



2022 BCCR Member Petitions

Final submissions for member comments

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PETITION 1 – PIT STOP TIMERS.....	1
PETITION 2 – OUTSIDE DOOR HANDLES.....	2
PETITION 3 – FUEL, OIL, AND COOLANT LINES IN DRIVING COMPARTMENT.....	3
PETITION 4 – TECH FORM.....	4
PETITION 5 – FUEL CELL FIRE NOZZLE.....	5
PETITION 6 – ANNUAL VPI ADJUSTMENT CAP.....	6
PETITION 7 – TECH DESK E46 TRANSMISSION RULING.....	7
PETITION 8 – FENDER FLARES.....	8
PETITION 9 – COOLANT EXPANSION TANKS.....	9
PETITION 10 – ALTERNATORS.....	10
PETITION 11 – 2 ND PACE CAR.....	11
PETITION 12 – OIL COOLERS.....	12
PETITION 13 – OIL COOLERS OR ACCUSUMP.....	13
PETITION 14 – ACCUSUMP.....	14
PETITION 15 – PIT SPEED LIMITS.....	15
PETITION 16 – SPEEDING IN PITS PENALTY.....	16
PETITION 17 – LIMIT TIRE CHANGES PER STOP.....	17
PETITION 18 – TIRE CHANGE PROCEDURES.....	18
PETITION 19 – ALUMINUM RADIATORS.....	19
PETITION 20 – ADJUSTABLE SHOCKS.....	20
PETITION 21 – DRY BREAK SYSTEMS.....	21
PETITION 22 – CARBON FIBER WINGS.....	22
PETITION 23 – CARBON FIBER SPLITTERS.....	23
PETITION 24 – HANS RECERTIFICATION.....	24
PETITION 25 – HOOD LOUVERS.....	25
PETITION 26 – MAX HP LIMIT.....	26
PETITION 27 – TIRE SIZE LIMIT.....	27
PETITION 28 – STRUT/SHOCK TOWER BAR CONTACT POINTS.....	28
PETITION 29 – SHOCK/STRUT TOWER BAR CONTACT POINTS VALUE.....	29
PETITION 30 – ALUMINUM FLYWHEEL.....	30
PETITION 31 – TIRES AND FUEL IN SAME STOP.....	31
PETITION 32 – 1 MINUTE PENALTY FOR TIRE CHANGE.....	32
PETITION 33 – LIMIT ON TIRES USED PER RACE.....	33
PETITION 34 – LIST OF ALLOWED TIRES.....	34
PETITION 35 – TECH FORM #2.....	35
PETITION 36 – TECH INSPECTION.....	36
PETITION 37 – MID-YEAR RE-TECH.....	37
PETITION 38 – TECH FOR NEW TEAMS.....	38
PETITION 39 – CLASS IDENTIFICATION.....	39
PETITION 40 – OIL PAN.....	40
PETITION 41 – ALLOW CARBON FIBER.....	41
PETITION 42 – MULTI-ELEMENT WINGS.....	42
PETITION 43 – PIT STOP FUELING.....	43
PETITION 44 – VIN REGISTRATION.....	44
PETITION 45 – OFFSET BUSHINGS.....	45
PETITION 46 – SKID PLATES.....	47

PETITION 47 – STRUT TOWER BARS	49
PETITION 48 – IMPOUND REPRESENTATIVE.....	51
PETITION 49 – KILL SWITCH LOCATION	52
PETITION 50 – COOLANT EXPANSION TANKS #2	54
PETITION 51 – WING VALUE.....	56
PETITION 52 – RAIN LIGHT CONFIGURATION	57
PETITION 53 – FLYWHEELS	58
PETITION 54 – STEERING PARTS	60
PETITION 55 – EXTENDED BALL JOINTS AND CAMBER ADJUSTMENT	62
PETITION 56 – HOMEMADE VS AFTERMARKET CAMBER PLATES	64
PETITION 57 – FLAGTRONICS.....	65
PETITION 58 – ALTERNATORS #2.....	67
PETITION 59 – FUEL CELL CAPACITY	68
PETITION 60 – CLASS IDENTIFICATION #2	69
PETITION 61 – ROOKIE CLASS	70
PETITION 62 – TRINKETS.....	71
PETITION 63 – ROLLING TECH.....	72
PETITION 64 – RAIN LIGHT CONFIGURATION #2	74
PETITION 65 – DECORATION LIGHTS	75
PETITION 66 – SUPERSEDED PORSCHE PARTS.....	76
PETITION 67 – DRIVERS DOOR HEIGHT	78
PETITION 68 – FUEL JOGS ON PIT WALL	79
PETITION 69 – FUEL CELL OVERFLOW LINE	80
PETITION 70 – CHAMPCAR STAFF TO EC	81
PETITION 71 – LEXAN IN DRIVERS WINDOW	82
PETITION 72 – 2 DAY HANDICAP (MOV).....	83
PETITION 73 – MENTOR PROGRAM.....	84
PETITION 74 – VALVE SPRINGS WITH CAM	85
PETITION 75 – VALVE SPRINGS.....	86
PETITION 76 – KUMHO V720 RESTRICTION.....	87
PETITION 77 – LIST OF DISALLOWED TIRES	88
PETITION 78 – DUCT TAPE	89
PETITION 79 – YELLOW FLAG RULE	90
PETITION 80 – SPLITTER/DIFFUSER DIMENSIONS.....	91
PETITION 81 – DUCT TAPE #2	93
PETITION 82 – VEHICLE WRAP	94
PETITION 83 – DBW THROTTLE BODY	95
PETITION 84 – SWAPPED VPI LIST.....	96

PETITION 1 – PIT STOP TIMERS

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Bernie Myers

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Pit stop timers

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

There is no current rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Mandate that a flat metallic surface be bonded to the top left corner of the roof area above the windshield.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Some cars have aluminum or fiberglass roofs. Some have none just the roll bar. At pit exit many times the Official has to find the timer. Some are on the wipers, some have slid around the roll bar, some are between the fender & windshield. A universal location for everyone will speed up the time to both place & remove the timers. Time is lost for the team at pit exit looking for the timer and it causes cars to stack up. I watched this happen at Road America working the pits

Any additional information:

PETITION 2 – OUTSIDE DOOR HANDLES

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Bernie Myers

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Make outside door handles mandatory

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Seen a couple cars go through tech without outside door handles it is currently not a rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Outside door handles are required on both drivers & passenger doors.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

In a case of an emergency a crash or fire safety personal will not be able to open a door from the outside. Requiring them to locate an inside handle or pull cable.

Any additional information:

Seems simple enough

PETITION 3 – FUEL, OIL, AND COOLANT LINES IN DRIVING COMPARTMENT

Category:

Rule Clarification

Member Name:

Bernie Myers

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

This rule is misleading:

9.10.3.5 Any fuel, oil or coolant lines (including Aeroquip steel braided lines) that pass through the driving compartment must be METAL or encased in continuous steel conduit or aluminum tube."

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Had a car come through tech at Elkhart that had a beautiful fuel system. But it had short runs of 3/8" stainless steel hardlines. Which the way the rule is written this is OK while the intent of the rule is to have every line encased. Wording is wrong it says it must be metal or encased.....

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Remove the word "metal or"

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Team did a nice job with their fuel system but used short runs of steel hardlines which the wording in the rule does say is ok.

Any additional information:

PETITION 4 – TECH FORM

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Bernie Myers

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Teams that come to tech without a tech form filled out slow down the process

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

There is no current rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

If a Team presents themselves in Tech without the Tech Form filled out previously they go back to the end of the line.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Jay & I rocked tech inspection at Road America in the Fall of 2020. The single most hangup that slowed down the inspection process was teams having to fill out a Tech Sheet once they were inside the Tech building with their car.

Any additional information:

PETITION 5 – FUEL CELL FIRE NOZZLE

Category:

Rule Clarification

Member Name:

Joe Houseman

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Champcar rule 9.10.2.12 permits installation of the fuel cell in the passenger side floor of the vehicle, provided it is behind a full metal bulkhead. However the rule does not require a extinguisher line/nozzle inside of this "fuel cell compartment". Due to the relative close proximity of the fuel supply to the driver (compared to a conventional rear mounted cell/tank), it seems to make sense to make this a requirement.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Perhaps an oversight, or perhaps to avoid that undersized extinguisher systems have too many nozzles thus reducing the overall effectiveness of the system.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Create a new rule 9.10.2.12.5: "Minimum (1) extinguisher nozzle, located inside of the fuel cell compartment centrally located towards the top and center of the fuel cell, or fill plate.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

In the hopefully rare event that a driver is unable to quickly exit a vehicle which experiences a fire in the passenger floor fuel cell compartment, the addition of this rule may provide critical additional seconds in which the driver can exit the vehicle before being overcome, or rescue teams to reach the vehicle and apply additional fire suppression measures,

Any additional information:

This proposed rule would only be valid for those vehicles which have a fuel cell mounted in the passenger floor per rule 9.10.2.12.5

PETITION 6 – ANNUAL VPI ADJUSTMENT CAP

Category:

Rule Clarification

Member Name:

Dylan Wittenauer

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Large changes in car VPI lead to unintended consequences and a perception of a lack of rule stability.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

VPI changes are a necessary tool to balance cars. While necessary from time to time, there should be limits in place to prevent large swings.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Car VPI may be increased or decreased by a maximum of 50 points in one calendar year.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

While large swings are actually quite rare, they have received much criticism (I.E. Foxbody Thunderbird, C3 Vette) and give the impression of a lack of rule stability / balance. Putting reasonable limits allows Champcar to make balance changes while also giving teams a reasonable assurance that their builds will still be relevant year to year.

Any additional information:

PETITION 7 – TECH DESK E46 TRANSMISSION RULING

Category:

Rule Clarification

Member Name:

Nathan Gardiner

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

"A question was posed on the tech help desk which asked (paraphrasing) ""can I use (for zero points) the ZF transmission from the BMW 328i on my e46 BMW 325i even though the Getrag transmission was the only transmission offered on the BMW 325i?""

The response from Jay Mauney was ""You can use any transmission form the E46 generation.""

This ruling is not consistent with the rest of the rulebook, specifically the part which says:
Transmission / Transaxle swap: 25pts for any transmission / transaxle from a vehicle on the VPI list

With this ""ruling"" Jay made a model-specific exemption to the rulebook, that e46 gets free transmission swap, and that exemption should be redacted."

