

Minutes of the NARRC Committee held November 13, 2010  
At Fairport, New York

Present: G. Bloeser, H. Denham, C. Franson, J. Hanifan, E. Hurlbut, C. Morales (part), C. Mosley, B. O'Connor, D. Panas, D. Patullo, D. Perlman, J. Rigoli, D. Stewart

**C. Mosley** welcomed all to the meeting.

He noted that during last season (2010) after the committee had agreed to a "no drops" format, that an email campaign resulted in a "drop" format being accepted. He also noted that at the end of the year there was a concern regarding crowning champions due to their not having achieved the points levels agreed upon in past meetings.

**Mosley** also remarked that the NARRC Series needs to be pushed and emphasized since there are also several other Regional series that run concurrently with NARRC.

### Schedule

After discussion, the committee agreed upon the following dates / events as being the NARRC schedule for 2011.

May 7-8	Pocono	Double race
May 28-29	NHMS	Double race
June 18	LRP	Single race
July 2	LRP	Single race
July 23-24	WGI	Double race
Aug 20-21	NJMP	Double race
Sept 30-Oct 1	LRP	Single race (double points)

### Points

A situation arose in 2010 whereby some confusion arose regarding the number of points required / acquired, versus the number of races entered in order to be called a "class champion".

Various people expressed a concern that points alone were not enough of a criterion for a person to be a class champion. The number of events entered should also be included in that mix.

**J. Rigoli** noted that in one class there were 31 entrants, however very few people ran more than two races. The question arose that people were not running for the Championship, but were merely running races. It was felt by the Committee that participation and not merely numbers of points should be considered to crown a champion.

**D. Patullo** noted that under the current point structure, a person could win all three Lime Rock races and accumulate enough points to be considered a champion without

ever going to another track. This would not be the case with any other track on the schedule.

**C. Mosley** suggested that a minimum number of races should be attended in order to be champion, and that number would mean that a competitor had to travel to various tracks in order to win.

It was noted that in 2011 there are 11 races scheduled vs. 8 in 2010. Therefore a driver has an increased chance to accumulate the points necessary to be a champion, and in that case, should drops be allowed.

The initial feeling of the committee was that if no drops were permitted that there would be a grass roots movement, as there was in 2010, to change that format.

It was also noted however that with the 2011 schedule as agreed upon, there is only one trip scheduled to each of the “outlying” tracks (New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Watkins Glen) and therefore given the percentage of people in each of the classes that actually seemed like they were running the Series, rather than just attending races convenient to them, allowing no drops would eliminate the possibility of an “accidental” class winner.

**D. Perlman** – Do we still give bonus points? No, we stopped those two years ago.

**D. Patullo** – we got into trouble using bonus points system to push people to certain races.

**C. Mosley** – Can we get agreement on starts necessary to qualify? 50% plus one. That’s 6 starts.

**C. Morales** – There’s no way you can get 6 starts without going to three tracks. And if you don’t finish the race you don’t get the points.

**D. Patullo** – We give 10 points for a DNF.

**Without a motion, the committee agreed that 6 starts would be required to qualify for a class championship with no minimum points required.**

A discussion followed regarding the number of people entering a specific number of races. It was determined that in 2010 only one person ran all the NARRC races. This led to a discussion of whether “drops” should be allowed. This included analyzing the number of people in each class who would have been affected by drops. The number was minimal.

**B. O’Connor – Motion – That no drops be allowed in the 2011 NARRC Championship.**

**J. Hanifan – 2<sup>nd</sup>.**

Discussion included the realization that the format of the series has been tinkered with every year. It was the opinion of the Committee that what we adopt here should be left in place for at least a couple years to see what the true effects are. Once this Committee decides upon a format, participants are going to have to live with it until it can be proved that it's wrong.

**After considerable discussion the motion was carried unanimously.**

### **Promotion**

**B. O'Connor** – It used to be that NARRC was the premier series in the North East. It was the counterpoint to MARRS. Now we have many other series that people can win and NARRC is diminishing in prestige. What can we do to make our races better?

We can't make them cheaper because we can't afford to do that – but how do we make them better?

