



Welcome to the PKRA Forum



Phoenix Kart Racing Association -> [General discussion](#) -> General -> View Thread

You are logged in as a guest. ([logon](#) | [register](#))

Eliminating Motul as a spec oil [Frozen] Moderators: [Brian Noel](#) Jump to page : [1](#) [2](#) Now viewing page 2 [25

messages per page]

[View previous thread](#) :: [View next thread](#)

[Message format](#)

Frozen

[General discussion](#) -> [General](#)

Barry Davies

PKRA Board Member Emeritus Posts: 308 ★★

Posted 2009-07-17 10:44 AM (#7350 - in reply to #7349) **Subject:** RE: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

|Eric Wuestenhofer - 2009-07-17 9:32 AM I am sticking with motul!
err, actually if you use motul, you wont be sticking - isn't that the idea?! (sorry couldn't resist) Barry

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)



Ted Tucholski

Posts: 115 ★

Posted 2009-07-17 12:00 PM (#7352 - in reply to #7349) **Subject:** RE: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

If we are going to quote the IKF rules manual as gospel then according to rule 675.21 Rotax motors will run under the Rotax Max Challenge rules in any local or IKF event. That means Motul is the legal oil for any Rotax engine. I also find it ironic how the club appeared to be supporting a Rotax series here and even promoting the class locally, then they send the Motul oil packing. The oil decision seems to be an very anti-Rotax. Is that the real intent behind the oil decision? Are there any local engine builders here that are certified Rotax mechanics. I know I am not, but I still support the Rotax idea locally. Edited by Ted Tucholski 2009-07-17 12:04 PM

Dave Van Gordon

📄 **Posted** 2009-07-17 6:16 PM (#7358 - in reply to #7352) **Subject:** RE: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

PKRA ChampionPosts: 76★☆☆

NHRA checks about 30 different kinds off fuel every weeked they manage to make it work! like they said if you think some body is cheating send it out to get it checked.

Jeff Eckart

📄 **Posted** 2009-07-17 6:29 PM (#7359 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

Posts: 14★

If this ruling is merely mistaken judgement, or worse, how is it undone without affecting the integrity of our club and prevented in the future. Is there a procedure? The new ruling has not seen the track yet. Can it be undone as easily as enacted?

Chris Fosso

📄 **Posted** 2009-07-17 6:47 PM (#7360 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil



"Larry"Posts:

352★☆☆☆☆Location: Glendale

why could it not be "undone" >? seemed to come up with it without club member input.....undo it the same way as the "did" it ... no one has raced yet on this bean oil. or at least lean towards what steve R. said..... make a time frame both oils can be used until...this gets resolved.....then put it on the slate to get voted on(by members)for a new season....not just change it on a whim in the middle of a year>?.. i don't think that is much to ask or sounds unreasonable

Randy Lyon

📄 **Posted** 2009-07-17 8:28 PM (#7362 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** RE: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil



PKRA

Forum AdminPosts: 720★☆☆Location: Scottsdale, Arizona

Jeff and Chris,

I believe it is possible and appropriate to ask for a vote on issues that affect all racers. According to a post Barry made last year, such votes take 30 days or more. I assume that's to make sure everyone knows and has a chance to think about it.

Its a separate issue, but in light of the 30 day delay for votes, it seems reasonable that future decisions which affect all racers should be announced at least 30 days before they go into effect, so members have a chance to override it with a vote.

Perhaps the board would agree to postpone the oil change until a vote could be taken, if a formal request for a vote is submitted by Monday's meeting. From everything I've read and heard, there was no pressing need to make a change by next weekend. I suspect the board did not anticipate members would want it put to a vote and saw no harm in a short notice.

But if members want a vote, someone needs to make that formal request.

Update 2009-07-20: I see that the oil change was announced in the June 9th PKRA Newsletter. I apologize for implying there was not 30 days notice of the change.

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Chris Fosso

Posted 2009-07-17 8:33 PM (#7363 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil



"Larry"Posts:

352★☆☆☆☆Location: Glendale

how is a "formal request " made>?