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

I can't think of any good reason to allow for this exemption to the transmission swap value in section 4.3

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Email affected teams who asked about swapping the e46/e36 transmissions and notify them that this exemption was a mistake, and that using any transmission other than that which is OE to the car is 25 points. No change needs to be made to the rulebook since it has the correct transmission swap information.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Eliminates a model-specific rulebook exemption and further eliminates "secret handshake rules" known only by tech and very few teams. The entire point of the tech desk was to eliminate the secret handshake and "I have an email from tech saying this is ok" rules.

Any additional information:

PETITION 8 – FENDER FLARES

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Fender Flare Rule

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

I think it was to limit tires sticking out and the thought was everyone would go back to small tires. No a single team did that and just hacked up their fenders for zero points. If it was to limit a car on car tire touching it does nothing to do this. So the current rule is there to make cars look as ugly and hideous as possible.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Fender flares are required and zero points.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

"No one is taking points on fender flares and taking laps. Some take points, but only when they have them to spare. If not, they hack up the car, bend the fenders out and most are basically ugly as hell. We also have the bent up fender lips that are sharp and potential to cut a tire or a person, a person for sure, ask me how I know.

Can we please make fender flares zero points so we can have good looking cars. We have sponsors, such as Tire Rack, who I am sure would like to see better looking cars.

The person who came up with the crazy rule is gone so can we be gone with that rule now please. "

Any additional information:

PETITION 9 – COOLANT EXPANSION TANKS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Coolant Expansion Tank points

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

To give points and laps to people that want to save money on replacing coolant expansion tanks race after race.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Coolant expansion tanks zero points.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

The coolant expansion tanks in stock vehicles get worn out and are a replacement item. If replaced often, maybe every race or few races, then you will not have an issue of failure. If not then you risk failure. Teams change them regularly and this causes teams an unneeded expense. There is no performance gain from an alum expansion tank and it actually hurts you as it weighs more. The gain is that you buy it once and are done versus the continuation of buying new ones. Also, on some older cars it can be very hard to find coolant expansion tanks that are stock.

Any additional information:

PETITION 10 – ALTERNATORS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

10 Points for a non stock racing alternator.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Alternators and the brackets are zero points. I have zero clue why this is.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Racing alternators 10 points.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

The Bosch style, small, lightweight, high output alternators are in the series at zero points. These can cost \$500-1000 and should not be allowed without points. Racing alternators should not be zero points.

Any additional information:

PETITION 11 – 2ND PACE CAR

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

2nd Pace Car

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We do not have a rule now for a 2nd pace car

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Black flag a 2nd pace car on track. When a car/driver is going at a very slow rate of speed when a full course caution or pace car is out and causing the field to back up behind them instead of catching the car in front of them at a safe manor then that car should be black flagged.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

It will keep racing fair for all.

Any additional information:

PETITION 12 – OIL COOLERS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Oil Cooler Points

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Points for oil coolers is there to give laps to people who want to add an oil cooler to keep their car from blowing up. The argument is that teams can pick reliability or speed, but all know teams pick speed 99% of the time and need to now with the speed of the field.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

1 free oil cooler per car, any additional will be 20 points per cooler. (If the car came with an oem oil cooler that counts as the 1 free one, but can be upgraded to a larger oil cooler if desired)

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

"Some cars come with oil coolers, and that is great, but most do not. This will give teams the opportunity to add a single cooler at zero points to promote them finishing a race.

If a team fails they go home and might not come back, simple as that. If we can get teams to finish races and have a great time they will come back. This rule can influence teams to race in the future and not cancel races due to a blow up car. "

Any additional information:

PETITION 13 – OIL COOLERS OR ACCUSUMP

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

points for coolers or accusump

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We give points for coolers or accusump is the idea of teams picking reliability or performance with the the points they have. Back in the Condren era it was highlighted that teams should fail and would, this comes from the lemons roots we have. Some people still want to point these items as they want to see competitors fail and if that competitor quits, then all the better as they do not have one more team to beat.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

1 zero point item, accusump or oil cooler. The rest should be 10 points for accusump or 20 points for cooler.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

With new cars in the series and the massive speed creep teams do not have the choice in most cases anymore of choosing a reliability item over a speed item. Teams should have the option of one item to add that has zero points to help them finish a race. It almost all cases the reliability item will make the car slower as it adds weight, but if a team finishes they can come to race again. How many teams have failed and do not race anymore is a real issue we should deal with and a rule like this helps with that. We need every car entry and should cherish those entries to continue the series.

Any additional information:

PETITION 14 – ACCUSUMP

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Accusump points.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We point for accusumps to punish teams for wanting to finish a race. We have the idea of choosing reliability or speed, but with the speed the series is and the number of new fast cars you need to pick speed to be competitive. Back in the old days it was expected to fail and built into the rules to fail, we should not have that. No other series points for accusumps and most want you to finish. Why we do not, I do not know, but I know some people want others to fail so they can do better.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Accusumps zero points.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Teams finishing races. A team that finishes will come back. A team that blows up an engine may not. A blown engine puts oil on the track and can causes crashes, will causes EV personal on the track and the extra exposure is not needed. A blown engine can catch on fire and hurt a member. From a safety perspective we should encourage accusumps. Maybe we can finally get away from the you choose your car mentality of some (which we really know what it means) and encourage great racing until the end with great battles for all.

Any additional information:

PETITION 15 – PIT SPEED LIMITS

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Varying Pit Speed Limits

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We have different speed limits at different tracks based on what the track says is an acceptable maximum speed.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Pit Speed Limit 25mph all tracks.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

It will make it so we have the same pit speed limit at all tracks and the expectation of all is the same. It will cause teams to know what it is at all tracks and can set their RPM in X gear to be correct to that speed. After volunteering and observing how many cars and teams were way over the speed amount something needs to be done as some teams were way over every single time and caused the pits to be unsafe. Using the I did not know, sorry, I thought I was ok, I do not have a speed limit gauge, ect, will not be acceptable anymore. Also, it only saves a few seconds to speed in the pits so there is not a need.

Any additional information:

PETITION 16 – SPEEDING IN PITS PENALTY

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Speeding in the pits

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We do not have a written rule on what happens if you speed in the pits

Propose a solution or revised rule:

1 minute hold penalty at pit out if speeding in the pits.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

There is no need to speed in the pits and the time saved is negligible at best. With the rule in place then teams will know just what will happen and be aware of the consequences, as there really are not any in place now.

Any additional information:

PETITION 17 – LIMIT TIRE CHANGES PER STOP

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

The tire wars we have and perception of the need to have multiple sets of tires per weekend of racing. The teams with money load up on the fast tires that wear out quickly.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We have never effectively addressed the tire spending situation. There is no good answer so people shy away from any answer and nothing gets done.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Limit the number of tires allowed to be changed per pit stop to 1

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will keep teams from changing multiple sets of tires per pit stop per race.

Any additional information:

PETITION 18 – TIRE CHANGE PROCEDURES

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Multiple tires per race day. Teams come with many tires and burn through them as some teams can afford it while teams on a tight budget need to use tires that last. The haves and have nots is a growing problem with costs.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We do not have a rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

- You can only use hand tools to change a tire. No air guns, cordless drills allowed.
- Only one tire can be changed at a time. If you need to change more than one wheel you need to completely finish that wheel before starting the next.
- Only 4 tires are allowed over the wall, that includes what is on the car. If you need to change a tire you need to remove the tire, put that tire over the wall, then bring the new tire over.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will greatly slow down the multiple tire changes at once.

Any additional information:

PETITION 19 – ALUMINUM RADIATORS

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Alum radiators are points.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

To give teams points for alum radiators.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Aluminum radiator of the same basic size and capacity (110%) as stock with a value of less than \$300 should be zero points.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Finding radiators on some older cars is getting impossible to find. The cost of a stock radiator can be very high. If a radiator is the same size and capacity it does not give a performance advantage and should be zero points. There is no reason a team should be forced to spend a lot of money on a radiator when a suitable cost effective option is available.

Any additional information:

PETITION 20 – ADJUSTABLE SHOCKS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Adj shocks at 25 points each.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

I am not sure why it is so high. My thought was to keep costs down, but we all know that a single adjustable shock can be the same or less than current non adjustable ones.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

10 points for single adjustable shocks.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

10 points seems a fair amount as the gains are not worth a 100 points. This will also allow teams to use much less costly coilover shock and spring combo for 80 points total. Those can be purchased for \$500-1500 all day long for almost all cars. This also allows cars to come over from other series much easier as they do not have the point rules as we do.

Any additional information:

PETITION 21 – DRY BREAK SYSTEMS

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

dry break systems

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Not sure

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Remove the allowance to use dry break systems

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

What perception do we want to have allowing a dry break system in the series. Who can really afford it and who would it benefit. We do not need dry break systems.

Any additional information:

PETITION 22 – CARBON FIBER WINGS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Carbon Fiber ban

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

To keep costs down

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Carbon Fiber Wing 20 points

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

There are a lot of teams in other series that have a carbon fiber wing and this will allow them to cross over and race with us. The points can be 20 instead of 10, so there is a penalty to running them. There is not need to totally ban all carbon fiber as it can cause a team to not enter.

Any additional information:

PETITION 23 – CARBON FIBER SPLITTERS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Carbon Fiber Ban

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

To keep costs down

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Carbon Fiber Splitter 20 points

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Teams from other series have them and can transition to Champcar if we allow it.

Any additional information:

PETITION 24 – HANS RECERTIFICATION

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Hans Recertification rule

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Not sure.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Remove Hans recert rule.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

It will save drivers money, time, effort and the problems in tech to verify them. We are not here to police if someone has a hans that is frayed or damaged as that is up to the driver to inspect their gear.

Any additional information:

PETITION 25 – HOOD LOUVERS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Hood Lover Points

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

I have no idea why we have a rule that points hood vents.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Hood vents should be zero points.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

You can cut lovers into a stock hood for zero points and if you use a premade one that looks good and does the same thing it should not be points. Let us keep life simple and have good looking cars.

Any additional information:

PETITION 26 – MAX HP LIMIT

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Limit Max HP

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

There is no rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

The maximum amount of wheel hp allowed in Champcar is 299.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

We have cars making close to 400hp and the speed differential is just far to great at the end of the straights. Do we really want cars that have 400hp and is that really what Champcar is? I see a bad accident in the future with the amount of speed differential we have with a few cars.

Any additional information:

PETITION 27 – TIRE SIZE LIMIT

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Tire Wars and Sizing

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We have zippy tire rules except 200tw, which we know is a joke now.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Limit tire size to 285mm.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Teams will not be able to show up with 325 wide tires and burn through them to win. It will also limit the speed potential of the extra tire width. It can help keep costs down as the larger sizes are very costly. We should not have the perception of a 325 wide tire and the amount of cost it is to run.

