



Special Meeting Minutes

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

May 30, 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 8:01

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: Were all here. We got 25 out of the 46 done last week. Let's get the other easy ones done and see how many we can knock out. Page 7. The petition to ban certain batteries. Does anybody know much about battery technology?

JE: I don't know much, but have we had a problem with this? I'm not aware of one, but maybe Phil knows.

PM: What's going to happen if one of these catches on fire? We just don't know. I don't have enough technical knowledge if one does. Will they explode like a sealed battery?

JE: I think I may have one in the Miata and I think a whole bunch of people run them. I'll have to look when I get home. I don't know if we are addressing a problem that just doesn't exist. It could cost our racers some money if they have to buy a new battery.

BM: We run a Lithium ion battery. Anti Gravity is the manufacturer and they are pretty common in the racing community. I don't know which is which as far as the LifePO4 or Lithium Ion.

MC: If there is significant concern we should be proactive. Like an airbag in your car. If it hasn't happened yet the manufacturer brings your car in to make sure it doesn't happen.

JE: How did the membership weigh in on this petition?

MC: Eight in favor, eleven against. There are a couple of these that are basically 50/50 which means the members may not care or they don't know, and it falls to us to make a decision.

BM: Looks like the Life PO4 are primarily for the hobby market.

MC: Yes, I use them in my RC cars and they get hot. We charge them in metal cases to prevent a failure which is common. I can do some research and get some info to you all tomorrow, so we can make an informed decision.

PM: If you get a chance see if there is a material safety data sheet on them.

BM: I can't even find a 12volt car battery sized one so maybe folks are adapting hobby sized ones to use in our series.

MC: OK, tabled for more research.

PM: We might want to consider making it mandatory that they be mounted in a metal box.

MC: Let's talk about the P11 automatic transmission petition. Says the auto transmission points reduction is unclear and is asking the VPI table state that all cars are manual. The point value should represent the manual version of the car.

PM: There are cars that run with us that only came as an automatic.

BM: So, does the VPI reflect a reduced value on these or do they get to claim the 75-point reduction?

MC: Every value we put on there represents a manual version which is why every car that shows up with a factory automatic they get a 75-point credit.

TA: Even if the automatic was the only available transmission?

MC: Correct. It's a lot more work for us to break out those cars on the list and the note at the top of the page would not hold true because if we listed them the value would already reflect that. So, if you have a car like that, say an 85 Monte Carlo that only came with an automatic and you put a manual in it you are going to be 25 points over the listed value. The petition I think is asking that the swap should be listed as zero points. Comments?

PM: What transmissions are we going to allow them to run for zero points?

MC: I think we already have a rule about that? Is there an advantage in there? Are we going to allow a T5, T10, T56 in your car for free?

PM: We valued them pretty low because we know they are automatics if I remember correctly. There is not that many cars where it even comes into play.

MC: Correct. And the newer the car the less of a disadvantage it is as we have seen in the Infiniti team. They have podiumed several times. So, are we going to say "no" to this one and leave it as it is?

PM: That would be my vote. It's only talking about a few cars and I don't want to change the rules for one or two cars.

MC: I'm OK with that

DW, JE, BM, TA: Agreed

MC: OK, moving on. Page 12 Swap formula 50-point penalty. The formula kicks out some weird things. You swap in a lower HP engine and you get a 346 point add on to your base number, but you reduced your horsepower. It's not an error but the formula does not handle negative values at all. What Phil and I have done is told people to just take a flat 50 points because you did swap for a reason. You lightened the engine, made it more reliable, more fuel efficient. Whatever the reason it's 50 points. The petition wants this put into print.

TA: So, let me clarify. If you swap to lower horsepower it's just 50 points.

MC: Correct.

JE: So, on the corrected verbiage it will read all reductions in swapped horsepower will be 50 points. Shouldn't it say "minimum".

MC: So, the thing is if you reduce the hp by even 3 the formula kicks out something like 150 points. If you reduce it by 20 horsepower it kicks back like 600 points. The formula just doesn't handle negative numbers so the minimum word would carry no weight.

JE: I like it that if you reduce your horsepower it's just 50 points. I think that's fine...

PM: As long as you do not exceed the \$1500 limit.

