



Special Meeting Minutes

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

June 6, 2018, 8:04 PM EST

Present:

Mike Chisek (MC)

Doc Waldrop (DW)

Phil McKinney (PM)

Jerry Enger (JE)

Tiffany Alexander (TA)

Rich Sainato (RS)

Absent:

Bruce Mills (BM)

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: Let's get started. We had one petition we tabled last week to gather some more information and that is page 7 regarding Lithium Ion Batteries. I sent out some data to go over. It seems that most if not all these batteries are not even produced in what you would call a car style/type battery, so I don't know if it's really even an issue, but there does seem to be an increased risk of fire, so I think based on that alone we should pass this petition.

DW, PM, JE, TA, RS: Agreed

MC: So, it's passed with a yes vote. Moving on we get to Page 38 and Page 45 regarding Turbos.

MC: Page 38 deals with turbos must come from the VPI list. The members were split on this issue.

RS: I don't care if your turbo came from the VPI list or from ebay. It's still a turbo. Having an OEM part number on it doesn't really change anything in my view.

MC: There is no detriment to using aftermarket turbo other than it may cost more \$\$\$.

DW: No more rules than we must have. I say no.

PM, JE, TA, RS: Agreed. No.

MC: Page 45 has to do with turbo clarifications. It seeks to increase the points value to over 100 points. Since we are adding turbo models as separate line items in the listings this will not be necessary, so I say no.

JE: I could see it leading to teams leaving the series if it changes significantly.

PM: Seems to me the BCCR rule 2.2.5 could be used that the event director reserves the right to move any competition vehicle to the EC class at any time.

JE: Turbos in our style of racing are going to have reliability issues, use more fuel and as Mike pointed out, the separate VPI listings for turbo cars makes this pointless.

DW: I say no to this one as well.

TA, RS, JE: Agreed...no.

MC: Page 39 This petition has to do with upgrading brakes and adding points for Non-OEM brake packages.

RS: Petition to adding points for brakes I was against as it goes against our already standing 2X rule. Adding this rule did not seem relevant to the series.

MC: By making all brakes 5 points/corner, the cost of brakes would skyrocket. Brakes are also dangerously small on some cars and we want them to stop. Tires still limiting factor on grip. I say no.

JE: Yeah, some older cars are hard to find parts for and the newer model aftermarket calipers last longer. The 2X rule works fine. Maybe we should drop the Wilwood name and just substitute "aftermarket".

PM: Yeah, I think it's a step back from a safety standpoint. Plus, it penalizes certain cars that have poor OEM brakes.

MC: I think we can all agree this is a no to this petition:

DW, RS, TA, JE: Agreed.

MC: Page 26: This petition asks to change classes from a displacement base to a points-based system. I'm willing to bet this is going to be a long discussion.

DW; I was afraid of that. Talk slowly is all I ask.

JE: If you go down pit row almost everybody tells you the are in xxx place in their class, so a lot of people only pay attention to that, not the overall.

TA: Yes, if you go up and down pit road most people will tell you where they are running overall and in class, so I think the members do value the classes regardless of trophy.

DW: I'm all in favor of it, but it will take some careful study.

TA: A group has a bunch of Miatas, is not very comparable to my 80 horsepower Accord that I've only used about 250 points, just agreeing that the current system isn't great. They say, I am running this overall ___ and running this ___ against cars that are equivalent to mine. I mean I had 80 horsepower and I wasn't competitive with those cars.

RS: The Miatas are at 1.8 liters and I have 2.5 liters and they are passing me on the straightaways. I agree with Troy, classing on displacement is just not right. You have a 2.5-liter motor that makes 120 hp and nowadays you have a 2.5-liter motor that makes 240-250 hp

TA: Going by points equalized that.

RS: Going by points does supposedly equalizes that because our entire rulebook is based on points.

MC: Keep in mind our system was founded and based on single class racing. Classes was thought about in our current series, or points-based system value adds, is about handicapping every car from the 80 hp Honda Accord to a 250 hp Mustang so theoretically they can finish the race at the same time.

Reclassifying all our cars on their points is going to jumble up our finishes and would involve remaking ourselves.

