



Special Meeting Minutes

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CHUMPCAR INTERNATIONAL INCORPORATED, A Mutual Benefit Organization, 501(c)(7)

May 16, 2018 8:00PM EST

Present:

Mike Chisek (MC)

Doc Waldrop (DW)

Phil McKinney (PM)

Jerry Enger (JE)

Bruce Mills (BM)

Tiffany Alexander (TA)

Excused Absence: Rich Sainato

Called to Order 8:02

A quorum has been met for the purpose of this meeting which is to discuss member submitted petitions.

As a quorum was present, other Club business may be discussed and was not objected to.

MC: Purpose tonight is to discuss petitions submitted by members. You have a compilation of the petitions with the member input and our own votes on the matters put forth compiled by Bruce so let's get to it. I did not respond Yes or No on some of them because I am open to your ideas and I think they need to be discussed further.

We have 6 items that we are all in agreement on.

The members were split in half on #10.

MC: #10 JDM Engines: Yes, allowed.

#21 Driver Exit timed: No. The members were overwhelmingly opposed to. Dan has requested a demo of one member at tech. She was thankful he did in the end and she passed. I think Tech should reserve this right on a case by case basis as needed.

#31 Driver Licensing: No. Members were also unanimous.

#35 Rules Infractions: Yes. Most members agreed this needs to be done. The team will have to be re-teched every race.

#37 Rear Diffuser: Yes.

PM: The rules will be clarified to read: Rear wheels to the rear of the car is considered the rear diffuser area. The front wheels to the front of the car is the splitter area. Between the wheels will be considered a separate area as the underbody of the car. Any modification of these areas will be considered separately as 10 points apiece.

MC: #40 Ban Aero devices: No. Members were mostly opposed to making a rule banning aero.

We have 5 items that I consider "race procedures" and we are all in agreement that they should not be included in the BCCR: #2, 9, 18, 19, and 20. There are some good ideas by the members, some of which we are already doing, but I don't think they should be considered rules. The Race Director needs to have some discretion as to the conduct of the race. For instance, I am going to allow Championship contending cars to grid first at NCM. Some of these are in violation of individual track rules so we cannot go against those. The members were split on several of these as was the board.

JE: Will they be included in the race operations manual?

MC: Yes, they will be, but this manual will never be made public as it contains propriety information about how we run CCES. This manual is literally how we do business.

TA: What about wave-by during yellow flags for a slow, obviously crippled car?

MC: This will still be at the discretion of the race director. We can generally tell when this happens. When a corner worker calls in 10 cars for PUY we can tell a car is causing this by a simple review of the incident and where it took place on the course. We continue to ask our drivers to limp back to the pits staying well clear of the racing line.

PM: What if we instituted a "Purple Flag" like VIR at all our races?

MC: That might be a good idea. It works well at VIR.

PM: There are some logistics to work out with the individual tracks to explain this. Particularly with the safety crews and emergency workers.

MC: Yes, I will reach out to VIR and see how they handle this and what advice they may give us. Even where they have their flags made. This should be in the ops manual, not in the rule book.

PM: Yes, as there are several tracks that do not allow safety teams out on the track unless there is an actual pace car, pacing the field.

MC: There are several petitions regarding limiting octane allowed in the cars. #5 & 25. The members want a limit on octane, but are there really any tools out there to 100% guarantee with instant results of this kind of testing?

PM: Not that I am aware of and I have seen this at several other series/tracks I have worked at and how they deal with it. The most accurate results are tests of samples mailed in for analysis. This is impracticable for our series where we need results finalized at the track after impounding. If we can't enforce the rule we can't make it a rule.

MC: Agreed, if we can't enforce a rule we just can't make it a rule.

JE: We can see if the members know of a testing method. Query them on the Forum...

PM: With open ECUs you can literally tune an engine to specific octanes/grades of fuel.

JE: Well, the problem is the engines. If you need to run higher octane you have really done something in the engine to require that higher octane. Like upped the compression...

PM: There is nothing in our rules that prohibit you from increasing the compression ratio...

BM: A couple of the members feedback also noted some turbo models need higher octane to prevent damage to the engine.

MC: I think we should ask the members and seek their input. We can't rule on this without more input but will remain open to this idea for future implementation. It is tabled for now.

PM: I'm opposed to posting the request on the Forum. Really, it comes down to the petition as it was submitted: There is not enough information included to make an informed decision.

BM: We really need the members to find a solution for testing that works across the board.

DW: Then they should do the legwork. We are all busy enough dealing with other matters and I, for one, am certainly not qualified to go out and look for a reliable way to do this other than cursory internet searches.

MC: Then we need a new petition that is more detailed as to how we test fuel with reliable results. Tabled, but open for discussion then it is.

There are four petitions that deal with fuel capacity in some way or another. 4 of them. #4, 15, 30, and 41. Members are universally opposed and so is the board on increasing fuel capacity in any way. Any thoughts on these?

PM: As far as ½ gallon or larger surge tanks allowed I am opposed to this. Many teams have the allowed one-quart tanks already allowed under the rules and to open this up to allow larger tanks will simply drive costs up for them.