MC: There is that. At Watkins Glen a team said something that set off some alarm bells in my head of a potential loophole. Don't get any ideas here you car builders...It's probably not an issue but we need to need to make sure that there is not a car on there that is improperly valued that would allow somebody to exploit this small loophole.

JE: Are there any cars that have this kind of engine where this would be a problem?

MC: It just jumped out at me that there could be a car out there because we valued the car out there incorrectly. We can take a look at the VPI list this Summer and make sure we didn't miss anything. Is everybody OK with making this a rule?

JE, TA, PM, BM: Yes

MC: OK...page 14 This is about the swap horsepower calculation. They would like a standard chart of engine horsepower like we have standard chassis weights. That way nobody can find a strange number to have an advantage over their competitors.

DW: I like that idea.

TA: Don't we need that as a reference if we are going to do dyno pulls?

MC: It could help. I had to go pull some numbers at Daytona because I knew who we would test. I gave it to Phil at tech so he had it. We had it at the flywheel, but still have to reduce it for driveline loss to get it closer to what the dyno would say. It could be a benefit to us and be more transparent to the members.

TA: So, it sounds good, but who is going to do it. Sounds like a lot of work...

JE: How many variations are out there?

BM: Isn't this already in the database?

MC: No, it is not. Phil, remember doing this about a year and a half ago?

PM: Yeah, I remember. I remember how many people it took to do it too!

MC: There were like 7 or 8 of us. Over the holiday...Christmas to New Years. We worked for days.

PM: Seemed like weeks! And when you start doing that, what source do you use? On Wikipedia how accurate is it?

TA: And then you have to put a variation like 3-5 percent? Different dynos have different pulls.

JE: We are talking about stated numbers, not dyno pulls. What I is saying is that Wiki is not a reliable source. I know on the Ecotec in my car there is literally 7 or 8 numbers. It depends on the year and the model the engine came out of. It's all the same engine so which one do you use?

TA: So, what do we use? Something in the 10 % range?

JE: So, look, ECUs are open and a lot of us claim cams, induction, and headers so of what value is the horsepower number?

MC: Everything changes in a hurry.

TA: Yep, there are a lot of variables.

MC: So, if we say “no” is our response to the members “no” because it’s a lot of work and we don’t want to do it or is it no because (inaudible).

PM: You are still going to have to contact tech and we are going to have to give you those numbers for the swap. When the teams don’t give me the numbers I have to do the research, figure out what number I give them to be fair to them. Sometimes they give you wrong numbers just to test you to see if you know what you are doing. Its aggravating.

TA: So, when we do these we keep records so the next team that sends in one that’s the same swap they get the same return. We could publicize that.

MC: It brings up a point AI would like to talk about for 2019 and I have talked to Phil about it. To build a database of preapproved swaps that we see most commonly. We could publish in the rule book, so a new team can build that combo and we would know what it is.

BM: On a swap, if I want to build a Corvair and put a Camaro engine in it, isn’t it incumbent on me to provide the documentation to Phil that justifies what I am doing? I think the burden should be on the person doing the swap and not on ChampCar.

TA: But you are going to provide the most advantageous documentation...

BM; Well, if it’s real, it’s real.

PM: What we are doing now with the tech sheets is we are pdf into a file. Could we create a pdf file on the webpage: Here are the swaps that have been done and here are the calculations and publish any swaps that have been done. Next year when they tech it has to be done again...it starts all over.

MC: It can be easily done. We have their swap sheets and we can publicize the numbers they used. Someone can look at it and claim that’s BS, that engine puts out this much power. It might create some arguments among the members, but at least it is not our fault.

PM: If one of those car podiums they are going to look at them anyway.

MC: We have seen this issue. I have talked to teams. They change the ECU for the application. That’s why it’s hard to create a database for that engine. We should just post up what they are claiming.

PM: We post up what they are claiming, and someone wants to question that, they can submit more data and we will look at it. We have so many cars and so many configurations and so many creative teams out there that its hard to write it into the rules. What’s great about it is that it allows teams so much creativity and we have to allow them to continue to let them do that.

TA: The creativity is self-policing too. When you publish it.

MC: They will still send me emails.

JE: Here’s an example: My Ecotec is rated all over the board. I have the Edmunds paper to support my claimed HP. It could create a can of worms, but I don’t care if you use my research. Go ahead.