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Kurt Deibel

Posted 2009-07-17 9:34 PM (#7364 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

Posts: 13★

Mr Hall thank you for the comment and the invitation. I must however decline. I was heavily involved in the SKUSA races in Tucson and never got a chance to race. There is no racing in Tucson so I joined the club in Phoenix and have had a spendid time. I did at your suggestion look at your post in the Technical Discussion Thread. This prompted me to do my own research, and the following is what I discovered. The first rule you quote (601.1.4) " The goal of these rules is to insure that all entries in a class are running the same fuel." this actually is refering only to the (3) previous entries (601.1.1, 601.1.2, 601.1.3,) where the rules give the option of either the track bringing pump gas to the track or selecting a gas station in close proximity to the track, a single pump must be selected for use. This means (601.1.4) has no validity in our situation as we use race fuel from one source and pump gas whould be easily detected. The other rule you quote is (601.1.6.4 c) this rule only and exclusively pertains to the "Germaine Fuel Test" and is not applicable in our particular situation (601.1.6.4.b) says the following " the test is only to be used under controlled spec fuel situation with fuel purchased at the track under closely monitored conditions". This is not the fact in our club. I believe rules should not be quoted to support a position unless they apply. This looks like "cherry picking" and is counter productive. I also contacted a Tech Director with IKF and SKUSA and your assurtion that tech will "speed-up" is somewhat quetionable, about the only that would be more time consuming is (4) four numbers must be remembered instead of (2) two numbers. It did come to light that adjusting and recalibrating for the change in ambient temperature apparently is somewhat time consuming and must be done frequently as the temperature changes. I also perused the 2008 PKRA Pre and

Post-Technical Reference Manual this indicates that Ron Hall is the Technical Director and the Committee Members are Tom Miller, Darryl Pattulo, and Bill Spicknall, during further investigation it came to my attention that Mr. Pattulo is no longer part of the committee which leaves only one person on the committee who is an engine builder, Ron Hall. To the best of my knowledge neither of the two remaining members are engine builders or have "technical" experience, I appreciate all who give their time but someone on the technical committee should have technical experience. How long has this been the case? A true Technical Committee would have many, if not all of the engine builders who supply motors to the membership on the committee. This is what should be strived for as it would insure that all are represented and none are excluded. In closing I would like to reiterate that my experience at PKRA has been a high point in my life in the past year, and that everyone would give of their time, energy and expertise to make PKRA a great place is appreciated every time I am fortunate enough make it to the races.

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Chris Fosso



"Larry" Posts:

352 ★★★★★ Location: Glendale

Posted 2009-07-17 9:51 PM (#7365 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

so.....Ron Hall is a local engine builder in area.....and has people with his engines racing at PKRA(that he sold to them).....and.....he is the guy that does the tech inspection for club>?.....hmm....curious

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Randy Lyon



PKRA

Forum Admin Posts: 720 ★★★★★ Location: Scottsdale, Arizona

Posted 2009-07-18 8:38 AM (#7366 - in reply to #7364) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

Kurt Deibel - 2009-07-17 9:34 PM I also perused the 2008 PKRA Pre and Post-Technical Reference Manual this indicates that Ron Hall is the Technical Director and the Committee Members are Tom Miller, Darryl Pattulo, and Bill Spicknall, during further investigation it came to my attention that Mr. Pattulo is no longer part of the committee which leaves only one person on the committee who is an engine builder, Ron Hall. To the best of my knowledge neither of the two remaining members are engine builders or have "technical" experience, I appreciate all who give their time but someone on the technical committee should have technical experience. How long has this been the case? A true Technical Committee would have many, if not all of the engine builders who supply motors to the membership on the committee. This is what should be strived for as it would insure that all are represented and none are excluded.

