fellow in Shropshire ORC Comps a bobtailed Range Rover. If it was ALRC he would have to make it into an 88" Series I, why? Body shape means nothing to speed events and his is a lot more Land Rover parts than one with fabricated body, wings etc.

Standard motors do need to look like what they are but modified class, so long as they are constructed from Land Rover components do not. Many people make a big issue about

non-standard motors gaining advantage in trials, don't mark out tight sections and any advantage is negated.

I've not managed to win a SORC event but not been last either and this is competing against big V8's of all shapes and sizes, with and without fiddle brakes etc. so the advantages are more psychological than actual.

- n. Do not take so long to change the rules. Once voted on there should be no going back.
- o. We need to find ways of getting a younger membership. We need to be open to change but not change for change sake, embrace the young with their gizmos and channel their energy, keep them on the straight and narrow within the club.
- p. Older club members not very open to any form of changes, but any way of increasing membership should be looked at in times when membership numbers are falling.
- q. Promote more use of cheap entry level vehicles (older Freelanders) to attract new members.

Discourage purchase of vehicles for individual events with intention of destroying if needed to win.