MC: Well...and we know your number is off because you flashed the ECU, took off the air compressor, removed the catalytic so we know your number is off anyway. It’s going to make more horsepower so it’s kind of a moot point now anyway. Bottom line #14. What are we gonna do about this? Are we going to say “no” because there are too many variations, we have a different idea...is that what we are talking about?

BM: I think it’s “no” because members need to present their horsepower for the swap.

PM: I agree with that.

MC: I agree.

JE: I agree with that too.

TA DW: Agreed.

MC: OK. Let's move on. Page 16. Parts modification not all listed. This is a proposal for a litmus test of sorts to see if your modifications should cost points.

PM: The way I would like to answer this is "no", we aren't going to put this in the rules, but it could be published as a guideline for teams to follow.

MC: 100% agree. I think it's a great idea for people to say "use this if you are wondering what's going to happen, but its not a rule book item.

TA: A guideline.

JE: I wrote that we cannot anticipate every possible scenario, so I would say no.

MC I will say no as well but publish a note saying that we will keep this in mind as to their modifications and if they justify adding points when we make decisions.

TA BM DW: Agreed.

MC: Alright Page 17. This petition was revoked by the person that made it although my name is on it as they wished to remain anonymous. It created a fervor on the Forum. I don't know if we should revoke it as well and just say no.

DW: A fervor on the Forum? Say it isn't so!!! That couldn't possibly happen.

TA: The Forum reads like a soap opera...

MC: It looks like it was overwhelmingly popular, but I know Bruce and I talked about this at Sonoma and he had some good points.

TA: The member that submitted it withdrew it?

MC: Technically my name is on it and I submitted it but wished to remain anonymous, so I put it in there. It's not my idea.

TA: So, you can withdraw it.

MC: I suppose I could.

PM: Some of the things they have to change, like the intake so the hood will fit on the car. I don't want to say they can't do that. Because a lot of the cars that are currently running with us would have to be changed to meet this rule. It would freak people out.

MC: I'll mark it down as no.

TA, BM, JE: Agreed.

MC: Moving on to page 27 and this ties into page 29 as well. Page 27 allows non-championship contenders to avoid Park Ferme and work on their cars.

TA: I saw the note that says it might be a scoring nightmare.

MC: It is. And they tie in together. In order to do a race within a race, to do it properly I have to run a separate second decoder running side by side with the primary decoder, running two races. We are then shipping more things around the country. It puts a stress on us when 2 races are going on in a weekend.

JE: If it's a 24-hour race, it's a 24-hour race. And how many park ferme races do we have now? Just the one, right? Seems crazy to change the rules for one race.

TA: it would be nice for teams that aren't ready for a 24-hour race, but it stretches our resources.

MC: A team came up to me at Watkins Glen and asked if they HAD to run the full 24 hours at Nelson Ledges. I said no. We have teams that drive until nightfall, retire and grill some steaks, party at their hotel, and come back in the morning with a mild hangover and race the rest of the day. They said, "that's awesome" and signed up.

JE: They may finish in 45th, but who cares.

MC: To some extent, this becomes our choice. Maybe one day we might want to run a race within a race.

TA: I think it should remain an option, but not a rule.

PM: We could put it in the supplementals for that race.

MC: OK, I will put a no on each.

JE BM DW: Agreed.

MC: On to page 33. Roll bar padding SFI mandatory. Currently it just says you have to have roll bar padding. We highly recommend the SFI padding. (inaudible) Some teams run pool noodle style padding.

TA: What happens to that padding in a fire?

DW: GRRR...Nobody is running pool noodles! What we are running is the Pegasus colored padding. No, it's not SFI rated but we fire retardant ours and it's cut like regular roll bar padding, thinner on one side, thicker on the other so you can tuck it in where your roll bar is closer to the chassis. Not that half the cars have their cages tucked that close to their bodies anyway.

MC: Well, you were the only no vote, so I expected you to have an explanation. You are kind of passionate about this subject.

DW: I just don't think it's an issue. I can hit it with a hammer and not get close to the roll bar.

TA: What's the price difference?

MC: Significant. And when I built my car I used the stuff Doc uses. The SFI padding is stupid expensive.

PM: Let me ask you this Doc. You race a lot...When you have your Hans device on and you are strapped in, what bars can you possibly reach with your helmet? Which one could it touch?

DW: Just the top of the door because I don't have a containment seat.