Any additional information:

PETITION 28 – STRUT/SHOCK TOWER BAR CONTACT POINTS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

strut/shock tower bar

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

10 points for a strut shock tower bar

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Limit the number of contact points for a strut tower bar to 2 for aftermarket or homemade bars.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

The current strut/shock tower bar rule allowance to basically make a front or rear tube frame chassis it not for the intent of the shock tower brace. Let us be real, we all know what a shock tower brace is and a tube frame chassis is not that so we need to put rules forth that say so.

Any additional information:

PETITION 29 – SHOCK/STRUT TOWER BAR CONTACT POINTS VALUE

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Shock/Strut Tower Brace 10 points

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

10 points for a shock/tower brace

Propose a solution or revised rule:

10 points for a shock tower brace with 2 contact points, 10 points for each additional contact point. All contact points need to be bolt in.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will limit the use of the shock tower brace rule to make a tube frame section of a car and label it as a shock tower brace.

Any additional information:

PETITION 30 – ALUMINUM FLYWHEEL

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

alum flywheel as 10 points

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

I am not sure, it has changed so much in the past who knows what is going on now.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Alum Flywheels zero points.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Keeps life simple for all. An alum flywheel does not really do much at all anyway and can be safer to run.

Any additional information:

PETITION 31 – TIRES AND FUEL IN SAME STOP

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

tire changing during a race

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

There is not one

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Teams are not allowed to change tires and take fuel in the same pit stop.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will cause teams to have to take a time penalty to change tires during a race if they want to run tires that will not last the race.

Any additional information:

PETITION 32 – 1 MINUTE PENALTY FOR TIRE CHANGE

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Teams using multiple sets of tires per race

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We do not have a rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

If a team changes a tire they are required to be held at pit out for 1 minute per tire changed. If they have taken fuel it will be in addition to the 5 minutes. If they come to the pit out and the time has already expired then the 1 minute per tire starts then.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will limit the number of tires used in a race and give teams with a budget a chance. You can use the faster tires that wear out, but have to use the time to do so.

Any additional information:

PETITION 33 – LIMIT ON TIRES USED PER RACE

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Using multiple sets of tires per race weekend

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

No rule now

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Limit the number of tires used per race to (TBD based on race length) (TAC can recommend the amounts, but an example would be - 0-8 hours = 6 tires, 8.1-14 hours = 8 tires, 14.1-24 = 12, 24.1+ = 14.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

We should limit the number of tires used in a race to keep budgets in mind and the perception that you do not just win because you are the fast tires.

Any additional information:

PETITION 34 – LIST OF ALLOWED TIRES

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Tire Wars

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

200TW only

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Tires used from the list in the appendix are given a starting advantage of 1 lap for races 8 hours or less and 2 laps for races more than 8 hours.

Hankook RS4, Dunlop Direzza Star Spec, Falken 615, ect (TAC can come up with a full list of tires)

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

It will give teams with a smaller budget who can not afford the fast tires a chance to do well.

Any additional information:

PETITION 35 – TECH FORM #2

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Tech Line

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

No rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Teams need to come to tech with their tech sheets and swap sheets full filled out or will be sent to the back of the line to have enough time to fill them out.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Tech takes forever and a huge part of that is that teams do not fill out paperwork before coming to tech. No one wants to wait forever in tech and this will help more than you know. After watching tech and half the teams did not have paperwork filled out and we had to wait for them it is not fair for tech or members waiting in line.

Any additional information:

PETITION 36 – TECH INSPECTION

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Tech lines and finding items

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Tech is find all items in the car that are legal or not, then go over all safety items, enter the data and tally the points.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Tech should not be there to police all the cars and try to catch and find things. Tech should be there first to address the safety issues with the cars. It is up to teams to put the items onto their tech sheets and enter them. If there are issues it will be found out after the race with protests. If a person has a question on points, sure, that is fine and great, but tech is not there to try to catch people cheating and have the perception. The members will find them out quick enough at the end of the race.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

It will simplify tech and speed up the process. Tech will be there to help and not be the bad guy.

Any additional information:

PETITION 37 – MID-YEAR RE-TECH

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Tech and Reteching cars.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

You need to fully retech your car if you adjust anything or even remove anything.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

If you have gone through the safety check for the year and are only adding or removing points items you do not need to go fully through tech. You only need to be bring your logbook and paperwork and get that adjusted.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

There is no need to hold up tech when the car has already been gone over. It just adds time to an already long tech line.

Any additional information:

PETITION 38 – TECH FOR NEW TEAMS

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Tech for new teams

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

No rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

We should have a designated time or even a designated line for bran new teams and builds. This way tech can really take their time and go over the cars to make sure they are safe. They can also take the time to address any members questions or concerns when a new team.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

It will welcome new teams and builds to the series and show appreciation for them coming.

Any additional information:

PETITION 39 – CLASS IDENTIFICATION

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Dennis Gundersdorff

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

identifying the class of car behind you

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

there is no current rule

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Each class of car would use a different color windshield banner to be easily identified at a glance

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

easier to identify if you are competing with the car trying to pass you

This would be the easiest and cheapest way to identify a car from the front

Any additional information:

Unless you are running 1-3 for overall there is no reason to be overly aggressive to stay ahead of a car in another class unless you don't know he is in another class. It would also be helpful to identify cars from the rear other than the small class sticker and # that not all cars have.

PETITION 40 – OIL PAN

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Points for oil pans

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

The points for an aftermarket oil pan is high

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Oil Pan non oe 10 points

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will still point oil pans that are aftermarket, but at reasonable amount so people can add these to save their engines. We want teams to be able finish races and come back.

Any additional information:

PETITION 41 – ALLOW CARBON FIBER

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

William Strong

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Cars from other series forced to run in EC class because of carbon fiber wings and splitters. Lost revenue as teams don't want to run in EC if they would be class legal if the wing and splitter were made of papier-mâché.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

The rule was put into place to keep teams from using high dollar carbon fiber parts. At the time the rule was put into place, these parts were super expensive with some wings exceeding \$1500. the material along was very expensive. This rule was also put into place to keep teams from using CF body panels. Times have changed.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Allow carbon-fiber wing, rear lip spoiler, and/or carbon fiber splitters.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

There are competitors that would build a car with catalog/Internet parts rather than build their own. There is zero difference other than weight, between CF wings and splitters and their homemade plywood, or plastic cousins. These competitors have built cars that easily fall into our ruleset, with the exception of having an outlawed part on their cars which force them into EC.

By allowing these 2 parts only, to be made from carbon fiber, will not upset the field balance of power. But it could improve the revenue potential of the ChampCar Endurance Series by enticing more teams to enter as they could now compete in a class.

There are also teams that prefer their car to look like a real race car like they see on Tv or the magazine and less like they just pulled the car out of a junkyard.

Any additional information:

This idea comes from my talking with hundreds of teams coast to coast, with teams telling me that they would have brought a second or third car if they could have used a carbon-fiber wing or splitter.

PETITION 42 – MULTI-ELEMENT WINGS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

William Strong

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Multi-element wing points

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Tech has been charging teams with cheap or purpose built multi element wings points for each element. Tech looks at each element as two wings, thus 2x the points.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Allow two element wings for 10 points.

Additional elements would be 20 points per element.

The 2nd element must be mounted in the same horizontal plane as the 1st element and be within 20mm of the 1st element.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This would allow teams to use cheap ""eBay"" wings if they so choose. It discourages the use of 3+ element wings. This way we don't start seeing Miata's showing up with 1980s F1 style wing elements.

Sure, you will get some higher dollar wings should up on cars, but usually, these teams don't have access to a wind tunnel to really tune the front and back aero balance. Most of the teams I talk to about aero just want a cool looking car.

Any additional information:

PETITION 43 – PIT STOP FUELING

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

William Strong

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Fueling Safety during a pit stop - over the wall and fuel handlers

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

There was a relaxing of the rules in the early days of ChampCar.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

This is two parts.

Part 1.

Require everyone handling fuel on both sides of the wall during a fuel stop to be dressed in full driver/fuel fill gear. From helmets to closed toe shoes.

The person assisting with handling the fuel on the cold side of the pit wall is usually in a position of danger if a fire starts. We also see teams swinging the bottle over the wall as a stream of fuel flies through the air over the wall into their easy up area. This would bring us in line with other endurance racing series that require all fuel handlers to be suited up.

Part 2.

Require all people over the wall to be dressed in fire suits during all aspects of a stop. During fuel stops, we get some teams fueling (Car A), while another team (car B) is within a few feet or yards of the team behind or in front working on their car. If an incident happens with Car A, the team at Car B could just be out working on their car, and become quickly part of the incident at Car A. Sometimes pit lane is really packed with cars and this can be a really dangerous situation. Anyone that has worked pit lane will tell you that incidents can happen really fast, without any warning.

ChampCar has been really lucky over the past 12 years of racing with fires on pitlane.

The kickback will be from teams that say they are too hot in a fire suit. Maybe we explain to them that being on fire and having your cool nylon athletic shirt melt to your back or chest could be a lot worse, and is a lot hotter.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Safety on pit lane.

99.9% of our members do this racing for fun, while having a job they need to go back to on Monday morning. Keeping them safe during the event is our job as a sanctioning body. Even the pro's require fully fire resistant clothing, helmets, and such when they are over the wall. There is a reason. They want to keep the people safe.

Any additional information:

PETITION 44 – VIN REGISTRATION

Category:

Rule Clarification

Member Name:

William Strong

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Teams registering a car or engine swap as an incorrect year

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

There has never been a requirement to list in your registration or tech form a VIN.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Require a chassis Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) to be listed on the tech inspection form, and entered into the race cars logbook.

Require the engine VIN (on cars newer than 1990) and to be listed in the tech form for both normal and swapped cars.

If a new engine is installed mid-race, a tech inspector must verify and annotate the new engine VIN in the tech system and the logbook.

If an engine VIN is ground off, or the tag is removed, the car will be placed into EC, until the engine make and displacement can be verified.

If the online tech/logbook does not show the updated VIN while the car is in impound, the car will be moved to EC.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will allow tech to confirm the engine type, displacement, and legality in our series.

Any additional information:

PETITION 45 – OFFSET BUSHINGS**Category:**

VPI Value

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

4.3.2 - Offset bushings: 5 pts/corner

This rule is strange from multiple levels.