Chris Fosso - 2009-07-17 9:51 PM so.....Ron Hall is a local engine builder in area.....and has people with his engines racing at PKRA(that he sold to them).....and.....he is the guy that does the tech inspection for club>?.....hmm....curious

We tried to get an engine builder from out of state who would fly in to our races at his/her expense and who never did work for any member and refuses to do work for any club members in the future. Believe it or not, we couldn't find a single one. 🙄 But seriously, Kurt, Chris and others (myself included) sure it would be great if our technical committee was filled wall to wall with technical experts and our tech director had zero possible conflicts of interest but those people aren't lining up to volunteer for the jobs. If we want a discussion on how to get more technical people involved or how to pay for someone with no connection to the club or its members, please start another thread. But as long as board members and committee members are volunteers, they will certainly make decisions that could benefit themselves or people they have a personal relationship with. So its pointless to hint at POSSIBLE conflicts of interest. THEY ALL HAVE THEM. If you think someone threw the club under the bus for personal gain, vote them out of office and/or call for member voting on specific issues. Unless someone has a copy of a check from Burris to Ron, lets just discuss the merits of the change and how to reverse it if that's what the members want. While Ron and ALL the volunteers have a POSSIBLE conflict of interest, what is not in question is that every one has given

their time and effort so that the rest of the members have a great place to practice and race. And they ALL deserve our respect and gratitude.

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Randy Lyon

Posted 2009-07-18 9:23 AM (#7367 - in reply to #7363) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil



PKRA

Forum AdminPosts: 720★☆☆Location:
Scottsdale, Arizona

|Chris Fosso - 2009-07-17 8:33 PM how is a "formal request " made>?

That should be covered in the ByLaws accessible from the Rules page of the club website. I don't know if other sections apply but section 6 is relevant. 6.0.2 says a special meeting can be called by 3 or more board members or a request from 25% of the members who can vote. A vote could be part of that meeting. On June 11th I believe we had 161 voting members so 25% would be 41 members asking for a vote. 6.0.4 says members who may vote must be notified at least 10 days (but no more than 50 days) in advance of the special meeting. 6.0.6 says 15% of voting members must participate for decisions to be valid. Based on a membership of 161, that would be 25 members voting. 6.0.8 says voting members need not be present to participate if they give their proxy to another member. I believe a vote could be taken at a regular meeting, but all the other percentages, etc would still apply. I'm not sure what constitutes "notifying" members of an upcoming meeting (vote). In the past it had to be a postal letter. I have tried to have that changed to allow a the web site notice to be acceptable but don't know if that's the case. If letters must be sent out, that will delay any vote and add to the cost. So the best I can tell, if someone wants to reverse the decision to ban Motul oil, they need to either talk the board members into reversing the decision OR they need to call for a special meeting/vote of the membership in which case you need to get at least 41 members to ask for a meeting/vote, get at least 25 to vote and get more than half of those to vote to reinstate Motul.

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Chris Fosso

Posted 2009-07-18 4:40 PM (#7372 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil



"Larry"Posts:

352☆☆☆☆Location: Glendale

hmm that odd,, if that's the case...then why did`nt 6.0.2,6.0.4,6.0.6 and 6.0.8 take place or get used when they changed ruleTO ban oil>?...from the motul>? it only works like that when the board changes it>?and we want to change it back>? i did not read all those sections. butif we want to keep a modern oil. i guess i am going to have to brush up on politics.....

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Randy Lyon

Posted 2009-07-18 5:01 PM (#7374 - in reply to #7372) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil



PKRA

Forum AdminPosts: 720★☆☆Location: Scottsdale, Arizona

Chris Fosso - 2009-07-18 4:40 PM

hmm that odd,, if that's the case...then why did`nt 6.0.2,6.0.4,6.0.6 and 6.0.8 take place or get used when they changed ruleTO bean oil>?..from the motul>? it only works like that when the board changes it>?and we want to change it back>?
i did not read all those sections. butif we want to keep a modern oil. i guess i am going to have to brush up on politics.....

Chris, that section covers how a member requests a SPECIAL meeting/vote. As has been described, the board makes most decisions without a vote of the members. It's much like your Senator does not ask everyone in the state how they should vote on a bill. Now you and other members have a situation such as if a bill gets passed that you don't like. You can get your senator to introduce a new bill OR you can get up a petition to have a special referendum. Same thing with this rule. Whoever is behind the new rule thought its a good idea. If enough people disagree, there is a procedure to change it. You just need to convince the board to reverse it OR get enough people to ask for a special vote so the members can decide.