BM: That's where we have our SFI padding. It's \$4.99 for the standard padding and \$16.95 for SFI, almost 3 ½ times the cost.

MC: So, am I hearing that where ever your head can touch be SFI and your knees, arms can hit be non SFI?

DW: I'm OK with that.

TA: BM: I am too.

PM: That's what the petition reads, and we need to beef up that rule to read anywhere a driver's feet' arms, legs can come into contact with the roll bar needs to have padding. Its not in the rules now.

MC: Yeah, look at that. It does say that anywhere a driver's helmet can touch needs to have SFI padding. We can add that anywhere any part of the body can touch a roll bar needs to have padding.

TA: I like that.

JE: I like that too. I'm looking at my Miata and it has SFI padding where the helmet can hit, just soft stuff everywhere else.

PM: If you look at where dash bars are, when you ask a guy what's the worse case scenario when you are knocked out and your legs are flopping around, what's going to happen to them.

DW: When you hit a non-padded bar with your ankles it's going to HURT.

PM MC: It does!

JE: Bill Strong got a hellua concussion and messed up using not that good a padding at VIR.

MC: He's still messed up.

BM JE DW PM TA: ALL LAUGHING

MC: I guess that's a yes then the way he wrote it.

PM: Make a note on there to beef up the rule.

TA: SFI where the helmet can touch. Padding anywhere the body parts can contact the bars.

JE BM DW: Yep

MC: Alright. The next one is 34, Tech sheets versus log books. It's been a nightmare since it was posted out of the clear blue sky. Issue is tech sheets have never been available until recently. Even now its hit or miss depending on who is working the event and gets them into the Google cloud. Sometimes the printer is not working. We don't always have a given tech sheet but per the rules we always have a log book at impound. This petition was to require log books and not tech sheets at impound. Didn't you submit this one Phil?

PM: Tech sheets are not always available. I don't even want to discuss it anymore. I want log books, not tech sheets.

MC: The tech sheet is a workbook when you get your annual sticker and that becomes the standard at every event. There is no reason for anyone to think that a tech sheet is more valuable or more accurate than a log book.

TA: People want to see what added up to what. They want to see how that math worked out.

MC: Every item on the tech sheet goes into the log book so they match. Furthermore, the log book shows the history of the vehicle and you can see what changes they made, adding or moving components that the tech sheet does not reflect over time.

JE: Yeah, I never understood the fascination over the tech sheet. The log book should be just fine, and everybody has theirs there too.

MC: Phil's made his case. I'm with him. Log books instead of tech sheets.

JE BM TA DW: Agreed

MC: We can now do any easy one. Page 44 Class winners at impound. I talked to Jerry and we tried it at Watkins Glen and 2 minutes into impound we had a protest from the 39th place team. (inaudible) Lovely. Other than that, it worked fine: we had more cars, more people, and more beer. I don't think it made any more work for tech. Members liked this petition 15-3. I'm fine with it, too.

TA: Sure, if you get a trophy maybe there should be more scrutinizing.

JE: I think that because we did have a protest, that means it's working.

DW: Even if you are not a part of impound, doesn't mean you can't protest, right?

MC: I'll have to look at that.

TA: Well, they are not at impound for the big money.

MC: OK, we will go yes on this one.

JE BM TA DW: Agree that is fine to say yes too.

PM: What about EC cars? Do we want them impounded as well?

MC: We don't have them jack up the cars, remove wheels. They are there just to receive some recognition because they did something successful... (inaudible) Let's do more before the night is over. 2 petitions, one on Page 32 and one on page 6. I wanted Rich here for this but...Both pertain to fueling. Page 32 has to do with fueling by funnel, page 6 about allowing dry breaks. I consider them tied together. Jay, Ray, and I talked about this on pit road this past weekend watching teams refuel. Curious about your thoughts...

DW: Personally, I'm against fueling with a funnel. There's more surface area, therefore more fumes. I've seen some ridiculous size funnels that can hold ½ a gallon or more and that's more than you would ever spill using a hose. I'm against dry breaks as well

TA: Yeah, when you are pitting next to a team using one of those HUGE funnels you can see the fumes coming off the surface are huge as well.