RS: I am going to put myself in the shoes of someone who is class racing. Let's say D class is 451 to 500 points and C class is 400 to 450. As an E30 owner, I can now make a choice. Do I want to run for a C ss trophy and just bring a stock E30 to the track, or do I want to run for the overall win in D class, the big boys? I actually have a choice here. I don't care about the class racing, but to Troy's point I have more choices now of who I am racing and how I am spending my money.

MC: Yes, you could go down a class and try and beat up on smaller cars beneath you.

RS: Yes, you can, but to do that you are taking things off your car that allowed you to go after the overall win. Yeah, we would be putting a greater emphasis on class racing that I guess I am OK with. I would be more OK with it under Troy's proposal than I am with it now under our current system. The displacement system is not a good system.

DW JE: I agree with that.

MC: Our displacement system is not a class-based racing system. It is designed to award some more trophies and have additional battles on track, but our uniqueness, and many people have spoken about this in the past, is that we are single class. That's what we focus and that's what we award. No other race organization does it and they have all gone down the rabbit hole that they start breaking up the classes to equalize performance and finishes and pretty soon you have 2 dozen different classes and 3 cars in each class. While the petition has some merit I don't favor it.

RS: I'm still not a fan of classes since it was added, but I feel if we are going to do it, and it seems like we are, then we need to tweak it to make it work. If people are going to watch the class racing, let's make it worth watching. Let's make it make more sense. I'm not saying add more classes. We have 4 now, let's leave it at 4. Under 300 is A, B is 301-400, C is 401 to 450, whatever. Give us some options, but I still think you will see people going for the overall win. We give away at some races, a trophy for EC and that's not even a class. Those are folks not even playing by our rules I don't even know how many of our winners are EC now, but it seems like more and more now every month...

MC: No, we have only had 3 in our entire existence.

RS: Really...then I'm crazy. I'm imagining things...

JE: I'll add in a point on the proposal. You could bring a 1.6 Miata, bone stock, not spend a lot of money on it, put a cage in it and the other required safety gear and now you are racing for something and not spending a lot of money. It might open up things for new racers to come in. As they gain more experience maybe they add aero, do a motor swap, whatever. It might give us a more entry level class. I kinda like it although I initially put down a "no". Engine displacement is so arbitrary, at least this isn't.

RS: I would be all in favor of approving the petition, maybe with a 1-year trial...see what happens.

TA: Would this give people the option of coming over from other series and not have to make major modifications and race their car as is. A lot of le like to race in different series. They then try ours and stick around.

RS: I think it's a better option than what we are doing now.

MC: We could talk about this last at the board meeting in front of the members and get them to contribute and get feedback. We have had some very passionate email that came in on this subject. Probably the largest (inaudible) for the whole series. Not to be taken lightly.

RS: I'm not taking it lightly. What we are doing now is arbitrary.

JE: Yeah, let's discuss it at the meeting next week.

PM: We've been doing it this way for a long time, years.

TA: I'm kinda with Rich; it does make a lot of sense. I don't know if the masses will deal with that change very well.

PM: But there are some cheap cars out there that are very fast. If they are still running for an overall win, what difference does it make? Yes, they are arbitrary by engine size, but at the same time the points system is arbitrary too because we don't assign points based totally on horsepower. We do mainly...

RS: No, we assign points based on overall performance or anticipated performance. Our whole series is based on this point system so to NOT have our classes based on points is counter intuitive to me. A 300-point car in my mind cannot be running for the overall win. You need to be building a 500-point car, or close to it. Those are the cars trying for the overall win, not the 300-point cars. They are essentially backmarkers.

PH: What's the car always competes and wins at AMP, Mike? The 8 car?

MC: The Mazda MX3

PM: That is a cheap car.

RS: That cheap car, but what is their total value?

MC: 350? He beats up on the 500-point cars like they are sitting still.

RS: Understood. That's one car, one case. That's also the same as a 1.8 beating up on a V8.

TA: AMP is also a track that is going to cater to a lower horsepower car. Not a lot of straightaways.

