



Meeting Minutes
2019 AMA Congress Meeting

Motocross Commission

Friday, December 6, 2019
Hilton Columbus Downtown

Meeting Agenda

1. Opening of Meeting (see last page for commission member attendees; guests include Tony Moseley, (AMA Board member name?), Sean w/ Cobra, Tim Cotter, Nate Ramsey KTM, Tim McAdams, Jeff Massey)

- a. Comments by the AMA Motocross Manager
 - a. Announcement of Tim Cotter taking Mike Burkeen's position on commission
 - b. Gerhard Ward is unable to attend, so Tad DeWalt will be taking the chair position for today
 - c. We will be discussing chest protectors proposal, discuss any new business, made mention that he was glad that a few board members were in the room to shed some light on the rule approval process (at the board level).
- b. Comments by the Commission Chairman
- c. Take attendance (this was completed at the beginning by Mike Burkeen; see last page of doc)
 - Present
 - Absent with notice
 - Absent without notice

2. New Proposals

- a. None submitted for the 2019 review

3. Agenda Items

- a. Mx-A1219-1 Upper Body Protection
 - i. Read proposal
 - ii. Mike Quinn commented on the reality of commotio cordis
 - iii. Jeff Cernic mentioned looking at the FIM rule wording to try to make it similar.
 - iv. Burkeen: anyone think this is a bad idea, or that there will be issues because of it?
 - v. Kent Cameron – riders showing up w/o protection and being DQ'd.
 - vi. Quinn – he could borrow one. Or promoters could have a few extra small chest protectors on hand. From a safety standpoint, he doesn't see any reason NOT to do this.
 - vii. Fessler – why age 14?
 - viii. Quinn – we wanted to go to 18, but figured it would be too hard of a sell. Backed to 14 (chances of commotio cordis go down as you get older). Start w/ youth, in a few years, be able to mandate for all riders.
 - ix. Cotter – when will it go into affect? 2021 – plenty of time to market. Can encourage now, but 2021, mandated. This gives a year to promote it. AMA could send out a slick promotion (public awareness) announcement about it. Mentioned incidents where questioned if the chest protector would have saved the life – no reason to not mandate.

- x. Cernic – add “ECE tag” on it. European standard, most protectors have it.
- xi. DeWalt – are the manufacturers prepared to support and list as compliant? Would it be a better implementation to mandate for youth classes? Youth class was seconded by several (Cernic, Richardson)
- xii. Eigenmann – going back to previous culture of racing. Cultural change that we need to promote (mentioned several bar to the chest incidents).
- xiii. Richardson – much rather take safety complaints regarding the mandate than lawsuits.
- xiv. Eigenmann – most guys start local, as you progress into racing culture, start doing AMA events and then have had time to “know what’s going on”. Must start adhering to the rules when doing AMA.
- xv. Cernic – we will need to spread the rule news.
- xvi. Richardson – district back home is 100% on board with the rule and will get word out.
- xvii. DeWalt – in favor of rule?
- xviii. Quinn – can MX make all youth classes in our discipline?
- xix. Burkeen – try to take info back to medical commission, pass the rule, and then MX can make rule specific for our discipline.
- xx. What about ECE? Need some kind of standard. Cernic – ECE is very high standard in European stuff (take a look at European rule).
- xxi. Quinn – check protectors in staging. Doesn’t need to be overly technical on promoter.
- xxii. Burkeen – does it put us at greater liability if we put the ECE label? Or make a recommendation?
- xxiii. DeWalt – mentioned helmet standard; similar concept.
- xxiv. Burkeen – recommend double-checking the standard.
- xxv. Cernic – let’s get started now on the concept (getting word out).
- xxvi. Quinn – should be easier with the younger ones
- xxvii. S. Gammon – mentioned why would we not want to do the youth concept for every discipline (mentioned GNCC and the difficulty in figuring ages vs. chest protector on the line of 100+ riders).
- xxviii. Richardson – sent Tad picture of FIM rule standard. Tad – EM1621 is the standard.
- xxix. Burkeen – need to send someone to Medical meeting to explain our thoughts on the youth class & standard rating concepts.
- xxx. Quinn – will take these concepts to Med/Safety meeting.