1. The original intent of the bushing rule, as described below, was to allow teams to save money. When purchasing aftermarket delrin/poly replacements, the ones with offset holes are generally the same or similar cost as the ones with ""stock"" holes. If manufacturing your own, the only difference is where you put the drill bit when making the hole. Therefore, allowing offset bushings does not deviate from the original intent of the rule.
2. When installed in the stock location, offset bushings do not allow teams to move or adjust suspension geometry more than possible with stock parts. If a team were to take a worn out stock rubber bushing and force the geometry to one side, then weld in a bracket or fill with window weld, voila ""offset bushing"". This practice is legal and in use currently in champcar. Allowing off the shelf just makes this easier for garage-level teams versus fab-shop teams.
3. Enforcement. Champcar tech has limited time and resources. Is the allowance of offset bushings, installed in the stock location, something tech needs to focus on? Is this going to allow a car to become dominant? I argue that at worst, it will save some teams tire-wear from getting slightly better alignment specs. Its a random obstacle that is difficult to enforce (are all bushings easily visible in impound? where specifically was the stock hole on a random bushing on a random car?).

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

To allow teams to purchase cheaper aftermarket bushings for cars at a lower cost. On some cars, OE or OE equivalent "rubber" bushings are expensive, and low-cost delrin or polyurethane replacements are readily available. The rule to allow bushings at no point add was added in 2017 (previously it was 25 pts/car).

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Bushings in Polyurethane or Delrin, Which fit into the OEM mounting location/bore, without modification of the mount/bore: 0 pts/car

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

1. Removes a silly restriction on geometry that can't possibly be enforced
2. Allows some creativity/ingenuity for teams within the champcar ruleset.
3. Removes incentive to perform risky modifications in search of changes to alignment settings.
4. Allows teams with lesser fabrication skills the opportunity to improve alignment with off-the-shelf offset bushings
5. Opportunity for reduced cost through improved tire wear
6. Improves availability for low-cost parts to teams
7. Reduces workload on tech inspectors

Does NOT increase bushing costs for teams in any significant manner.

Does NOT allow potential for significant (or even notable) increase in performance."

Any additional information:

PETITION 46 – SKID PLATES

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Skid Plates

There is no reference in the BCCR to skid plates.

Skid Plates are being charged to competitors per cost of materials. Values appear to range between 4-10 points.

A skid plate is not a ""reliability"" item in the same sense as a oil cooler or a accu-sump, in that the only situation were a skid plate benefits a driver is if that driver has already screwed up and is going off track, or if there is some debris on the track - AKA, the skid plate is similar to acts-of-nature insurance.

I don't want to see any competitor's track time reduced or ended due to an off-track excursion or impact with debris on the track. Everyone pays a significant amount of time to arrive at the track and prepare for an event. Its in champcar's best interest to ensure that every opportunity for track time is leveraged.

In addition, a busted oil pan requires cleanup. The cleanup takes time and money. That money will be billed to champcar first, and then passed on to teams.

We should provide an allowance to avoid these situations.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Not Applicable, or "no such thing as a free part"

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Provide an allowance for all teams to install a skid plate, if desired or necessary, at zero points.

The potential rule could read:

Teams are allowed to install a skid-plate for the protection of engine oil pan. Skid plate shall not perform any purpose except for oil pan protection.

or

Fixed-Point Value List;

Skid Plate: 0 pts

Skid Plate Definition: Device installed underneath a vehicle in order to protect the oil pan. The skid plate device shall not extend outside of the vehicle body. The skid plate device shall not extend beyond the underside of the engine compartment. The skid plate device shall not be designed for any purpose other than protecting the oil pan.

I feel that this issue got stuck in some details last year. I would like for this to be super simple. Protect your oil pan. If your oil pan protector is designed to do anything else, expect to pay points. Your splitter can protect your oil pan, but it will be charged points like a splitter.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

In the event of a situation where a skid plate would benefit a team, the team running without one to save points will encounter one or more of following:

- Severely damaged engine from oil starvation
- Oil on track surface
- Possible FIRE from hot oil escaping the block
- Potentially large cleanup fee from the track to champcar and team
- Full-Course-Yellow delaying/interrupting race time for other teams
- Potential accidents - Cars out of control due to slick racing surface

The team running with a skid plate, to prevent the potential of such an event, will not gain any competitive advantage. In fact, the skid plate is likely to:

- Add weight, specifically nose-weight, in a league with no weight minimums
- Add drag
- Increase front aero-lift
- Reduce access to engine compartment components, delaying service time if necessary

I want all teams to be able to complete a race weekend and avoid lost time due to broken oil pans.

Any additional information:

PETITION 47 – STRUT TOWER BARS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Strut Tower Bars - Both bolt-in and Weld In

4.3.2:

- Shock / strut-tower reinforcement bar (commercial or homemade): 10 pts each

Many champcars are aging vehicles which have lived hard lives. Over time, metal fatigues. Spot welds designed in the 70's, 80's, and 90's were not intended to sustain the repetitive forces placed on them by endurance racing. Most champcars see more track time in a single race than many "track cars" see in their entire lifetime.

As a result, I expect many champcars have (or will have) issues with fatigue around the strut tower bars.

Additionally, there is a persistent issue encountered by teams as a result of understanding and enforcement around the rear down-bars of a roll cage, and the concept of a "rear strut tower bar".

Its common practice in roll-cage building to weld a solid roll-cage bar between the mounting points of the rear diagonal down-tubes in a roll cage. Cars built for NASA, SCCA, or other series roll-cage rules are likely to have this bar installed. When these teams want to come race with champcar, they end up getting an unexpected point penalty for this bar being installed.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

"no such thing as a free part"

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Allow bolt-in or weld-in strut tower bars for zero points.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

The potential performance increase from allowing these items is almost negligible.

Champcar is a zero-minimum-weight series, and particularly in the case of the common rear-roll-cage bar, this adds significant weight in a high position when compared to the CG.

The potential safety increase from allowing these items is definitely tangible. Connecting the front strut towers together, especially when bars are also installed connecting the strut towers to the roll cage inside the cabin, significantly increases the structural rigidity of the chassis, adding another layer of protection to the cabin in the event of a hard impact.

The potential maintenance decrease is also important to consider. Once a chassis starts to age in champcar, these structural defects come to the surface. By allowing reinforcement to the front strut towers, one of the heaviest loaded portions of the chassis gets a reinforcement which can potentially extend the useful life of a chassis or prevent the need for extensive repair/reinforcement due to failures.

Connecting the rear strut towers together at the roll cage down-tubes adds another preventative measure against the down tubes collapsing or pushing together in an impact.

The potential incentive that is hard to quantify is the removal of the issue where teams have to either cut out an existing bar in their completed roll cage, start 1 lap down for a part that really doesn't even come close to offering 1 lap of increased performance, or decide not to race with champcar because we have a rule about this part and their car has it welded in permanently and they don't want to cut it out. I think this is the most compelling reason to get rid of the rule - it will bring our ruleset into alliance with many other common roll cage rulesets and eliminate this hurdle to potential customers wanting to cross over from other series.

Because the cost of these items is comparatively low (off the shelf strut bars are generally a few hundred dollars at most for a reasonably common one, less than the cost of tires for a race), and the performance increase is negligible, I argue that this will not generate a situation where teams feel compelled to install these components to feel competitive, and in the event a team does feel the need to install one for competitive purposes, no team will be precluded from being able to due to reasonable financial constraints.

Any additional information:

PETITION 48 – IMPOUND REPRESENTATIVE

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

William Strong

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Podium teams not prepared for tech inspection during the impound session.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

1. Teams not having a team representative standing beside the car that can answer all technical questions that the tech inspector or the race director has.
2. Teams not having basic handtools available to remove cam covers, intakes, throttle bodies, or sparkplugs.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

1. Current BCCR 2021 3.0.0. 5.4 page 16

Does not state that a person with the impounded car's technical knowledge should be with the car during the duration of impound to answer questions.

Add the following to the BCCR section 5.4

5.4.2.5. The team must have a representative that has technical knowledge of the race cars build, and is able to answer questions that the tech inspectors may have. They must also have the technical ability to remove parts from the car so that tech may inspect, such as spark plugs, cam covers, intakes, etc.

2. Current BCCR 2021 3.0.0. 5.4 page 16

Does not specify that hand tools should be on hand to allow tech inspectors to inspect parts at impound.

Add the following to the BCCR section 5.4

5.4.2.6.

Teams must have on hand basic tools that can be used by the team technical representative to disassemble parts of the car for technical inspectors.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will allow tech to not have to wait for teams to collect team members that have the technical ability to answer questions about the build, or to assist tech with inspecting parts.

Any additional information:

PETITION 49 – KILL SWITCH LOCATION

Category:

Rule Clarification

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Kill Switch Placement Rule, Section 3.14

3.14. MASTER ELECTRICAL KILL (CUT-OFF) SWITCH

3.14.1. All cars must have a racing-type master electrical kill switch mounted in the center of the dash area of the car (roll cage dash bar) or center console area of the cockpit, accessible to and by the driver while he/she is secured in the driving seat by all seat belts and harnesses. The control or key for this switch should be red and the OFF position should be clearly indicated. Both the main battery circuit and the ignition circuit must be interrupted by the kill switch. All electrical cut-off switches

shall be identified by the international lightning bolt symbol. Decals available at ChampCar Tech Inspection.

3.14.2. The dash or console switch MAY be the sole kill switch, or it MAY be a second switch, wired in series with an existing or additional switch located elsewhere on the car. If the switch is wired in series, the interruption of either switch, independent of the other, must kill all power and vehicle operations.

This rule mandates that every car have a kill switch located in a specific location (center of the dash area)

This rule is not in alignment with many other rulesets.

This rule is not in alignment with corner worker understanding.

This rule is not critical to safety in its current implementation. The "safety" of a champcar is not affected adversely if the kill switch is located by the left side A-pillar instead of in the radio or HVAC panel in the dash. As long as the driver can reach it and activate it, the same level of safety is achieved.

The above statement is reinforced by the common occurrences of "single race allowances" provided to teams who arrive with previously raced cars from other series' and have functional switches installed in locations not permissible by the current rule. If the location was a critical safety matter, these allowances would not be permitted even for a single event.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Not Applicable. This has been around since Condron.

I have heard it explained that corner workers expect it in the center console area, and this allows them to easily find the switch in the event of a bad incident. I know this to be incorrect, as having personal relationships with many corner workers I have asked them. This bit of knowledge about the champcar ruleset is not known by these flaggers, who expect it either just inside the window or on the cowl area (both common placements among other groups like NASA).

Propose a solution or revised rule:

3.14.1. All cars must have a master electrical kill switch securely mounted in a location accessible to and by the driver while he/she is secured in the driving seat by all seat belts and harnesses. The control or key for this switch should be red and the OFF position should be clearly indicated. Both the main battery circuit and the ignition circuit must be interrupted by the kill switch. All electrical cut-off switches

shall be identified by the international lightning bolt symbol. Decals available at ChampCar Tech Inspection.