RS: It is also their home track. They are there 3 times a month.

PM: That makes my point.

RS: I have no problem with a 350 point car winning occasionally. At least then the other 350-point cars think that they have a chance too. We may have the points wrong on the MX3, or it can be that they are really that good which I think is what it is. It's their home track and I know them pretty well. They are there an awful lot.

DW: If you look at it, last year they entered one race, AMP, finished 7th place. It's not like they are dominating the field.

MC: They have a top 5 in them.

TA: Using points you could choose reliability vs horsepower.

RS: It gives the car owner options. I could run for the class win or the overall. It means I would, not have to add camber plates, motor or trans mounts, wings, splitters. I can bring a 450-point E30 versus a 500 point. If points are where we do our performance equalization everywhere else why aren't our classes based on points?

TA: Could we decide this is not a yes or no, but worth further discussion?

MC: Yes, I've already written down that we will discuss it at the annual meeting.

DW: The last 15 minutes all you have managed is to make me write more minutes of minutes.

MC: Yep, next week we will discuss...

PM: Tabled for further discussion. It does have merit.

DW: I think most people would understand studying this further. It's a big move for us.

MC: It was pretty evenly split among the members. 8 For, 11 against. Page 42 concerns the formation of a technical committee. It proposes a committee of 3 people to include Phil. It was overwhelmingly popular with the members. This is against it. I am too but I think it's for different reasons.

TA: Tell us why you don't like it.

MC: According to this, this committee would handle all sorts of discrepancies. Anything rules related would go to this committee. So, if we are at post race impound and somebody says that part at car is supposed to have a value and we go to the rulebook and it's not listed. At that point as this petition is written that challenge would go to the rules committee. So, we are sitting at Watkins Glen and it's 4:30 in the afternoon can we honestly expect this committee to be available by phone? No, it's impossible.

PM: Yep, impossible.

MC: Yes, for this reason we cannot approve this petition as written.

PM: I've always said we do have a technical committee made up of me, (inaudible), Ray Frank, Dan Diggs is on it, John and ultimately the Directors. When something comes up I email everyone, we review it. This should be a fulltime position. I don't have time to review things instantaneously like some people do I know I get criticized all the time because I don't get on the Forum and maybe I don't respond in a timely manner, but I do the best I can working a 50-60-hour job. What they are proposing is someone to monitor the Forum and if somebody has a question they expect an immediate response. It ain't gonna happen.

TA: A committee could make the response take longer.

PM: I challenge the notion that anybody carries an email to the track. When I get a question I simply reply with the part of the rule book that applies. If there is no answer in the rule book I will address it and we will deal with it.

TA: So, we say we already have an advisory committee?

JE: Let me tell you the pros here. This is the way I see it. Right now there is no visibility and we are not talking about a tech question at post race. We are talking about a rule interpretation, a problem with the swap calculator, a problem with the VPI table, or someone found a loophole, and a tech committee could look at that and advise. And I think 3 people is far too few. I think we need experts on our most popular marquees. There are people in the Forum that are very knowledgeable and when an issue arises on there, they could get together. I don't like the petition because 3 people is not enough. I think more like 7 or 8 people. They decide majority rules and they have a chairman that brings their decision to us, the Board. We can ignore it, we can accept it...reject it, but we have a group that are knowledgeable that would address the issue. Like the Porsche S2 issue that came up over and over again at Watkins Glen. Hell there's 20 pages on the Forum about it. It does not appear to our members that anybody is addressing it. And maybe we are, but I haven't heard about any of us addressing it. And chances are it IS being dealt with, but it's a visibility issue more than anything else. We need experts on the marquees and not that Phil and those guys are not doing their jobs. They are doing a great job, but they cannot be expected to know the intricacies of every platform out there. I don't think we can do it with 3 people and I will be happy to rewrite a petition for next year.

TA: You would have to lay it out properly: This is what they do, this is not what they do.

JE: Yes, they are advisors. They are not going to change the rules.