4. Summer Proposal Discussion:

- a. Misinformation is that the board looked and said, “We’re not doing this.”
- b. Board has a committee that looks at proposals, discusses, makes suggestions to general board, and general board elects to pass/not pass proposals.
- c. Rules have gone through board committee, but not general board yet (except e-bikes). The board tries to make amendments to pass on to the commission if the rule is not passed.
- d. Rules (awaiting general board approval for 2021):
 - i. MX-819-1: Update to 51cc class names (passed commission and board committee)
 - ii. MX-819-3: Appealing classification – change to verbiage and dates, cleaning up. (passed commission and board committee)

- iii. MX-819-4: Homologation (factory editions) – pulled by AMA staff; can be up for discussion in the future.
- iv. MX-819-5: Modification to limited class (rear brake clevis, reservoir cap, hydraulic clutch). (passed commission and board committee)
- v. MX-819-6: Foreign rider rule (have to classify before they ride) – minimum of B classification until the rider proves he should be in a different class. (approved by commission and board committee)
- vi. MX-819-7: Violation of limited class rule – increasing penalty (passed by commission, denied by board committee – recommendation to have more checks and balances/oversight, inclusion of an appeals process). Board mentioned that they hope people will reach out (email) them. Burkeen mentioned the board’s concerns being valid.
- vii. MX-819-8: Riders receiving DNF/DNS in qualifying heat may ride LCQ. DQ cannot ride in LCQ. (passed commission, passed competition board committee)

5. Kevin Crowther

- a. Explanation of small changes to commission format (timeline changes); meat and potatoes now, fix any leftover issues in summer time.
- b. Install new members for 2021; everyone has to re-apply by Jan 1, 2020. Only install new commission members every two years; only time we vary is if someone steps down.

6. Revisiting Business

- a. Revising MX-819-7 (limited class violation rule from summer 2019)
 - i. S. Gammon – referee dq’s for the day, then sends recommendation to the MX commission to suspend. Burkeen – you would have to send all to the commission.
 - ii. Review current rule (page 19, 1.2.5)
 - iii. Quinn – intent is correct (“dad’s teaching kids to cheat is not acceptable at any level”); penalty is correct. Suspensions need to be done by the AMA; subject to AMA approval w/in 5 days of the meet?
 - iv. S. Gammon – what about buying a bike from a dealer w/o knowledge of the change, a new rider unaware. Seconded by Russ Irvin.
 - v. Burkeen – Is 30 days more appropriate?
 - vi. Eigenmann – there is no deterrent in cheating in AMA (except maybe PW class). No meat/substance to DQ rule; starts w/ 50’s. DQ from the event does not prevent them from continuing to do it at future events.
 - vii. DeWalt – mentioned issues with referees not completing protest forms; AMA spreadsheet on previous penalties (has not been kept up – would be helpful). Comment to Sam’s – call AMA on Monday after incident, there is an appeal process. Tad said he always documents if it’s a scenario in which he does not recommend suspension.
 - viii. Quinn – belabored (per his words) Tad’s point.
 - ix. Irvin – putting verbiage in about the appeal process may take the edge off.
 - x. S. Gammon – more cheating likely at an AQ; local races are going to be the ones that bring people out of the woodwork that unintentionally violated the rule.
 - xi. DeWalt – the rule is not just for the limited class; also includes internal engine modifications.
 - xii. Burkeen – remember on the appeal process, it’s not like going to court.

- xiii. Cotter – MX Sports totally against changing the rule. Explained incident at Loretta’s. He wishes Alex, Kip, the guy before Kip (MN Manager position) were in the room and he could ask how many times we’ve suspended for a year for second offense. Burkeen is not aware of many times. Tim - “We are the problem” and “let’s do the rule that is in place”.
- xiv. DeWalt – clarified – if you get DQ’d at AQ, you are DQ’d for that class only. 3 options and voted: let it die with its current state, do a better job of monitoring who is getting caught cheating, and discuss in a year; modify from “event” to “meet”, check in a year; complete rewrite, keep with 60 day. Decision of the group was “Died” in current state – will do a better job of tracking penalties and providing information to organizers/referees.

7. New Business

- a. Change Supermini/Girls Sr. limit from 112cc to 105cc (over 11 votes, so will entertain rule)
 - i. Supermini (79cc-105cc), Girls Sr. (79cc-105cc)
 - ii. Nate Ramsey mentioned reaching out to the engine builders; policing it may be difficult (more protests, more people “not knowing”); same money to build 105 vs. 112.
 - iii. Lawrence H. – parents hate the class b/c of the “all-in” factor.
 - iv. Eigenmann – common denominator is the crankshaft (that’s where cost is); either have kids skipping from 85 to 125, or dads writing \$15,000 checks.
 - v. Burkeen – you can cheat in any class (so the policing point Nate made isn’t fair)
 - vi. Quinn – the recurring expense is the issue, when bikes blow up and need redone, not the initial build (mentioned his experience with riders at pro ranks, when they were going through the class)
 - vii. DeWalt – ties in to Technical Committee; let’s send to them, give them a year to discuss.
 - viii. Cernic – trying to make a more cost-effective class
 - ix. Unanimous vote to move forward with the rule.
- b. Change top two 85cc classes to big-wheel, 19” maximum (over 11 votes, so will entertain rule)
 - i. 85cc (12-13), 85cc (14-15)
 - ii. Burkeen – all Europe has this rule.
 - iii. Quinn – asked about what to do for 85cc (9-12); Burkeen recommended putting in supplemental rules as small wheel.
 - iv. KTM bike concern – may need to do a competition bulletin regarding
 - v. Unanimous vote to move forward
- c. Lawrence H. - Husky 250 vented airbox – homologated that way, so legal.
- d. S. Gammon – two incidents of riders riding under a different person’s entry. Used to be that the rule was a one-year suspension; unable to locate rule of penalty or figure out when/how it was removed. (rule on page 262, but no penalty)
 - i. DeWalt – review Chapter 4 (better tie offenses/penalties together);
 - ii. Burkeen says it’s on Kevin’s radar, and it’s on his radar to try to clean up.
- e. Eigenmann - Requirement for cc’s to be on cylinders on the engines. Some believe they should be on there, others do not.
 - i. Page 20, 1.e.

- ii. DeWalt – remove “(Modified Classes)” from Title for 1. (over 11 votes, so can discuss as new business)
- iii. Eigenmann – would like to see something that prevents defacing/changing something that the manufacturer stamps on the cylinder. If we need the rule, let’s keep it (and enforce); if we don’t need it, let’s change it.
- iv. Recommendation to remove “(Modified Classes)” from 1, and adding something about not defacing factory markings on cylinder. Removal or alterations of manufacturer cylinder and/or case designations is not allowed.
- v. Unanimous vote to move forward
- f. 51” wheelbase – look at a change for the 85cc class, and potentially 65cc class (vote to look at is over 11)
 - i. Burkeen – in general, we never change a rule for a bike that is outside of the rules.
 - ii. Cernic – why can’t we make a proposal to change it? Response, Board would not pass it. Manufacturer needs to change...Cernic’s point is 90% of the bikes may be illegal, so we should change to fall in line.
 - iii. Toolie – explaining rule, that until they started measuring adjustable wheelbase, they did not know there was a bike outside of the range. KTM decided middle of the measurement. When he (Toolie) measures, do before and after and make sure there is no change.
 - iv. Lawrence H. – asking if this is the only machine, or others that might be affected (even with other measurements); 2 scenarios – wheelbase, and changing the shock on a particular bike, which changes seat height illegally. Is the intent on the manufacturers or the riders to be in compliance?
 - v. Tad – read definitions of minicycle, motorcycle, and wheelbase. This will need to go to Technical to look at first.
 - vi. Is it a matter of adding a little bit of wording to the wheelbase definition?
 - vii. Sean – if changing the rule, give manufacturers a few years to accommodate.
 - viii. If we change it, concern is that KTM will go another 1/2”; issue isn’t solved.
 - ix. Quinn – you almost have to go to the max adjustable, to confirm they are not beyond the limit.
 - x. Cotter – recommends we add the 1/2”, because KTM sent the bike to the AMA and we homologated it, w/o catching the wheelbase issue.
 - xi. Toolie – I think you clarify the rule so that it makes the current KTM w/in parameters, not allow them to go another 1/2”.
 - xii. DeWalt – define better how we are going to measure for homologation, give everyone until 2022 to do it (manufacturer letter).
 - xiii. Striking vote...no, continuing discussion. Tim mentioned sending a competition bulletin.
 - xiv. Burkeen – if we did a communication, we should make mention we are measuring race length (not adjustable). Will work with Toolie to make sure we are homologating properly.
 - xv. DeWalt – We will do the following: Review wheelbase on all classes; note 50cc & 65cc say adjusted length and potentially review; let manufacturers know how 2022 models will be homologated; and send

- out a competition bulletin to riders, letting them know wheelbase will be measured at race length.
- xvi. Break for lunch – 1256
 - xvii. Cernic – FIM rule, when there is not a fraction in the number, they go to the less than number.
 - xviii. Burkeen – will follow up with Toolie on homologation with these issues, making sure we are homologating properly. Will be working on his end with Kevin to make the appropriate changes if needed immediately.
 - xix. Will stay on the list.
- g. Concussion protocol for amateur racing – Conrad, what do we have in place?
- i. Quinn - waiting on board, but rule going forward regarding concussions. Defines concussion, any athlete suspected to have sustained a concussion must be immediately removed from competition. You need to know what your state law is regarding concussion laws. Hope to add baseline testing (impact test) at some point.
 - ii. Cotter – shared about the baseline testing in pro racing, as he was involved in the start. Has seen it change over the years (at a medical facility to on-line), and encourages it at the amateur level.
 - iii. Quinn – mentioned that youth take longer to heal and get back to baseline.
 - iv. Nate Ramsey – talked about a discussion with Dr. Reimann about state laws may require certain people working with youth to be trained in concussion-related material.
 - v. Eigenmann – wondering if there is anything that this commission needs to do regarding the new concussion proposal coming through.
 - vi. Cotter – making mention of difficulty in implementing for a large # of riders (turning people away w/o the test during race registration)
 - vii. Cernic – talked about starting with a small group (like not at the Area level, but need to have it by the Regional level)
 - viii. Lawrence H. – mentioned concerns with liability, does it need to be included in the waivers?
 - ix. Nate – mentioned the test they use for Orange Brigade, that there are several options out there.
 - x. Quinn – we know we’re looking at a monumental test (30 kids on a football team is a lot easier than this).
- h. Eigenmann/Burkeen - Competition Bulletin regarding changing the atomizer in the carb, which changes another part that is not legal. No need to add to the rulebook; it’s already in there and can be interpreted. Somehow was allowed over time, but should not be, and will not be moving forward.
- i. Tear-downs and finding other parts not legal that were not protested.
- i. DeWalt – DQ’s if he finds them (can’t unsee it).
 - ii. Law enforcement comparison, that if you have a warrant for one thing, and you find other stuff illegal, you would get charged for that, as well.
 - iii. Burkeen/Tad – mentioned they aren’t going looking for stuff, but if you find it, you should act on it.
 - iv. Burkeen – slippery slope, mentioned frivolous protests and the concern with there being more protests that are time-consuming
 - v. Cotter – brought up supplemental rule regarding Amateur National program and frivolous protests. Mentioned the difficulties of protests (may have to ship parts to confirm), needs to be private.

- vi. Burkeen – currently, protester signs the protest form and the protestee has the right to know who the protester is; should they be anonymous.
- j. Cernic - Top 5 Majors rule (pg. 12, 6.d.) – proposes we get rid of the rule (over 11 voted to talk about)
 - i. Discussion of there only being a few that don't fall under other advancement criteria.
 - ii. Quinn – mentioned doing top 5 at three majors (rather than taking the rule out)
 - iii. Striking entirely vs three top 5's at a Major
 - iv. Cernic – changes original proposal to three top 5's
 - v. Top 5 overall finish in any three B classes at an AMA Major Event, excluding vet/senior classes, will be advanced to A class (will need reworded).
 - vi. Unanimous vote to move forward.
- k. Chest protector discussion – Quinn brought up that others he had spoken with wanted to apply to all ages. Toolie mentioned it was a long process with FIM. Start w/ baby steps.
- l. Wire brush on concrete – did rule go anywhere? Doesn't sound like it...
- m. DeWalt - Dunlop tires – said needed to add that the tires must be readily available (requested it be talked about to see if it was necessary)
 - i. Cernic feels that if they are available at an event for everyone there, that is sufficient for "readily available".
 - ii. Richardson – what are the ramifications of doing nothing? Dunlop will develop spec tires that the top guys will be running. Changing minds – vote was over 11 to discuss further.
 - iii. Tires must be commercially available through retail sources (put on p.23, before 14.a.)
 - iv. Vote (for 17)
- n. Gaskets – didn't really go anywhere.
- o. Russ Irvin - Recommendation to set a schedule for commissions; Burkeen - goal to do two phone calls and a summer meeting (Burkeen will coincide with the board meetings to make sure proposals get to them in time).

8. Closing of Meeting

Quinn – What do we do with e-bikes at the tracks?

Burkeen – due at dealers next week, let them race with the 50's, score separately.

Tim – we will not let them on the track with other 50's. Starting very cautiously.

Burkeen – thanked everyone and closed.

9. Notes to bring back:

We need to have name cards for the tables next year.

AMA app pads (can we add family membership)?

AMA app – can the rulebook be added?

Need to end out commission application to all members for renewal.