3.14.2. The driver accessible switch MAY be the sole kill switch, or it MAY be a second switch, wired in series with an existing or additional switch located elsewhere on the car. If two or more kill switches are installed, the interruption of any switch, independent of the others, must kill all power and vehicle operations.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Allows cars from other series' to crossover into our series without having to make changes to the kill switch location. This will bring our ruleset into alignment with SCCA/NASA rules (which not that it should be easily accessible from the OUTSIDE of the car, which is in direct contrast to our current rule).

This will reduce the number of hurdles teams must overcome to participate in our events, without adversely affecting performance or safety.

Any additional information:

PETITION 50 – COOLANT EXPANSION TANKS #2

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Tech Desk Article #92

<https://champcar.org/tech/knowledgebase.php?article=92>

Aluminum Coolant Expansion Tank Points

Q.

I was told today by another competitor that they were being assessed 5 pts for the aluminum expansion tank used on an EcoTec swapped Miata. When Jay saw the same tank during my Skype inspection I was told as long as it was no larger than the one that came with the engine there was no advantage, therefore, no gain or points. the original Malibu tank is plastic so I found an aluminum one that I thought to be safer.

A.

A recent review of aluminum expansion tanks determined that they should be charged 5 points.

This is specifically for ""pressurized"" tanks from what I can tell.

This rule penalizes teams with cars with plastic tanks financially- requiring they either ""risk"" a component failure resulting in potentially catastrophic engine damage, or continually purchase an OEM replacement plastic tank in order to reduce the risk.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

"no such thing as a free part"

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Coolant Expansion Tanks = 0 points

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This ruling does not make sense to me, and I will attempt to explain why.

1. Performance advantage gained from this part: Minimal to none. Perhaps more cooling through improved heat transfer? Extremely unlikely to be a significant factor.
2. Reliability advantage gained from this part: Yes. The failure of a plastic or other material pressurized tank will result in loss of engine coolant and a visit to the pits for replacement, likely taking that car out of contention for the event. If not noticed and corrected immediately, this could result in permanent engine damage.

However, what is the reliability advantage gained by installing an aluminum coolant expansion tank over a BRAND NEW OEM expansion tank?

The argument I would like to propose here is that zero reliability advantage is gained by the aluminum component over the BRAND NEW OEM component.

The benefit gained from the aluminum one is that a team must only purchase it once, instead of multiple times, to achieve the same reliability potential.

A quick research for the NC miata shows OE tanks are ~\$65, and commercially made aluminum ones can be had ~\$130. If a team were to replace this part annually for reliability reasons, it would pay for itself after 2 years.

Any additional information:

PETITION 51 – WING VALUE

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Thomas Benham

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Wings, at a fixed point value of 10 points are too low, given their cost/complexity and speed potential. The FPV of a wing should be higher than other 10 point pieces such as: ign. coil, strut bar, accusump, or motor mounts.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

I believe when the FPV was assigned, few people were using wings, and few believed the speed potential of them, therefore the value assigned was low.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

I propose the FPV for wings be raised slowly over the course of several seasons starting with a grace period of no increase for 2022 and then an annual increase of two (2) points per year until an FPV of 25 points is reached for 2030 race season.

year	FPV
2022	10
2023	12
2024	14
2025	16
2026	18
2027	20
2028	22
2029	24
2030	25

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

- Reduced cost of car prep
- Reduced cost of car development
- Reduced speed
 - includes less speed creep

Any additional information:

People are resistant to change, and this could be considered a radical change but I believe if it is implemented slowly and with enough notice, any rewrite of the rules is possible. "The horse has left the barn." or "We've always done it this way." are poor excuses to live with a status quo that is not right.

PETITION 52 – RAIN LIGHT CONFIGURATION

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Hillar Kalda

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Rain lights - no standard configuration for setup of rain light behavior

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

The current rule is for the recommended implementation of rain lights, but does not provide clarity as to the configuration. From the rules, during rain, the light can be flashing at all times, and turn solid under braking, OR it can be solid at all times and flashing during braking.

9.9.5.3. Light may not be configured to flash at all times. It is only permitted to be flashing during rain/wet/fog/snow weather.

9.9.5.4. Light is permitted to turn on solid with the brakes. (This does not count as one of the four allowable brake lights)

Propose a solution or revised rule:

All cars should be configured the same way.
Steady-on always, blink upon braking.

9.9.5.6 Rain lights should be configured as follows (use only during rain/wet/fog/snowy weather):

Not braking: light on solid

Braking: light flashing

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Having a single rain light configuration would avoid confusion amongst drivers. If some cars have a blinking light always, and others have a solid light always, judging which car is braking under adverse conditions may be confusing. All of a sudden some lights are blinking under braking and others turn solid.

Also, imagine how disorienting it would be to be chasing a pack of cars and all you can see through the grayness of the water spray is a dozen rapidly blinking lights in your face, lap after lap.

By far, the better FIA rain light behavior is steady-on always, blink upon braking.

This way, drivers know what to expect when seeing a rain light in adverse weather.

Any additional information:

Also, NASA requires ""Steady-on always, blink upon braking"" behavior.

PETITION 53 – FLYWHEELS

Category:

Rule Clarification

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Flywheel Rule issued late for 2021.

In section 4.3.2,

Flywheel / Clutch - Aluminum / performance "light-weight" SFI recommended rated flywheels with stock type clutch: 10 pts

Flywheel / Clutch - Multi-disc and / or smaller diameter clutch/flywheel systems: 50 pts

In section 4.7.2

Flywheel - All flywheels must be OE, OE equivalent, or SFI rated. Unmodified, SFI rated steel flywheel with similar dimensions and stock type / single disc clutch are zero points. Dual-mass flywheels may be converted to single-mass meeting above specifications for zero points.

These rules are contradictory.

These rules do not make sense.

These rules create an additional hurdle for cars crossing into our series.

These rules prevent use of common and affordable parts, requiring potential use of expensive stock parts or incentivizing modification of stock parts, on a component that has safety impact but near zero performance impact.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

This was rushed through at the last minute for some reason? No idea what the thought process was. It makes zero sense.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Section 4.3.2 - Remove all references to flywheels.

Section 4.3.2 - Revise combined flywheel/clutch entry to say ""Clutch, Multiple Disk systems - 50 points""

Section 4.7.2 - Flywheels

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Removes rules that are not able to be understood from the rule book.

Removes contradictory and confusing statements from the book.

Eliminates charging for a common and normal upgrade made to cars that are expected to go racing. This will allow for easier cross-over from cars in other series.

Eliminates being concerned about something that is hard to check or see on some cars, particularly when we still struggle to notice/catch things that are obvious and easy to see.

Proposed Rule still prevents allowing expensive multi-disk clutches which may actually have a perceptible performance increase. A non-stock flywheel's performance increase is within rounding error of ZERO in the realm of champcar.

Any additional information:

This rule **MUST** be changed. It does **NOT** make sense. This is one of the largest glaring issues in the BCCR for 2021.

PETITION 54 – STEERING PARTS

Category:

Rule Clarification

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Power Steering Rules.

4.3.2: Power Steering - Electro-Hydraulic Power Steering conversion - 10 pts

4.7.3: Items that are point free: Power Steering Components

Tech Desk:

Article 172: 2021-01-01 - Steering Rack Conversion

Q.

In the case of older cars and many trucks, such as a pre-1998 Ford Ranger, that come with a steering box from factory, what is the point value to convert to a steering rack sourced from a vehicle on the VPI list?

Does this fall under the BCCR 4.3.2. Fixed Point Value List assignment of ""Power Steering components - 0 pts""?

A.

When changing from a steering box to a steering rack - 10 points

Article 81: 2020-02-06 - BMW Steering column

""Steering columns can be changed for zero points""

This info applies to any E36, E46, or really any car that uses a rubber steering guibo.

There are also aftermarket suppliers of entire lower steering column sections with both joints solid. That type part is not approved as a free add but is under review.

(article goes on with more detail on bmw application but its not relevant to the petition)

These rules are contradictory and confusing.

What specifically entails a power steering component? Where does this start? Where does this end? A definition is needed if this is to be clearly and equally understood and enforced.

Are outer tie rods ""power steering components""?

Are hydraulic power steering pump pulleys ""power steering components""?

Is a steering column a ""power steering component""?

Is a non-power steering rack a ""power steering component""?

What specifically is an electric-hydraulic power steering conversion? Does this only encompass power steering self-contained units which use an electric pump to generate hydraulic pressure (such as the common ""MR2"" pump)?

What about fully ""electric"" power steering? See S2000 steering rack or GM electric steering columns for examples of this.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Small changes over time, plus multiple people involved making decisions in separate locations and situations, resulted in a mix-match of rules

Propose a solution or revised rule:

There are two paths which could be taken.

Path A is to stop charging points for steering related components.

I will ignore this path in this petition.

Path B is to clearly indicate what is points and what is 0 points, while attempting to maintain the same situation as is currently enforced.

In my understanding, that situation is as follows:

Steering ""conversions"" are to be charged 10 points, regardless of type.

That would include

Fully electric steering

Electric-Hydraulic steering

Hydraulic steering

Note: De-powering stock components has generally been accepted as a 0-point mod and I don't think this counts as a ""conversion""

Steering Columns = 0 points, including the lower section. Switching to a fully aftermarket steering column with an aftermarket universal joint configuration and a heim joint holding it into the car has not been charged points in the past.

For example, converting from a hydraulic steering box to a hydraulic steering rack = 10 points

Converting from a hydraulic steering rack to an electric steering rack = 10 points

Converting from a manual steering rack to a different manual steering rack = 0 points

Converting from a hydraulic steering rack to different hydraulic steering rack = 0 points

Exchanging the pulley on a hydraulic pump = 5 points (included in the pulley rule)

Exchanging inner/outer tie-rods, regardless of steering type, = 0 points, except for bump-steer kits or heim joints.

A proposed rule fitting with path B would be as such:

4.3.2:

Steering Type Conversion (rack, box, electric, electric-hydraulic, hydraulic) = 10 points

Bump Steer Kits - 10 points

4.7.2:

Steering Column (from steering wheel to rack/box connection)

Steering Components (must maintain OE steering type) i.e. - tie rods, rack, box, pump, hoses, motors, mounts.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Attempt at a less confusing rule regarding power steering without allowing additional "free" parts.

Any additional information:

This rule gets very verbose quickly. I am sure there is a better way to word it while maintaining the current enforcement level.