DW: Let me say something. I think it is a great way to get some of our more vocal members involved so that they see how difficult it is to keep everybody happy so maybe it cuts down on some of the discord. I agree with Jerry that it should be more than 3 people. And let me point out that we do not have to have a petition to push this idea forward. We can appoint committees through our bylaws at any time. We

are not dealing with the rule book here. We are dealing with our By-laws. Committees are to ADVISE; they don't pass anything. I think Phil and them do a great job and I have never had a problem getting my questions answered. It seems we go from crisis to crisis and I'd like to see that die down.

TA: Yeah, it gets everybody worked up.

DW: I'm tired of seeing Phil taking it on the chin from some of the hotheads.

PM: It's the nature of the biz and it doesn't bother me. I've been involved in racing for 40-50 years and it's always been that way. I monitor the Forum and let it go because I wanna see where it goes. A couple of them got out of hand and I called Bill and said stop it right now. It's a very small minority involving very few members and we can't overreact when someone gets on there and says something. With as many members, peoples, cars, and rules as we have we are not going to please everyone.

TA: We can try and make it as fair as possible for everyone though. Spread the work around too.

DW: I really agree with spreading the work around.

MC: If it's about getting some help and spreading the work around it's a great idea, but I don't think getting help from some of the hotheads on the Forum is the best idea. I don't think it will even calm them down. I think some of your advisory people should be like James Clay as the BMW guy, a Porsche guy. We can get a Ford guy and professionals that actually work in the industry.

DW: I wasn't suggesting we get the hotheads on a committee. I'm tired of hearing "nothing is getting done" because things ARE getting done, just maybe not at the speed they want. It's a perception as well as a visibility issue.

MC: We are planning a trip to look at BMWs and it will be sort of a primer at how our techs look at BMWs. What to look for, bushings, mounts, engines so it will be a technical primer, a useful guide to that marquee. I think that's what we should be looking at. Not just quelling down the more vocal members.

DW: I think they would be happy to see that we HAD a committee. Some of them don't wanna even do the work; they want to complain about it. And others have offered to help time and time again.

MC: They do expect it all from us and some think we are like NASCAR and IMSA that have lots of employees. We are working 60 hours a week and what we give them is all we've got short of not sleeping. They are not going to be content with the work we are doing...oh well. Maybe someone else can do a better job than the 3 of us, but in the meantime, this is what we have.

TA: I think you all are doing a fabulous job. What about an advisory committee that reports to Phil and Mike directly and does some of that research behind the scenes, like going through the VPI list with their expertise. Just doing some of the legwork. Take some of that off you guys.

MC: That's a lot more than what was proposed in the petition.

JE: We can deny the petition and still form a committee based on the By-laws as Doc noted. We could ask people to submit resumes to be a part of the first technical advisory committee. We could get a resume from a guy that has 20 years experience working on Toyotas and here's my proof. Great, you're our Toyota guy. We can go on merit. Get a group together that does not impact anything that Phil does. It's just an advisory group of technical expertise on a particular marquee. Let's deny the petition but still do something.

PM: I agree with you Jerry; I think it's a great idea.

MC: So...at the annual meeting when we deny the petition and the angry mob starts soaking their torches in kerosene, we say, we said no BUT

TA: We are gonna take your idea and build on it and make it something that has value to you as members.

PM: As a board, we have to take the petitions as written, approve or deny them or table them and take them as a suggestion.

MC: Correct, and when we are not sure of something we should not change it to keep us stable. We only ended up approving about 10 and a lot of them were just clarifying things. We did not change any of the core of the rule book and that is important.

PM, TA, JE; Agree

JE: So, I think we move to deny the petition, but move forward with the idea of forming a committee.

MC: Let's talk about it in person at NCM before the meeting. I'll everybody the presentation that includes the votes on the petitions and everything else we are going to talk about.

PM: I won't be able to be there in person, but I will be watching live. You need me, Mike's got my number.

MC: We can always dial you up with Skype.

DW: Yeah, you're not getting out of this that easy...

PM: My daughter's expecting...

JE: That's a great reason not to be there! Congrats!

TA, DW, RS: Chorus of congrats...

MC: Alright then, I will get this out this weekend. Meeting adjourned at 8:59PM EST



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 June 6, 2018.

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