MC: Jay and I saw one of those funnels that held a gallon or more and you could see the fumes and Jay was kind of freaked out about it. It got me thinking about this petition. We are safety conscious

everywhere else, why are we allowing open fuel outside the car. When the car is full where is this fuel going to go when they pull the funnel out? The ground or the drip pan...

TA: You have these fumes going everywhere, a hot car...

DW: It's a lot more surface area of fuel.

MC: How do the fill dirt cars Phil?

PM: It's done in your pits and the races aren't that long where it's an issue.

MC: So, this is an endurance racing thing.

PM: It is, it's only for that. Before next year I want to address...I went to Bill Riley's shops and looked at a car and him and I and his shop manager talked about the fact that we don't have any rules about how you attach and what you connect to a SFI rated fuel cell to a filler neck or what you can do. There are no rules here other than the size. We need to beef that up and I am "for" you cannot fuel with a funnel. We have a whole lot of teams that have all sorts of stuff in their cars, funnels even built into their cars.

MC: Jay and Ray would like to get on a conference call with you Phil when you are feeling better to discuss fuel cells. They have a lot of strong opinions many of which you have expressed and you as the tech team can put it on paper.

PM: I looked at one car and they had the filler neck attached to the fuel cell with a radiator clamp and I was like, "Do you feel comfortable with that like that?" He said, "I never even thought of it that way." I thought we might need to beef that whole rule up, with it like has to be a 2" wide stainless band clamp. We need to specify the connection rules up. There is one car that is a prime example. He says its, so the car can be fueled from the other side, having a 6' hose, but that's BS. He did it to increase the fuel capacity.

MC: So., if we vote and take away funnel filling, members, guess what, we voted, and you can't use a funnel anymore so at that moment the only way to fuel would to use a hose into the tank that still has some disadvantages and it takes us to the dry break petition. Everybody when they think of dry breaks thinks of NASCAR and that's not what we want to see, but there are dry breaks made for the Hunsaker and other types of gas cans that are going to deliver less fuel than an open hose, but they have minimum spillage and less fumes while you are fueling.

PM: A lot of folks voted no to dry breaks because they are kind of expensive.

MC: I've looked them up Some in the \$200-#300 range but you can get the Hunsaker ones for their jugs and they are like \$150 which for sure is a cost but its optional. I don't think you are going to have an advantage over someone else because they do flow less gallons per minute than an open hose does. Some of these teams that do the research, modify their filler necks are dumping 5 gallons in 11 seconds. No dry break can touch that. Ingenuity will always (inaudible)

JE: Mike I respectfully completely disagree with you. NASCAR teams are doing complete pit stops in 12 seconds and they are putting in a crap load of fuel into that car. People that are saying no to this petition are thinking about IRL systems that pump 30-40 gallons into the car in like 6 seconds. There are systems that can do that, maybe not the ones you looked at, but if you don't think teams that have the financial resources to do that wouldn't do that...

MC: Don't get me wrong; I 100% agree with you. I think if we would approve this, we would have to approve a specific dry break. One that we would think is acceptable and nothing else you could come up with. That's what I'm getting at.

TA: Nobody needs to show up with a NASCAR system and piss everybody off.

JE: That just sounds like lengthening the rule book for no good reason. I vote no.

DW: I agree with Jerry.

TA: Agree, keep it simple.

MC: I'm ok with a "no"

JE: As far as the funnels go, I'm not so sure, but I will yield to Phil's opinion. I think he knows more about it than I do...

PM: I'm OK with getting rid of funnels. Never have liked them. We have amateurs out there and there is less of a chance of spillage with a hose.

MC: Hoses are a much better choice and you can get faster fueling that is clean with a hose. Just get on the Forum, ask some questions, and plenty of people will help you out. So, for right now it is no to dry breaks and yes to banning funnels.

BM TA JE: Agreed

MC: So...it's 9 o'clock and an hour is enough for one night. We have 8 left. We need to meet one more time before NCM.

DW: Then we better meet next Wednesday then!!!

JE: Yep, we are running out of time. I can go longer tonight.

MC: Well, its earlier for you since you are not on the East Coast...

JE: True.

MC: I'll get the research done on the batteries, send it out, and we can meet again next Wednesday.

DW: We do need to get this all compiled and typed up for the annual meeting.

MC: Yeah, next Wednesday gives us a full week. OK we will talk next Wednesday, same time.

Meeting adjourned at 9:01



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 30, 2018.

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