MC: Agreed, let's keep it simple. The less changes we make to the BCCR, the better.

DW: Really, it's simple: We did not pick your car.

MC: We are in agreement then that all 4 petitions are No votes then.

There are 5 petitions that really all are about reliability vs. performance advantages.

#8 is directly related to this question regarding allowing cars that run in other series to enter our races with no penalties for their added reliability items. Members mostly opposed and we as a board are unanimously opposed.

#22 concerns Accusumps Members shaded to opposed as they are on #23 and #24

#23 Oil Coolers

#24 Aluminum Radiators

#36 Transmission, oil, and differential coolers.

The only one on here that really has any contention among us is aluminum radiators. That's Doc

DW: I can see their points regarding aluminum radiators. OEM parts are indeed hard to find for some of these cars. As long as the capacity and the dimensions are the same I have no problem with passing this. Of course, the number of cores IN the radiator may change, but...

TA: Yeah, on some cars the aluminum radiators can be a third of the cost of an OEM replacement

PM: I'm open to adjusting the points on an aluminum radiator.

JE: Let's adjust the cheap aluminum radiator down to 10 points vs the current 20 points. Is that a reasonable compromise?

PM: I think that is reasonable as long as we cap the replacement limit to the \$300 provision.

DW, TA, JE, BM, MC: Agreed

MC: This issue of is a reliability issue a performance advantage will always come up and it looks like we are all in agreement that it is...

Page #3: Welding shocks to make them nonadjustable in the field. Most members opposed to allowing this and so are we as a board. Any discussion?

PM: No, but I can see us adjusting the points down to allow more cars from other series to compete in ours, but what should the point hit be?

MC: I can see the value lowered as well. Something in the 20-25 points range.

TA: Yes, 75 per corner is simply too high.

PM: I can't see going below 25 points per corner.

MC: Yes, 100 points is a manageable number, certainly vs. 300 points. Adjustable shocks DO make a difference, but not THAT much.

TA: Then let's lower the points to 25 per corner.

PM, DW, JE, BM, MC: Agreed

MC: Seat back braces. #6 Members approve. We were split. Discussion?

PM: Yeah, I need to rewrite this rule as they way it was written years ago is a bit unclear between seats on sliders and fixed seats. It's clear to me, but it can be reworded.

MC: Yeah, I think that's what James Ballenger was getting at.

PM: Yep, I'll work on that just to clarify it further. An explanation would help as to how we see it, fixed vs adjustable seats and the brace.

MC: Page 11, the automatic transmission discount. Members split. Phil opposed.

PM: Yeah, some cars on this list were available ONLY as an automatic and our list does not reflect that. It is a swap if you have one of these cars and change it to a manual. Then you get hit with the 75 points.

MC: So, would we have to go through our list completely and identify those cars, revalue them so there are no double deductions? That will take some time.

BM: Yeah, the member has a point.

MC: We need to clarify that this rule and the value given is already reduced to reflect this car is only available as an automatic.

PM: Yes, you get the 75-point reduction if you are running the automatic transmission.

MC: We should table this one and think how we want this to look like. See what the best solution is.

On to Page 13: Totaled car eliminated from running for the Championship. Members were mostly OK with this. Jerry, you were opposed.

JE: Well, you never build the exact car twice. You are always making improvements. Refining the car.

PM: We have allowed it in the past. What if they totaled it during a track day, or in another series. How can we verify that it was indeed totaled?

MC: Bruce, you have some experience here...

BM: You can indeed strip and rebuild a car in a short timeframe.

MC: So, must it be the same car?

BM: During the year you change things constantly so it's not the same car you qualified anyway so what's the difference? As long as it is the same platform I don't see the big deal.

MC: True, dynamics are changing constantly.

TA: Is this a slippery slope? Can we approve on a case by case basis? As long as it is essentially the same car, sure.

DW: How many cars are affected. One I can think of.

MC: Well, that can change in the future. Do you pass this petition based on how it is written? If they change any major component they must get re-tech'd anyway, so tech will have to approve the car regardless. So, we are split 3-3.

DW: We need Rich here. I am waffling on this one. But I DO understand it is not the same car anyway as you indeed adjust things during the year as you dial in the car.

MC: Then we agree to approve this.

DW, PM, BM, MC, TA: Agreed

MC: Well, that's about enough for tonight. We got 23 out of 46 handled. I will get the results compiled and out to you, but it might be after Watkins Glen.

DW: Yeah, still a lot to discuss and we are running out of time before NCM.

MC: True, can we agree to a call again on May 30th to handle the rest?

DW, PM, TA, JE, BM: Agreed.

MC: Thanks all. Meeting adjourned at 9:02



SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE

I, Richard L. Waldrop, certify the following: I am the Secretary of ChumpCar International, Inc. ("CCII") and this document is an accurate account of this meeting;

FOR THE BOARD, AND IN WITNESS THEREOF, I hereby set my hand this May 16, 2018.

/s/ Richard L. Waldrop
Richard L. Waldrop, Secretary –CCII