**J. Rigoli** – when I ask our guys what they want, longer races, more qualifying, etc., they want more races. Not longer races, just more races. At the NARRCoffs in October, some of the Miatas ran three classes.

**D. Perlman** – we ran 32 lap races then. We timed it out and it seemed that that would work. We wanted to get the guys the most track time we could. Shorter races means that they're paying for track time that they don't get. With short races you've got a lot of wasted time in between races. So the answer really is longer races.

**J. Rigoli** – I've walked the paddock at Lime Rock and New Hampshire and when I ask the guys they say that after 10 laps the race is over – now they're just hanging on till the end.

More similar discussion ensued regarding race lengths and qualifying procedures.

On the question of making races "better", suggestions included pictures of the winners, champagne on a podium, uniformity of trophies, banners, and more promotion. Possibly having the podium at tech so that trophies can be awarded to the winners in front of their fellow racers. Some of the series that seem to be organized the best have common elements at every race, the same podium, signage, promotion, etc. It's the predictability of what's there that draws entrants.

**C. Mosley** – If we want to build the series, we need to promote ourselves. Maybe we need to have a NARRC representative at each race to make sure that things are run the way we want them; so that people know that you're a representative of the NARRC Committee and that you're available to answer questions and to take problems back to the Committee.

## **Reserved Numbers**

Because a lot of people don't race the entire series a lot of numbers go unused at any given race. A question was asked as to what other Regions do in regard to releasing reserved numbers. Feedback from Registrars have indicated that if the reserved numbers were released a week or two before the event instead of being held open to the "drop-dead" date it would be easier for them.

Discussion continued trying to evaluate various time frames for this procedure. It was noted that various Regions tend to ignore the published release date. It was also noted that numbers issued to racers in one end of the Division don't get seen at the other end. This results in unnecessary number changes. The intermingling of various Series at certain tracks can also be a problem. (MARRS, NARRC, NERRC, etc.)

Holding a reserved number until close to the race day – say, the Tuesday before the race – means that if someone has requested that number his entry is in limbo until the driver with the reserved number either enters or doesn't. This can result in last minute problems.

**J. Rigoli – Motion – That reserved numbers be held up to 10 days before the event and at that point all numbers may be released.**

**B. O'Connor – 2<sup>nd</sup>**

**Motion – carried unanimously.**

## **NARRCoffs Course**

A question was posed regarding running the Pro racing course for the NARRCoffs using either one of the new Lime Rock track configurations. It was rejected in favor of the Classic course.

## **NARRCoffs Invitations**

**J. Hanifan** – proposed that invitations be sent to the class winners (possibly through 3<sup>rd</sup> place) to the other Series in the NEDiv to come to the NARRCoffs.

Discussion ensued regarding inviting people to the NARRCoffs as opposed to another invitational race for the champions from all the NEDiv Series currently operating. It was decided that due to people running concurrently the NARRC, NERRC, NYSRRC, etc. Series that such an event would amount to a NARRC / MARRS event.

After much discussion as to the complications involved with such an undertaking no conclusion was reached.

**E. Hurlbut** – reminded people that the rules for any NARRC specific classes that need changing / updating should be completed as soon as possible and sent to the webmasters for inclusion on the NESCCA website.

## **Class Changes**

**J. Rigoli** – indicates that his observations indicate that SSM is declining as a viable class in the North East portion of the Division. Later models of Miatas have taken over much of what was a well subscribed class.

Discussion followed regarding:

- people who run both classes (SM & SSM) and the number of increased entries that brings to an event.
- some of the specific changes needed to bring older SSM cars up to SM specs
- self-policing of both SSM and SM cars.
- that there was a reason for starting SSM in the first place which is now going away.

No decisions were reached and it was agreed to table this discussion until March.

## **Winners Stickers**

The question was asked as to what happened to the plan to have winners' stickers for NARRC. Supposedly the artwork was delivered to D. Anthony. B. O'Connor said that he would contact DA to get the work done.

## **Treasurer's Report**

After the meeting was adjourned a treasurer's report was received indicating that the NARRC account has \$18,323.84 in it and that the only money being spent currently is for jackets and trophies.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dave Panas, Secretary