PETITION 55 – EXTENDED BALL JOINTS AND CAMBER ADJUSTMENT

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Extended Lower Ball Joints vs Camber Plate points

Tech Desk Article # 163

2021-01-01 - Extended Lower Ball Joints

Q.

I'd like to confirm the value on extended lower ball joints since I'm not seeing these specifically in the BCCR and they are a pretty common aftermarket modification. These are used to reach higher dynamic negative camber values similar to offset bushings (5pts per corner). They are not adjustable and do not allow you to adjust caster like camber plates (10pts per corner).

A.

Extended lower ball joints are 5 points per corner.

Tech Desk Article # 109

Q.

I'd like a value on extended lower ball joints since I'm not seeing these specifically in the BCCR and they are a pretty common aftermarket modification as well as standard on NASA Spec Miata. These are used to reach higher negative camber values similar to offset bushings (5pts per corner). They do not allow you to adjust caster like camber plates (10pts per corner).

Stock Miata Lower Ball Joint Extended Miata Lower Ball Joint

A.

Aftermarket extended lower ball joints, used on Miatas to increase negative camber, are 5 points per corner.

BCCR 4.3.2:

Camber / caster adjustable plates / apparatus:

o Aftermarket (pair): 20 pts front, 20 pts rear

o Homemade (pair) 5 pts front, 5 pts rear

o Stock components (strut towers, suspension arms, sub-frames) re-drilled/slotted for adjustment: 0 pts

The issue here is that the Tech Desk has circumvented the BCCR and allowed a specific component to be installed at a point value less than the BCCR indicates.

The bccr says (if you select the relevant word from the slash statement)

""Camber Adjustable Apparatus"" - Aftermarket = 20 points per axle, Homemade 5 points per axle.

Extended lower ball joints are, as indicated by the Tech Desk questions above, Aftermarket apparatus designed to adjust camber. Therefore, they should be, per the BCCR, 20 points PER AXLE (10 per corner).

They are not, as the question indicates, similar to offset bushings - they are nothing like bushings. They allow the geometry to exceed specifications that would be achievable with worn stock components.

The tech desk instead assigned a value of 10 points per axle (5 per corner)

Why was this specific device for adjusting camber assigned a different value?

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

N/A

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Remove articles from Tech Desk. Enforce that Caster or Camber adjusting apparatus are valued as indicated in the BCCR

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Follow the BCCR as written instead of making up new values for parts.

Any additional information:

PETITION 56 – HOMEMADE VS AFTERMARKET CAMBER PLATES

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Homemade vs Aftermarket

BCCR 4.3.2:

Camber / caster adjustable plates / apparatus:

o Aftermarket (pair): 20 pts front, 20 pts rear

o Homemade (pair) 5 pts front, 5 pts rear

o Stock components (strut towers, suspension arms, sub-frames) re-drilled/slotted for adjustment: 0 pts

This is the only remaining item in the BCCR which specifically gives a reduced point value for a "homemade" component vs a commercially produced one.

I don't understand why champcar would be incentivizing that path.

The performance gain is theoretically the same (if anything, a homemade component made by a skilled fabricator would perform BETTER than a commercial one).

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Left over rule from a bygone era

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Suggested:

Set all Camber/Caster adjuster items to 2.5pts/corner

4.3.2 would read:

Camber and/or caster adjustable plates / apparatus: 2.5 pts/corner

Move this to section 4.7.7 (no cost items)

Stock components (strut towers, suspension arms, sub-frames) re-drilled/slotted for adjustment: 0 pts

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

The thought behind this is all "pointy end" teams are already optimized to use the "5 point" camber adjusters instead of the "20 point" camber adjusters. This just makes it simpler to enforce (no interpretation of "what is homemade?")

This also allows the "extended lower ball joints" to remain in use without point increase, but removes allowance given by the tech desk to use an obviously not homemade part at the homemade item cost.

The BCCR will be enforced as written and there will be no impact on overall speed.

Any additional information:

2.5 point items... 5 points would make more sense but it is what it is already

PETITION 57 – FLAGTRONICS

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

6.2.5. Flagtronics FT200 Wireless Flagging Display is recommended starting 6/1/2021. A Flagtronics FT200 will be required to compete as of 1/1/2022. You can bring your own or rent one from ChampCar.

6.2.5.1. For maximum performance, we recommend the FT200 be connected to 12V power via flying leads or a USB adapter (Type A plug) capable of 10W (5V 2A) or more. Lower power chargers will result in lower screen brightness.

6.2.5.2. If a Flagtronics FT200 is lost or broken, you agree to \$150 for it's replacement or you buy us a new one.

6.2.5.3 The FT200 and GPS antenna must be mounted per recommendation in the appendix.

This rule goes in DIRECT violation of champcar's mission statement

Taken directly from the website:

""ChampCar is North America's home for real, affordable, competitive endurance road racing.""

I am confused about how REQUIRING a brand new electronic widget installed in every competitor's car meets the ""Affordable"" part of our purpose.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Not Applicable

Propose a solution or revised rule:

6.2.5. Flagtronics FT200 Wireless Flagging Display is recommended starting 6/1/2021. You can bring your own or rent one from ChampCar.

The sub rules (6.2.5.x) are not relevant regardless. The power of the charger and type of wire needed is something that belongs in the widget's user manual, not our BCCR.

The cost of the Widget is depending on the sales price of the unit, which is yet un-announced. It is also subject to change more often than our BCCR, and therefore should be part of the rental agreement signed at the time of rental, not enshrined in the BCCR.

The antenna mounting should be in the widget's user manual, not in our BCCR.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Removes requirement for teams participating in a series proclaiming to be about Affordability to purchase a brand new, potentially expensive, electronic widget.

I am all for improving safety and protecting our customers/members. I want every team to have a safe, successful, and enjoyable event with us at the track EVERY time out. I am excited to see a member develop this new technology that has the potential to revolutionize the way F&S is performed at tracks. Being an early adopter for a new technologies is a great thing to support, and this one even has the potential to save the series money in the long run if successful. I am not suggesting we stop supporting or using this device completely.

However, as an amateur series we must carefully select which technologies we wish to utilize. We, in addition to our members, cannot afford to immediately adopt every new technology (or even every existing technology) related to racing.

What I am suggesting is that we do not REQUIRE teams to purchase or rent one of these devices until the technology has been proven, the system and its use are widely adopted, and the benefits are clear.

I feel it is my duty to represent the members or teams who race on a limited budget and to request that the requirement they spend an undisclosed amount of money to buy or rent this device after 1/1/2022 be removed from the BCCR.

Any additional information:

PETITION 58 – ALTERNATORS #2

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Alternator/Generator

4.7.2. Items that are point free:

- Alternator or Generator

This was changed as part of the 2020 rules updates

I can think of no positive benefits to allowing non-stock or non-OE alternators in the series.

This just opens the door for allowance of high-priced ""racing"" alternators which add reliability and reduce weight for teams which can afford it.

This adds another layer of confusion, because does it over-ride the pulley rule? If I install a non-stock alternator for 0-points per 4.7.2, and this non-stock alternator uses a non-stock engine accessory drive pulley, is that pulley subject to 0 points or 5 points?

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

No Idea

Propose a solution or revised rule:

- Alternator = 10 points, including pulley
(generators are obsolete in the automotive realm, not sure why that word was included)

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Removes a rules allowance which allows for increased spending (cost creep) and has potential to improve reliability.

The current rule does not benefit the series or its members through any of the following:

It does not have any cost-reduction potential

It does not have any safety benefits

It does not have any benefits for teams with minimal fabrication abilities

I am not sure why it was added in the first place, but it doesn't seem to fit with the goals of champcar.

Its a generally easy improvement to spot when looking at a car.

Any additional information:

PETITION 59 – FUEL CELL CAPACITY

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Roy Dietsch

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

There is a zero point competitive advantage to adding a fuel cell, which is also a costly endeavor. Fuel cells are a zero point modification which is trading dollars for speed/time, and adding a fuel cell could be a substantial competitive advantage. The safety of adding a fuel cell is countered by potential issues from hand made hoses a multitude of fittings, and in some cases, more risky mounting locations for the cell.

Power is limited by fuel, adding fuel capacity increases the potential for more power and speed creep.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Per Bill on the broadcast, the +2 gallon allowance was added to allow the use of off-the-shelf fuel cells.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

9.10.2.6.2 - EFFECTIVE 1/1/2023 Fuel cell capacity shall be limited to the stock, OEM fuel capacity, or less, for the make/model of car. Fuel cells larger than the stock capacity may use Fuel Cell Displacement Blocks, sold for such application, to reduce capacity of the fuel cell to or below the OEM fuel capacity limit.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This rule will reduce costs for new teams in these situations:

1. Teams who add a fuel cell to ""make it to two hours"".
2. Teams who add a fuel cell to support increased power.

These teams would spend between \$1,500 and \$4,000 for a complete fuel cell setup with at least 8 hours of installation.

This rule will increase costs for teams with fuel cells at the 2 gallon limit.

1. 2 gallons of displacement blocks cost just under \$200, and would take 30-90 minutes to install.

Any additional information:

I've spent nearly \$4,000 on a fuel cell, surge tank, pumps, hoses, fittings, connections, and materials to install a fuel cell in our Mazda Miata. We are doing this for a competitive advantage which will equate to ~2.55 seconds per lap for an 8 hour race at Road America. What's more, this cell will allow us to run a much more powerful swap (nearly 30rwhp more) in the future without the stint time penalties we currently have.

The stock tank is great, safe, and reliable. I am only doing this since its points free speed creep. I believe this is the exact type of ""loop hole"" that increases costs to be competitive and reduces parity in the field.

PETITION 60 – DUPLICATE OF #39 - REMOVED

Page Intentionally left blank

PETITION 61 – ROOKIE CLASS

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Lack of Rookie Class

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Not thought of yet

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Add a Rookie Class and award. A subclass designation for a Rookie Class Winner for the race, but still racing for the overall or a-b-c-d classes. A rookie team is defined as a new car team to Champcar with at least 50% of the team members new. The team will be eligible to be a rookie in that year of racing, team enters in 2021 they are a Rookie in that year only, etc. A single trophy, small, will be awarded at each race. EC cars not eligible for Rookie Class.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This can bring in new teams and have a starting point race for. A rookie team can have something to race for against other rookie teams. This can show that we appreciate new teams and want them to come to the series.

Any additional information:

PETITION 62 – TRINKETS

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Safety item

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Trinkets and items bolted to a car.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Do not allow trinkets or other type of items bolted to the car.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

We should not allow trinkets and other items to be bolted to the roof, hood or other part of the car that has no real function, can fall off the car and caused damage or harm to other vehicles. As much as I think it is cool and interesting to have certain items bolted to different parts of the car, if those items fall off the car can cause damage and wrecks for other vehicles. I have actually hit a briefcase in the past. I do not feel it is safe.