If a member wants to take the point in trying to get the new rule reversed and wants to gauge interest, they could start a forum poll. Forum polls are NOT binding and could not be used to satisfy the need for the formal request for a vote by 25% of the membership. But a poll could be used to get an idea if a vote would succeed in reversing the rule. Forum polls don't show who voted how, so the post should say how to contact the organizer to become one of the 25% required to request a vote. Click [here](#) to create a forum poll. If anyone does, I will merge the poll with this thread so the discussion can continue there.

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Chris Fosso

Posted 2009-07-18 6:32 PM (#7379 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil



"Larry"Posts:

352☆☆☆☆Location: Glendale

ah that clears it up some...thank you i created a poll as you suggested, a very good idea... we can take it from here i guess

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Jim Swaney

Posted 2009-07-18 10:59 PM (#7385 - in reply to #7366) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

Posts: 22★

But seriously, Kurt, Chris and others (myself included) sure it would be great if our technical committee was filled wall to wall with technical experts and our tech director had zero possible conflicts of interest but those people aren't lining up to volunteer for the jobs.

Randy, Darryl Patullo, who is still noted as part of the technical committee in the PKRA tech manual, was told his services were no longer wanted and I believe that I've read posts from Ted recently that he would be more than willing to help out with tech or the tech committee (If I am mistaken about that Ted, please correct me.) but has not been approached by the tech director regarding this. So to say that "people aren't lining up to volunteer for the jobs" is at a minimum misleading when you have two willing local engine builders not being utilized on the committee. Wouldn't this make any reasonable person at least question the credibility of PKRA tech?

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Ted Tucholski

Posted 2009-07-18 11:07 PM (#7386 - in reply to #7385) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

Posts: 115★

As an engine builder, I would be very willing to become a part of the tech committee. I would be happy to do this for the clubs benefit. I do not want any compensation for the services. Edited by Ted Tucholski 2009-07-18 11:24 PM

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Randy Lyon

Posted 2009-07-19 8:22 AM (#7392 - in reply to #7385) **Subject:** Re: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil



PKRA

Forum AdminPosts: 720★☆☆ Location:
Scottsdale, Arizona

Jim Swaney - 2009-07-18 10:59 PM Randy, Darryl Patullo, who is still noted as part of the technical committee in the PKRA tech manual, was told his services were no longer wanted and I believe that I've read posts from Ted recently that he would be more than willing to help out with tech or the tech committee (If I am mistaken about that Ted, please correct me.) but has not been approached by the tech director regarding this. So to say that "people aren't lining up to volunteer for the jobs" is at a minimum misleading when you have two willing local engine builders not being utilized on the committee. Wouldn't this make any reasonable person at least question the credibility of PKRA tech?

I was not aware that Darryl was asked to leave the committee. I am definitely going to check into that. My comment was regarding Kurt's remark that the committee should ideally have all the local motor builders on it, but I was not aware that any had been turned away, so I may have overstated the lack of volunteers.

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)




Randy Lyon

Posted 2009-07-19 8:30 AM (#7393 - in reply to #7275) **Subject:** RE: Eliminating Motul as a spec oil

A Poll was started on this topic and I intended to merge the two threads, but that did not work out. So I am freezing this thread and asking people to post in that thread instead (including any responses to posts in this thread. So consider the following thread to be a continuation of this one.

2-stroke Oil Option Poll

PKRA

Forum Admin Posts: 720    Location:
Scottsdale, Arizona

[↑ Top](#) [↓ Bottom](#)

Jump to page : [1](#) [2](#) Now viewing page 2 [25 messages per page]

Frozen

Jump to forum :

[Search this forum](#) [Printer friendly version](#) [E-mail a link to this thread](#)

Registered to: Phoenix Kart Racing Association 2009

[\(Delete all cookies set by this site\)](#)