American Motorcyclist Association Agenda Item for Discussion

Motocross Commission Agenda Item

Agenda: MX-A1219-1 Upper Body Protection

Item

Presented for discussion and feedback by the Medical and Safety Commission

The Medical/Safety Commission has been researching and working on a proposal for upper body protection. As you know, All racing disciplines with the exception of trials place the rider at risk for injuries to the sternum, ribs and thoracic spine. The underlying soft tissues such as the lungs and heart are also placed at risk. Because of the physical maturity and structural development of Youth athletes under the age of 14, they are at risk for commotio cordis, which occurs after a direct blow to the sternum. This may lead to sudden cardiac death. Protection from roost related to rocks may also allow better concentration of the rider and potentially allow safer racing. Also, modern chest/back protectors are well ventilated to reduce heat load to the rider.

Based on this data, the Medical Safety Commission is going to be moving forward a proposal that will make upper body protection mandatory for youth riders under the age of 14 competing in any speed related racing disciplines. When looking at the landscape of the current racing disciplines, the only racing discipline that we see not fitting into a "speed event" would be Trials.

Because this type of rule would impact multiple racing disciplines, we are seeking input and feedback from all of the racing commissions with regards to how or what impact a mandatory rule for upper body protection could have on specific disciplines of racing. Below is what we have determined is the best proposal to try and implement for 2021, with the intent of reviewing the deployment of a new rule and if it might warrant "mandatory for all racers" status in the future.

Please review the proposal and submit a written response to the Medical Safety Commission no later than March 6, 2020. This response should include bullet points of support, concerns, or any recommendations of what modifications you believe would better suit your specific type of racing.

Proposed Change

E. Competition Apparel

1. Protective pants made of leather or other durable material and long sleeve jerseys must be worn.
2. When a riding jersey or other apparel is used for rider identification, it is recommended that an 8-inch high number be on the back, and the number be of contrasting colors. ***When a back protector is worn outside of the jersey, the number should be placed on the back protector.***
3. Boots must be worn in all meets. They must be at least 8 inches high with any combination of laces, buckles, or zippers, or be specially designed and constructed for foot and leg protection.
4. ***A chest and back protector must be worn for all competitors under the age of 14 (at the date of competition). The protector may be worn under or over the jersey. It must cover the sternum anterior ribs, posterior ribs, and spine from T1 to T 12. For road racing a back protector must be worn under their leathers unless integrated into the design of the leathers .***
5. It is recommended that riders use the available protective equipment (i.e. gloves, neck brace, and knee protectors) to help protect against the possibility of injury.
6. All riders must utilize a shatterproof face shield or shatterproof goggles.
7. Wearing of Helmets: It is mandatory for all participants taking part in practice and competition wear a full face helmet. The helmet must be properly fastened, be of good fit, and be in good condition. The helmet must have a chin strap retention system.

Submission

Medical/Safety Commission



American Motorcyclist Association
MOTOCROSS COMMISSION

AMA Competition Commissions are volunteer bodies that consider, disseminate, amend, interpret, and assist in the enforcement of both technical and operational rules for amateur and pro-am competition events sanctioned by the AMA.

Composition of Commission – November 2019

Richard Bigelow **AWN**
Washington, MI

Mark Bonnell **AW/ON**
Pleasant Hill, IA

Brad Bowers **AWN**
Amarillo, TX

Don Browning **P**
Indianapolis, IN

Kent Cameron **P**
Durham, NC

Jeffery Cernic **P**
Johnstown, PA

Tad DeWalt **P**
New Haven, MO

Conrad Eigenmann **P**
Titusville, FL

Ken Ferrell **P**
Danville, VA

Jerry Fessler **P**
Jonestown, PA

Jane Gammon **P**
Bluff City, TN

Sam Gammon **P**
Blountville, TN

Tim Graves **AW/ON**
North Manchester, IN

Russell Hobbs **AWN**
University Park, TX

Lawrence Holzapfel **P**
Monroe, NY

Russell Irvin **P**
Phoenix, MD

Dan Knecht **P**
Springfield, OH

Dean Manshack **AW/ON**
Cleveland, TX

Jill Nicholson **AW/ON**
Evansdale, IA

Clayton Powers **P**
Port Matilda, PA

Bruce Richardson **P**
Park City, KS

Bradley Rideout **P**
Sebree, KY

Emil Shebelbon **P**
Conroe, TX

Rich Trevelise **P**
Howell, NJ

Gerhard Ward **AWN**
Mendota, IL

Richard White **AWN**
Cleburne, TX