Any additional information:

PETITION 63 – ROLLING TECH

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Tech Lines - They take forever.

Its not tech's fault. They are always working very hard.

Its not teams fault. They usually have everything needed and organized, know what to expect, and help out.

Its just a time consuming process.

On weekends where we get a test day on Friday, its awful - it takes valuable track time away from teams who paid for it.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Its always been done this way.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Tech is annual. We want to see the car on a recurring basis, to ensure the safety gear is in place and in good shape.

We also want to ensure that the car is appropriately valued - IE, the team has claimed all appropriate parts, and they have correctly interpreted the values based on the currently enforced rules.

The rules are enforced and updated on a calendar year basis. I definitely get the argument for doing tech on a calendar year basis as well. HOWEVER, this is what leads to the MASSIVE tech lines at certain events.

There is already an expectation of responsibility on Teams. You are EXPECTED to accurately read and understand the rules. You are EXPECTED to honestly assess your vehicles value and all added/removed parts, and to indicate as such on the tech sheet.

You are EXPECTED to re-visit tech whenever something changes on the car.

Additionally, the intent of Tech, in my understanding, is primarily to assess safety and appearance items. The assessment of value is a secondary task, and it has been stated publicly before that tech personnel cannot be expected to be experts on every make/model, so the post-race impound period is the primary method for ""catching"" cars with inappropriately assigned values or unclaimed parts.

Therefore, I propose that from a safety stand point, it would be equally as effective to move to a ""rolling tech"" year. Each team is expected to bring their car through tech once every 365 days. You go through tech this year in June, then you are allowed to race next year in May without re-teching.

You are still expected to meet next years rules. If you don't claim a part and get caught in impound, the lack of going through tech under that ruleset is not an excuse. Its not functionally different than a team going through tech this year in January and making a change to the car in April but not going back through tech. It could easily be done intentionally, but in the current case and in this proposed case, we are relying on the honor system to ensure this doesn't happen.

This would drastically reduce the number of cars required to go through tech at the first race of the year, and theoretically over the course of a few years even out the amount of cars teching at each race.

Additionally, with the ongoing implementation of digital tech, champcar has software systems in place to know when a car was previously tech inspected. This could easily be reviewed manually, or implemented automatically, into the registration system to ensure this annual tech requirement is met (similar to the annual ""membership"" fee).

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

- Reduction in wait times at tech
- Happier customers
- Happier tech inspectors

Any additional information:

PETITION 64 – RAIN LIGHT CONFIGURATION #2

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Kerry Steed

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Safety : Rear Flashing rain/snow/fog lights are blinding, create distraction, during the rain and when combined with other cars equipped with similar setup they look like a safety vehicle causing confusion for drivers and should be eliminated.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Some cars cannot be seen in rain/fog/snow and thus create a safety hazard.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

I suggest as a replacement to the flashing light a solid light, continuously on, equal to or greater than the brightness of the brake lights for those team that feel a secondary safety light is necessary.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

REDUCE confusing RED FLASHING lights from multiple cars on the track as SAFETY VEHICLES rather than race cars.
REDUCE distraction from varying types and lumens of rain/snow/fog lights.

Any additional information:

Thank you

PETITION 65 – DECORATION LIGHTS

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Kerry Steed

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Multi colored lights located on the rear of the car thought to be front/side/or top of car. When looking down the end of the straight, at night, green, blue, white lights were seen that appeared to be the side of a car (possible spin/rollover/etc) causing abrupt braking that creates a safety hazard for all cars checking up due to the confusion of seeing multi colored lights from the rear.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Identification purposes at night

Propose a solution or revised rule:

I suggest that multicolored led lights only be visible from the sides of the race cars.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

REDUCE confusion for drivers at night in inclement weather thus increasing safety.

Any additional information:

Thank you

PETITION 66 – SUPERSEDED PORSCHE PARTS

Category:

VPI Values

Member Name:

Nathan Gardiner

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Leeway is being given to porsches to claim a wide variety of bolt-on upgrades from better porsche models which were not part of the 'standard offering' on the claimed model.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

ChampCar set the VPI for each make/model/year based on the performance and performance potential of the vehicles. Only 'standard trim' models were considered because they are the vehicles readily available and likely to be built. Limited edition and special custom models are not allowed at the designated VPI because it would create an unfair advantage to teams with the means to acquire one of these ""better"" versions if they were allowed to claim the same VPI as the standard models.

See note 3 on the VPI tables:

Note #3 - All models must be standard factory offerings. Special, custom or limited editions are not included in this VPI table

It has been claimed by some competitors that, according to Porsche, any part from a different model which can be bolted on could have been requested as a factory upgrade. Therefore, any of these parts would be legal to use for the standard model because they could have been delivered from the factory with those parts.

It has also been claimed that some parts are hard to find and the part numbers have been superseded by Porsche to newer, better components never offered on the original car. They claim that because Porsche superseded the part numbers, that those parts are legal to use on the original base model.

Without the means to properly investigate these claims and without a rigid rule in place determining what is or is not a legal stock part for these models, ChampCar has allowed these upgrade parts to be used for 0 points.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

1) ChampCar cannot allow this mixing and matching of bolt-on Porsche parts because it invalidates the Porsche VPIs. ChampCar had a specific model and part offering in mind when they established the VPI table. If teams now have Porsches with better ""factory"" parts, then the VPI is too low.

2) Since ChampCar must no longer allow this mixing and matching of non-stock bolt-on parts, it needs a reference document to establish just what parts are going to be considered ""stock"". For BMWs the bible for stock parts is ""realoem.com"" it very clearly details exactly which parts were standard on each model / year / trim level. Porsches are also listed on RealOEM, but the entries aren't as specific, this listing for instance includes all parts used on 944 / 9442 / 944s2 / manual / automatic / turbocharged, and it is difficult to see which parts were stock to one trim but not another (for reference: https://nemigaparts.com/cat_spares/pet/porsche/9442/508u/1/). There must exist some list showing exactly what parts were stock on each model, it just has to be found (or created). This list, once we have it, would be the definitive ruler on what parts are stock or not stock for each Porsche model.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

- VPI would accurately reflect the performance of the cars.
- Porsche teams who haven't added on these 'not actually stock, stock parts' won't be at a disadvantage.
- Clarity to all teams on knowing what parts are or are not allowed.

Any additional information:

PETITION 67 – DRIVERS DOOR HEIGHT

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Thomas O'Rourke

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

75% of a drivers door on some cars is to low for safety issues

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

ease of entry or exit from the car?

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Driver side door must be 90% of the original door Height

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Keeping drivers safe and protected is key to the survival of this amazing series

Any additional information:

I have seen cars at the 75% rule, where you see mostly drivers body only protected by a window net, Unfortunately some day some driver could get seriously injured. When I ask why they do it, they respond "because the door gets bent when people sit on it."

PETITION 68 – FUEL JUGS ON PIT WALL

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Thomas O'Rourke

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Fuel jugs on the pit wall can start on fire when fueling is taking place just inches away.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

NA

Propose a solution or revised rule:

All fuel jugs must remain on the ground until the time to pass a full fuel jug to the fueler.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

In the event there is a fire during fueling, the pit area and the person handing jugs will not be involved in the fire.

Any additional information:

PETITION 69 – FUEL CELL OVERFLOW LINE

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Thomas O'Rourke

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Fuel cells should be REQUIRED to have overflow lines, aside from the vent lines.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Do not know why it is not required.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Many cars equipped with large fill tubes can carry nearly 3 gallons of gas. A fill tube is not rated to "Store" fuel in the fuel system. Requiring the overflow line should prevent these long tubes from having fuel inside them.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Having fuel only stored inside the fuel cell will stop fuel from leaking out of the vent lines onto the race track. Also fuel stored in a filler neck outside of the SFI rated storage unit, can prevent the possibility of a car starting on fire during a crash and burning a driver or track crew.

Any additional information:

PETITION 70 – CHAMPCAR STAFF TO EC

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Benjamin Robertson

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

The board hires Tech... Tech reviews Board at tech & impound... Tech has a fiscal motivation to look a different direction or look harder at other cars at impound and not to review the persons whom sign their pay check.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Small club... run by racers (this is a good thing)

Propose a solution or revised rule:

2.2.6 ChampCar staff may enter in races but any car driven by staff shall be immediately classified in EC.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Due to possible conflicts staff should not participate in the 'classed' races. Members of Tech, Board members, TAC, or even the IT guy should race, but in EC.

Any additional information:

PETITION 71 – LEXAN IN DRIVERS WINDOW

Category:

Safety

Member Name:

Mike Miskoe

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

The allowance for lexan/polycarbonate in-fill panel at DRIVER side window is too small to properly address the need to keep hands inside the cockpit with certain cars. Allowing this in-fill panel to be bigger than 80 square inches would help people build a car that meets the requirements of tech while not creating a measurable change in performance.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

The rule is needed to allow a better covering of the drivers window area since most window nets are not the same size or shape as the opening.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

3.5.1.2 Clear Lexan/Polycarbonate may be used to supplement the closure of the drivers side window opening at the A-pillar. Material must be 1/8" to 1/4" thick, securely attached and close the gap between A-pillar and the window net. In-fill panel may not be used at the B-pillar end of the window opening, nor may it overlap any part of the window net by more than 1". Window nets may not be cut or trimmed to make their front to back dimension smaller than as manufactured.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This would allow an easier method of closing this area than trial and error of sourcing and finding window nets. It is a common problem in tech that the gap at the front of the window net is bigger than desired.

Any additional information:

PETITION 72 – 2 DAY HANDICAP (MOV)

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Mike Miskoe

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Day Two Handicap does not fit the intent of Champcar to encourage people to get on track and promotes sand-bagging on day one of a two day event.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

5.6.1 Day Two Handicap - I don't have any understanding of what the intent was other than to stop an over-dog team from winning two days in a row.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Eliminate section 5.6 Day Two Handicap.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

If someone is clever, lucky, smart etc. enough to succeed on day one of an event, they should not be penalized for it. The rule does not provide victory penalties from one event to another, why should a two-day event be different? There is no other provision that handicaps a car that wins (no rewards weight, added points etc). The second day of a two-day event can be a completely different race than day one from a perspective of weather, luck, starting position, etc, so it should be treated that way with respect to previous finishing position.

Any additional information:

Champcar is not Lemons. The rule reads as "sour grapes" and is the ONLY part of Champcar that does anything except work hard to see that people get to go racing and enjoy it.

PETITION 73 – MENTOR PROGRAM

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

New members entering the series could use some help

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

We do not have a program to help new members

Propose a solution or revised rule:

A mentor program for new teams. Have experienced members mentor new members or teams. This would help invite new members, make sure they stay on track with their build and expectations, have help throughout the new team process and set up new teams for success long term. Have a detailed plan on the program, how it would be run, who would be involved, what qualifications to a mentor, benefits of being a mentor in champbucks, ect. Program guidelines - This is fluid and would change over time as the program evolves and we learn from it.

Mentor- specific requirements with tenure, rule knowledge, driver etiquette knowledge, specific car knowledge, and location of the mentor.

Match new teams to mentor in the area or the specific car type. We could also have dual mentors if one is in the area and one that is car specific knowledge.

We could assign two mentors per team based on car and mentor location as needed.

Mentor would earn Champbucks when the new team enters their first race.

A Mentor would accompany the new team to the first race or few races.

New teams would be teamed up in the pits with an experienced mentor team that will help out the new teams.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

I think this would really help new teams and show that Champcar really cares about the new guy and what is going on. It would help new teams enter the series and have a higher rate of entry for new teams.

Any additional information:

PETITION 74 – VALVE SPRINGS WITH CAM

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Mike Harris

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Camshafts cost 50 points, but almost all camshafts come with matching springs. If you add nonstandard valvetrain that is another 50 points which brings you to as much as a turbo or supercharger for much less gain. As I see it once you pay the extra 50 points for nonstandard valvetrain you are free to do anything you want, oversize Ti valves, Ti retainers, full Jesel shaft rocker system, adjustable timing sprockets. It would be much easier to allow springs with the cam and not open up the spending that could come with nonstandard valvetrain.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

The rules as they are now seem to be based on the assumption that only domestic V8 teams would do a cam swap, which is why the lifters are included. Some SOHC or DOHC engines don't even have lifters but do have other hardware in the valvetrain that needs to be changed with a cam.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Camshaft+lifters+valve springs 50 points per engine.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This would allow you to run springs that fit your camshaft without opening the door to extensive modifications covered by the 50 point nonstandard valvetrain.

Any additional information:

PETITION 75 – VALVE SPRINGS

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Mike Harris

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

In order to run upgraded valve springs, you must claim nonstandard valvetrain at 50 points. As I see it once you pay the extra 50 points for nonstandard valvetrain you are free to do anything you want, oversize Ti valves, Ti retainers, full Jesel shaft rocker system, adjustable timing sprockets. It would be much better to give valve springs only a smaller points value like 5 points per engine, and not open up the spending that could come with nonstandard valvetrain. This could even help teams who run the stock camshafts, for some older cars stock springs are not easy to find, and uprated springs could help prevent costly engine failures. I have watched front running teams sort through dozens of stock springs to find the best set, and they did this after every race. After all we allowed free suspension springs for a few cars with the exact same logic a few years ago. In the end allowing upgraded valve springs could be a cost saver, since if a team wanted to run a bigger camshaft, they would still be discouraged by the 50 point price for camshafts.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

No idea, including valve springs with things like oversized valves, or expensive rocker arm systems doesn't seem to fit

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Valve springs 5 points per engine. Making them free would be even better for the cost savings of reduced engine failures. Lots of other things that make much more difference are free already.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

You would allow teams to upgrade their valve springs for low or zero points to help prevent engine failures.

Any additional information:

PETITION 76 – KUMHO V720 RESTRICTION

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Roy Dietsch

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Hot tire compounds are markedly faster, wear faster, and more expensive, reducing parity in the series of those with financial means and those without.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

180 UTQG limits were put in place to limit tires to affordable and a low-wear category of tire.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

4.8.1.2 Kumho Ecsta V720 tires are not allowed in CCES.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Its a cheater tire. Extremely expensive, high wear, and seconds faster. If you don't ban it, someone will run it and destroy everyone, and that someone might even be me.

Any additional information:

PETITION 77 – LIST OF DISALLOWED TIRES

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Roy Dietsch

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Hot tire compounds are markedly faster, wear faster, and more expensive, reducing parity in the series of those with financial means and those without.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

180 UTQG limits were put in place to limit tires to affordable and a low-wear category of tire.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

4.8.1.2 Effective 1/1/2023 the following tire compounds will be disallowed from ChampCar Podium competition but will be allowed in EC (Exception Class).

Kumho Ecsta V720 ACR
BFGoodrich Rival S 1.5
Yokohama Advan A052
Bridgestone RE-71R

Compounds which have a significant performance advantage and high wear rates may be added to this list.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

To reduce expenses and increase parity within the series between teams with financial means and those without.

Any additional information:

PETITION 78 – DUCT TAPE

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Roy Dietsch

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Excessive use of duct-tape to create parts is effectively free material and is not within the written rule, nor the intent

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Duct tape, and other tape is allowed to attach things to other things.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

4.7.2: • Hardware, fasteners, and materials used to attach things to other things (nuts, bolts, screws, rivets, duct tape, bailing wire, zip ties, JB Weld, etc.)

Hardware, fasteners, and materials used to create parts or body panels shall be charged material points or points per the fixed point list. Tape of body panel seams or to cover holes will be allowed for no points, unless the tape become integral to the function of the panel, IE: ""swiss cheesing"" of panels and covering with tape.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will better clarify the existing intent of the rule of which a liberal interpretation is being taken advantage of.

Any additional information:

PETITION 79 – YELLOW FLAG RULE

Category:

Race Procedure

Member Name:

Troy Truglio

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Yellow Flag Rule

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

There is not a defined yellow flag rule in the BCCR and we should have one.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Yellow flag procedure. Yellow flag rule is line of sight of flagstand with yellow showing. When you see a yellow flag you are to slow down and get into single file line. You will be in single file line until you are at the next manned flag station that does not show the yellow flag or shows a green flag. You can race when you see the next flag station. Standing yellow flag is 70% race speed and waiving yellow is 50% race speed.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Written rule about the yellow flag process instead of a pre race video.

Any additional information:

PETITION 80 – SPLITTER/DIFFUSER DIMENSIONS

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Chris Huggins

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

A splitter is any horizontal device installed from the centerline of the front axle extending a maximum of 12" out of the front of the vehicle.

The ""centerline"" wording was added in 2020. In Jan 2021 it was enforced in an impound event with a ruler. Some cars have subframes which do not permit mounting things to them exactly at the centerline of the wheels. Specifically on front wheels, the caster of the suspension moves the centerline of the front wheels ahead of most of the suspension and subframe mounting bits.

On the rear wheels, sometimes the floor pan or subframe bits may be just in front of the centerline of the rear wheels.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

To ensure that teams running full under-trays didn't attempt to claim only a splitter and diffuser and say the splitter ran until the middle of the car and the diffuser ran to the rear of the car.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Provide some lee-way on splitters and diffusers mounting to make installing them a bit more flexible. 8-10"" either way isn't going to make a functional difference in speed, but it can certainly make a team question participation when they have to change something, again, because of an arbitrary rule.

""between the wheels"" is center aero

""between the wheel-wells"" is center aero

""1/3, 1/3, 1/3"" aero rule

I understand the need to ""Draw the line somewhere"", however in the interest of allowing more participants to easily join our group and pass through tech without getting surprised or sent off to do additional work, we should carefully consider where to draw that line in relation to how these components are commonly made and installed.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

Allow a bit more flexibility in mounting of aero devices underneath the car.

Mounting to a subframe in a secure method should be seen as positive - IE less potential aero related debris on the track, versus mounting to bumpers or spare tire wells or something else flimsy under the car.

Any additional information:

For transparency: This is written in frustration as I just learned my splitter, which was 10 points in 2018, became 20 points in 2019, is now going to be 30 points in 2021 since it mounts to my front subframe, which is behind the ""centerline"" of the front wheels, by 6""

PETITION 81 – DUPLICATE OF #78 - REMOVED

Page Intentionally left blank

PETITION 82 – VEHICLE WRAP

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Roy Dietsch

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Paint and vehicle wrap is not covered in the BCCR

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

Paint is implied, vehicle wrap may not be.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

4.7.2 - Vehicle wrap less than 5mil(125 microns) thickness applied to body panels

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This will provide a guideline to distinguish between plastic material which is points and wrap which is free.

Any additional information:

PETITION 83 – DBW THROTTLE BODY

Category:

Rule Change

Member Name:

Mike Harris

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Drive by wire throttle body replacement tech ruling doesn't make sense.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

An answer to a tech desk ticket. Stated that you could replace a DBW throttle body with a cable throttle body from the same engine family. Some newer engines never had a cable option. In another example a 2L MZR from a miata is only available DBW, some early Focus and Rangers using the same engine family used a cable throttle, but it is a completely different bolt pattern and would require an adapter. On the other hand a Ford 4.6 modular throttle body had the exact same bolt pattern and exact same butterfly diameter.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

DBW throttle body replacement. Any throttle body with the same or smaller flow diameter.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

This would make it easier to use some more modern engines in older cars. The only possible performance improvement from converting to a cable throttle would be if you increased the flow diameter, which with this rule would still cost 25 points as always

Any additional information:

PETITION 84 – SWAPPED VPI LIST

Category:

VPI Value

Member Name:

Mike Harris

Identify the issue, as you perceive it:

Weights on the swap calculator are constantly being manipulated to allow popular combinations to race regardless of what the calculator would assign without the manipulated weights.

Identify, if possible, your understanding of why the current rule or process was initiated and put into place:

The swap calculator was a big step in the right direction, much better than the old cost based swap rules. There are a few shortcomings, if you change the VPI of the base car, it changes things for teams who race the car without a swap. Manipulating the weights makes a mockery of using a calculated formula.

Propose a solution or revised rule:

Swapped vehicle performance index. ChampCar now has years of data on swapped cars raced under the calculator rules. Review these values, adjust them if tech feels it necessary, and add the swapped VPI to the official VPI list. Make the swap calculator for internal use only by tech for any team who wanted to race a swap not on the VPI list. If a team wanted to race a swap not on the list they would have to petition ChampCar for a swapped VPI just like a team must do now if they want to race a car not on the list.

Provide a list of the positive changes and/or rationale for implementing the proposed solution or revised rule:

It would make it easier for a new team to come in to ChampCar if they knew the VPI of the swapped car they wanted to race. Any argument over car - engine VPI would be exactly the same as the current arguments over non swapped VPI. It would still be possible to bring new combinations into the series, but as soon as it is assigned a VPI everyone would know what the new combination would race at.

Any additional information: