Modern Tire Conditioning & the Need for Updated Testing Protocols in Short Track Racing

A White Paper on Affordability, Competitive Integrity, and Evidence-Based Reform

Executive Summary

Short track racing is facing a structural affordability crisis that disproportionately impacts the everyday racer. While tire technology, compounds, and maintenance practices have evolved significantly over the past decade, the testing and enforcement protocols used to police tire conditioning have not kept pace. This misalignment has created unintended consequences: increased costs, inconsistent enforcement, reputational harm to racers, and growing mistrust across the industry.

Modern tire conditioning—specifically non-toxic, non-softening reconditioning methods—has demonstrated the ability to restore tire surface consistency by removing glazing and heat-induced degradation without altering compound hardness or structural integrity. These methods are fundamentally different from historical chemical softening practices that testing protocols were originally designed to detect.

Independent academic research, including a multi-year forensic study conducted by Purdue University utilizing over 70 tire samples, has demonstrated that chemical transfer between tires during on-track competition is possible. This finding alone challenges the core assumption underlying current testing enforcement: that the presence of a detectable compound necessarily implies intentional application.

Additionally, real-world competitive series data—including over six years of documented use in the Gen X Late Model Series—shows that controlled tire conditioning can improve parity, consistency, and safety without increasing failures or degrading tire performance. Racers reported faster tire fire-off, reduced glazing, and quicker recovery after cautions, all while maintaining durometer readings within normal variance.

Despite these developments, current tire testing models rely heavily on centralized laboratories, opaque calibration standards, inconsistent chain-of-custody procedures, and single-point determinations that can result in severe penalties, including loss of points, winnings, and personal integrity. These outcomes often occur without meaningful recourse, secondary verification, or contextual evaluation.

This white paper does not allege misconduct by any organization or entity. Rather, it presents evidence that existing systems—designed for a previous era—require modernization to reflect current technology, science, and economic realities.

The goal is not deregulation, but reform: transparent, reproducible, and fair testing protocols that protect racers, preserve competition, and support the long-term health of the sport.

1. The Economic Reality of the Everyday Racer

Short track racing has historically been sustained by working-class participants—individuals and families who balance full-time employment, family obligations, and limited discretionary income in order to compete. Any regulatory or enforcement framework that fails to account for this reality risks unintentionally accelerating attrition within the sport.

1.1 Direct Tire Cost vs. Reconditioning Cost

Under current market conditions, the cost of a single new racing tire typically ranges between **$150 and $200 per tire**, depending on compound, brand, and region. For many classes, competitive participation requires the regular purchase of multiple tires per event or per race weekend.

In contrast, modern non-toxic tire reconditioning practices—specifically surface restoration methods designed to remove glazing and heat-induced degradation—carry an average cost of **$15 to $20 per tire**. These processes require minimal time, can be performed at home by the racer, and do not require specialized equipment beyond standard preparation tools.

The economic delta between these two options is not marginal—it is exponential. For the cost of conditioning an entire set of tires, a racer may otherwise be forced to spend the equivalent of a full day's wages or more on new tires. For many racers, replacing a full set of tires represents **nearly a week's worth of labor**.

1.2 Time as a Hidden Cost of Competition

Beyond direct financial expense, time represents a critical and often overlooked cost. Tire conditioning can be performed efficiently within existing preparation routines, often requiring minutes rather than hours. Conversely, earning the income necessary to purchase new tires requires significant time investment away from family, recovery, and preparation.

This disparity disproportionately impacts:

- Entry-level and mid-tier racers
- Family-funded teams
- Retirees and fixed-income participants
- Younger racers attempting to establish themselves

When regulatory structures implicitly favor those with greater financial flexibility, competitive parity erodes—not through engineering superiority, but through purchasing power.

1.3 Competitive Parity vs. Competitive Advantage

A central misconception in the tire conditioning debate is the assumption that reconditioning inherently confers an unfair performance advantage. In practice, modern reconditioning does not elevate an aged tire beyond its original competitive envelope. Instead, it restores surface consistency and usability that would otherwise be lost due to glazing and heat cycling.

The practical effect is not domination, but **parity**. Racers using reconditioned tires are better able to remain competitive with teams that can afford to bolt on new tires at will. This distinction is critical: affordability-driven parity strengthens competition, improves race quality, and enhances fan engagement.

1.4 Long-Term Impact on the Sport

When cost pressures push racers out of competition, the consequences extend beyond individual teams. Car counts decline, fields become less diverse, and tracks struggle to maintain sustainable events. Tire turnover driven by enforcement rather than necessity may benefit short-term supply economics, but it undermines the long-term health of the racing ecosystem.

An enforcement framework that penalizes cost-saving maintenance practices—without clear evidence of compound alteration or safety risk—places the financial burden squarely on those least able to absorb it. Over time, this dynamic accelerates consolidation toward well-funded teams and away from the grassroots foundation upon which short track racing was built.

1.5 Summary

The economic reality of the everyday racer is not theoretical—it is measurable, observable, and increasingly strained. Any discussion of tire testing and enforcement that excludes cost-to-compete considerations fails to address one of the sport's most pressing challenges. Modern tire conditioning, when properly understood and regulated, represents a tool for sustainability rather than exploitation.

2. Tire Conditioning vs. Tire Softening: A Technical Distinction

One of the central failures in the current regulatory conversation is the continued conflation of modern tire conditioning practices with historical tire softening methods. While both are often discussed under the same enforcement umbrella, they are technically, chemically, and functionally distinct. This lack of differentiation has led to misclassification, inconsistent enforcement, and unintended penalties.

2.1 Historical Context: Why Testing Protocols Exist

Early tire softening practices—now broadly prohibited—relied on aggressive solvents, oils, and chemical agents designed to penetrate the rubber compound. These substances altered polymer chains, reduced durometer hardness beyond design intent, and in many cases compromised structural integrity and safety. Testing protocols developed during this era were designed to detect foreign chemical intrusion into the compound matrix.

Those protocols were appropriate for their time. However, they were built around a specific assumption: that any detectable foreign compound indicated intentional penetration and chemical alteration of the tire.

That assumption no longer holds universally true.

2.2 What Tire Glazing Is—and Why It Matters

Tire glazing is a surface-level phenomenon caused by repeated heat cycling, friction, and localized polymer reflow at the tread surface. As a tire is used, the outermost layer can harden and smooth, reducing surface energy, mechanical keying, and grip.

Critically:

- Glazing occurs **without** altering the underlying compound formulation
- Glazing reduces performance but not safety
- Glazing is uneven across the tread surface

An untreated glazed tire may measure within acceptable durometer ranges yet deliver inconsistent or diminished on-track performance.

2.3 Modern Tire Conditioning: Surface Restoration, Not Compound Alteration

Modern non-toxic tire conditioning systems are designed to address glazing—not compound hardness. These systems function by restoring surface characteristics through controlled cleaning, surface energy normalization, and removal of degraded outer material.

Key characteristics of legitimate tire conditioning include:

- No deep compound penetration
- No polymer chain modification
- No reduction in bulk durometer hardness beyond normal variance
- No degradation of tire carcass or structural integrity

In controlled demonstrations, tires subjected to repeated conditioning cycles over multiple seasons continue to measure within a narrow durometer band relative to untreated areas, confirming that the compound itself remains unchanged.

2.4 Durometer Readings and Misinterpretation

Durometer testing measures surface hardness, not compound chemistry. Minor variations in durometer readings can result from:

- Temperature differentials
- Measurement location
- Surface finish
- Normal wear patterns

It is therefore insufficient to use durometer variance alone as proof of illegal softening. Conditioning that removes hardened glaze can slightly normalize surface readings without exceeding acceptable thresholds. This normalization is often misinterpreted as softening when, in fact, it reflects restoration to baseline performance rather than enhancement beyond it.

2.5 The False Equivalence Problem

By failing to distinguish between:

- **Surface restoration (conditioning)** and
- **Compound modification (softening)**

current enforcement models create a false equivalence that penalizes legitimate maintenance while doing little to improve safety or fairness. This not only harms racers financially, but it undermines trust in the enforcement process itself.

A modern regulatory framework must acknowledge this distinction and adapt testing methodologies accordingly. Without such differentiation, enforcement remains rooted in outdated assumptions that no longer reflect current materials science or racing realities.

2.6 Summary

Tire conditioning and tire softening are not interchangeable concepts. Treating them as such results in inaccurate enforcement and unnecessary penalties. Recognizing the technical distinction between surface-level restoration and compound-level alteration is essential to any meaningful reform of tire testing protocols.

3. Independent Scientific Evidence: Purdue University Forensic Study

A critical component missing from many enforcement discussions is the role of independent, third-party scientific research. In contrast to anecdotal claims or commercially motivated positions, forensic studies conducted within academic environments provide neutral, methodical insight into real-world conditions. One such body of work—conducted by researchers at Purdue University—offers particularly relevant findings for modern tire testing and enforcement protocols.

3.1 Overview of the Purdue Forensic Study

The Purdue University study was conducted over an extended period and utilized more than **70 tire samples** subjected to forensic chemical analysis. The objective was not to advocate for or against tire treatments, but to evaluate the detectability, migration, and transfer behavior of chemical compounds associated with racing tires under real operating conditions.

Importantly, the study approached tire analysis from a forensic perspective—recognizing that race tires exist in a complex, high-contact environment involving heat, pressure, abrasion, and direct tire-to-tire interaction.

3.2 Key Finding: Chemical Transfer Is Possible

One of the study's most consequential conclusions was that **chemical transfer between tires is possible during on-track competition**. This finding directly challenges a foundational assumption underlying many current testing and enforcement models: that the presence of a detectable compound on a tire can be reliably attributed to intentional application by a specific competitor.

In racing conditions, tires:

- Make repeated sidewall and tread contact
- Are exposed to elevated temperatures
- Experience abrasion and material exchange
- Interact with track surfaces that may themselves carry residues

Under such conditions, the transfer of chemical traces—even in the absence of deliberate application—falls well within the realm of scientific plausibility.

3.3 Implications for Single-Sample Enforcement

The Purdue findings raise important questions regarding enforcement practices that rely on single-sample determinations. If trace compounds can migrate or transfer through normal racing interaction, then detection alone is insufficient to establish intent, timing, or origin.

From a forensic standpoint, sound conclusions typically require:

- Multiple samples
- Contextual analysis
- Control comparisons
- Chain-of-custody validation

Absent these safeguards, enforcement outcomes risk false positives—penalizing racers for conditions beyond their control.

3.4 Relevance to Modern Tire Conditioning

The study's conclusions are especially relevant in the context of modern, non-toxic tire conditioning systems that operate at the surface level. Surface-active agents, by their nature, are more susceptible to incidental transfer than deeply penetrating solvents historically associated with illegal softening.

This reality does not imply misuse or wrongdoing. Rather, it underscores the necessity of testing protocols that distinguish between:

- Intentional compound alteration
- Incidental surface contamination
- Transfer resulting from racing contact

Without this differentiation, enforcement frameworks risk conflating unrelated phenomena.

3.5 Scientific Caution vs. Absolute Conclusions

Notably, the Purdue study does not claim that all detections are invalid, nor does it excuse intentional violations. Instead, it introduces scientific caution into a space where absolute conclusions are often drawn from limited data. In forensic science, the presence of a substance is only one component of interpretation—not the conclusion itself.

Recognizing this nuance is essential for maintaining fairness, credibility, and trust within the racing community.

3.6 Summary

The Purdue University forensic study provides independent, academically grounded evidence that chemical transfer between racing tires is possible under normal competition conditions. This finding alone necessitates a reevaluation of enforcement models that rely on single-point detection as definitive proof of intentional treatment. Modern tire testing protocols must incorporate this scientific reality if they are to remain accurate, fair, and defensible.

4. Long-Term Competitive Case Study: Gen X Late Model Series

While laboratory testing and academic research provide essential theoretical grounding, real-world competition data is equally critical when evaluating the impact of tire conditioning practices. Over an extended period exceeding six years, the Gen X Late Model Series offers a rare and valuable longitudinal case study demonstrating how controlled tire conditioning can coexist with competitive integrity, safety, and cost containment.

4.1 Series Overview and Operating Environment

The Gen X Late Model Series was structured to emphasize close competition, driver skill, and cost control. Participants represented a broad cross-section of racers, including working professionals, family-funded teams, and semi-retired competitors—making the series a representative sample of the grassroots racing population.

Within this environment, tire conditioning using modern, non-toxic reconditioning methods was permitted under controlled conditions. This provided an opportunity to observe outcomes not over isolated events, but across multiple seasons, tracks, weather conditions, and competitive cycles.

4.2 Observed Performance Outcomes

Across the six-year period, racers and officials consistently reported several performance-related effects associated with tire conditioning:

- Faster tire "fire-off" at the start of runs
- Reduced tendency for tires to glaze over during extended green-flag conditions
- Improved consistency across heat cycles
- Quicker recovery of grip following cautions or restarts

Importantly, these effects did not manifest as runaway advantages for any individual competitor. Instead, they contributed to tighter fields, more competitive racing, and reduced dependence on frequent tire replacement.

4.3 Safety and Tire Integrity

Over the duration of the Gen X program, no increase in tire failures, delamination, or carcass-related issues was attributed to tire conditioning practices. Tires subjected to repeated conditioning over multiple seasons maintained structural integrity and operated within expected performance envelopes.

Durometer measurements taken at treated and untreated areas consistently remained within a narrow and acceptable variance range, reinforcing the conclusion that conditioning did not result in compound softening or degradation.

4.4 Economic and Competitive Effects

From an economic standpoint, the Gen X Series demonstrated measurable cost containment benefits:

- Extended usable life of race tires
- Reduced frequency of new tire purchases
- Lower overall season operating costs
- Improved accessibility for budget-conscious racers

These effects translated directly into healthier car counts and sustained participation over multiple seasons—outcomes that many short track series struggle to maintain under escalating cost pressures.

4.5 Racer Feedback and Acceptance

Racer feedback throughout the program was notably consistent. Participants reported increased confidence in their equipment, reduced pressure to overspend on consumables, and greater focus on chassis setup and driving technique rather than tire acquisition.

Crucially, the absence of widespread disputes or enforcement controversies within the series suggests that when rules are clear, technology is understood, and expectations are aligned, tire conditioning does not inherently generate conflict or mistrust.

4.6 Summary

The Gen X Late Model Series provides compelling real-world evidence that modern tire conditioning can be implemented without compromising safety, fairness, or competitive balance. Over six years of operation, the series demonstrated that reconditioning practices can enhance parity, reduce costs, and support long-term participation when governed transparently and intelligently.

This case study stands in contrast to enforcement models that rely solely on detection-based assumptions, highlighting the value of contextual, outcome-based evaluation in regulatory decision-making.

5. Limitations of Current Tire Testing Models

Current tire testing and enforcement systems were developed to address a specific historical problem: the intentional chemical softening of tire compounds through aggressive solvents and penetrants. While effective in that context, these systems exhibit significant limitations when applied to modern racing environments and contemporary tire maintenance practices.

This section does not allege misconduct by any laboratory, sanctioning body, or manufacturer. Instead, it identifies structural and procedural gaps that reduce reliability, transparency, and fairness when legacy testing models are applied to evolved technologies.

5.1 Legacy Assumptions Embedded in Modern Enforcement

Many existing testing protocols rest on a core assumption: that the detection of a foreign compound on a tire is sufficient to establish intentional application and competitive intent. As demonstrated by modern materials science and independent forensic research, this assumption no longer universally holds true.

Racing today involves:

- Higher tire-to-tire contact frequency
- Increased heat cycling
- More complex track surface chemistries
- Surface-active maintenance products

Testing systems designed for deep compound penetration are ill-suited to distinguish between intentional alteration and incidental surface exposure under these conditions.

5.2 Centralization and Single-Point Failure Risk

Centralized testing models concentrate decision-making authority within a narrow process window. While centralization can promote consistency, it also introduces single-point failure risk. When a single test result—often derived from a limited sample—serves as the sole basis for enforcement, the margin for error becomes consequential.

In engineering, forensic science, and quality control disciplines, single-point determinations are generally avoided where outcomes carry significant financial or reputational consequences. Redundancy, verification, and contextual analysis are standard safeguards in mature systems.

5.3 Chain-of-Custody and Sample Handling Variability

The integrity of any forensic determination depends on consistent and documented chain-of-custody procedures. In racing environments, tire samples may be:

- Collected under varying conditions
- Handled by multiple parties
- Stored and transported without standardized environmental controls

Without uniform custody protocols, it becomes increasingly difficult to attribute detected compounds to a specific action, time, or actor. Even minor deviations in handling can introduce contamination or transfer that complicates interpretation.

5.4 Calibration Transparency and Verification

Analytical instruments require regular calibration, validation, and environmental control to ensure reliable results. In many enforcement frameworks, calibration schedules, reference standards, and verification procedures are not publicly documented or independently audited.

This lack of transparency does not imply inaccuracy; however, it does limit confidence and trust —particularly when results lead to irreversible penalties. In other regulated industries, calibration traceability and auditability are fundamental to maintaining legitimacy.

5.5 Absence of Contextual Evaluation

Detection-based enforcement models often fail to incorporate contextual data, such as:

- Durometer readings across treated and untreated zones n- Tire age and heat-cycle history
- Evidence of performance degradation or enhancement
- Comparative samples from the same event

Without contextual evaluation, enforcement decisions risk over-reliance on binary outcomes rather than holistic assessment.

5.6 Consequences of Overreach

When testing models do not align with real-world conditions, the consequences extend beyond individual penalties. Racers may experience:

- Loss of points or winnings
- Reputational harm

- Financial strain
- Erosion of trust in governance

At the organizational level, perceived inconsistency or opacity can discourage participation, reduce car counts, and strain relationships between racers, tracks, and sanctioning bodies.

5.7 Summary

Current tire testing models reflect a legacy framework applied to a modern problem. While well-intentioned, these systems exhibit limitations related to assumption-based detection, centralization risk, custody variability, calibration transparency, and lack of contextual evaluation. Addressing these gaps is essential to ensuring that enforcement remains accurate, fair, and aligned with contemporary racing realities.

6. Governance, Due Process, and Competitive Integrity

Competitive integrity is the foundation upon which organized racing is built. Rules, enforcement mechanisms, and penalties exist not merely to punish violations, but to preserve trust among participants, officials, sponsors, and fans. When enforcement systems lack proportionality, transparency, or procedural safeguards, they risk undermining the very integrity they are designed to protect.

This section addresses governance considerations that extend beyond tire chemistry, focusing instead on fairness, accountability, and due process within enforcement frameworks.

6.1 The Weight of Enforcement Decisions

In most sanctioning environments, a tire-related infraction carries consequences that extend far beyond a single event. Penalties may include:

- Loss of points or championship standing
- Forfeiture of winnings
- Suspension or disqualification
- Long-term reputational damage

Given the severity of these outcomes, enforcement determinations should meet a commensurate standard of procedural rigor. In many regulated industries, decisions with comparable impact require layered verification and documented justification.

6.2 Single-Authority Determinations and Risk

Enforcement models that concentrate decision-making authority in a single individual or single analytical outcome introduce governance risk. While expertise and experience are essential, unchecked authority—particularly when combined with opaque processes—can erode confidence among participants.

Best practices in governance favor:

- Separation of testing and adjudication functions
- Multi-party review for consequential decisions
- Clear documentation of decision criteria

These safeguards protect not only competitors, but also the officials and organizations responsible for enforcement.

6.3 Due Process and the Right to Context

Due process does not imply leniency, nor does it excuse intentional violations. Rather, it ensures that enforcement actions are informed, proportional, and defensible. In the context of tire testing, due process considerations include:

- Access to test methodology and standards
- Opportunity for secondary or confirmatory analysis
- Consideration of contextual data (e.g., durometer readings, tire age, heat cycles)
- Clear avenues for appeal or review

Absent these elements, enforcement outcomes may appear arbitrary—even when well-intentioned.

6.4 Proportionality of Penalties

A cornerstone of fair governance is proportionality: the principle that penalties should align with both the severity and certainty of an infraction. Binary enforcement models—where detection alone triggers maximum penalties—leave little room for nuance or scientific uncertainty.

Modern regulatory systems often employ graduated responses, recognizing the difference between:

- Intentional manipulation
- Negligent handling
- Incidental or unavoidable contamination

Applying proportionality within racing enforcement strengthens legitimacy and reduces unnecessary conflict.

6.5 Trust as a Competitive Asset

Trust is not an abstract concept; it is a competitive asset. Racers who trust enforcement systems are more likely to comply willingly, invest in their programs, and remain engaged over the long term. Conversely, perceived opacity or inflexibility can drive disengagement and attrition.

Governance frameworks that emphasize transparency, consistency, and fairness foster cooperation rather than adversarial relationships between racers and officials.

6.6 Summary

Competitive integrity depends as much on governance and due process as it does on technical enforcement. Systems that rely on single-point determinations, lack procedural safeguards, or impose disproportionate penalties risk undermining trust and participation. Modernizing governance structures alongside testing protocols is essential to maintaining fairness, credibility, and the long-term health of the sport.

7. A Path Forward: Modernized Testing & Racer Protections

Meaningful reform does not require abandoning enforcement, compromising safety, or tolerating intentional manipulation. It requires updating systems to reflect modern science, real-world conditions, and sound governance principles. This section outlines a practical, phased framework for modernizing tire testing and enforcement while protecting competitive integrity and the everyday racer.

7.1 Differentiation-Based Testing Standards

Testing protocols should explicitly distinguish between:

- Surface-level conditioning and maintenance
- Incidental or transferred surface contamination
- Intentional compound alteration or penetration

This differentiation can be achieved through combined evaluation methods rather than single-point detection. Chemical presence should trigger contextual review—not automatic penalties.

7.2 Marker-Based Identification Systems

One of the most effective modernization tools is the introduction of **non-performance-affecting chemical markers** embedded within approved tire conditioning products. These markers would:

- Be spectrally identifiable
- Remain inert with respect to tire performance
- Allow clear differentiation between approved conditioning and prohibited substances

Marker systems are widely used in fuel regulation, lubricants, and industrial quality control. Their application to tire conditioning would dramatically reduce ambiguity, false positives, and enforcement disputes.

7.3 Multi-Sample and Confirmatory Analysis

For determinations carrying significant penalties, enforcement should rely on:

- Multiple samples from different tire zones
- Confirmatory testing where initial results are inconclusive
- Comparison against control samples from the same event

This approach aligns with forensic best practices and reduces the risk of single-sample error or misinterpretation.

7.4 Standardized Chain-of-Custody Protocols

Uniform chain-of-custody standards should be established across sanctioning bodies and tracks, including:

- Documented collection procedures
- Sealed sample handling
- Environmental control during storage and transport
- Clear custody documentation

These measures protect racers, officials, and laboratories alike by preserving evidentiary integrity.

7.5 Calibration Transparency and Oversight

Testing equipment and analytical methods should be subject to:

- Documented calibration schedules

- Reference standard traceability
- Periodic independent audit or verification

Transparency in calibration does not weaken enforcement—it strengthens trust and defensibility.

7.6 Graduated Enforcement and Proportional Penalties

Enforcement frameworks should incorporate proportional responses based on:

- Certainty of intent
- Magnitude of deviation
- Competitive impact
- Prior history

Graduated enforcement models allow officials to address issues effectively without imposing disproportionate consequences where uncertainty exists.

7.7 Appeals, Review, and Technical Panels

A structured appeals process should be available for consequential determinations, supported by:

- Independent technical panels
- Access to test data and methodology
- Timely review timelines

Such mechanisms reinforce legitimacy and reduce adversarial tension.

7.8 Pilot Programs and Phased Implementation

Rather than immediate wholesale change, reform can be introduced through pilot programs at select tracks or series. These pilots would:

- Validate updated protocols
- Gather operational data
- Refine standards before broader adoption

Successful pilot outcomes can then inform industry-wide best practices.

7.9 Summary

Modernizing tire testing and enforcement is both achievable and necessary. By integrating scientific differentiation, marker-based identification, procedural safeguards, and proportional governance, the racing industry can protect fairness, affordability, and integrity simultaneously. Reform is not a concession—it is an investment in the sport's future.

7.10 Tiered Implementation Model: A 70/30 Framework for Responsible Reform

Recognizing that not all racing classes operate under the same economic realities, competitive pressures, or risk tolerances, a **tiered implementation model** provides a practical and responsible pathway for modernization. This framework allows meaningful reform to begin where it is most needed, while preserving stability in upper-tier competition.

Under a proposed **70/30 framework**:

- **Approximately 70% of grassroots, local, and budget-focused classes** would be permitted to utilize modern, non-toxic tire conditioning practices under clearly defined rules and oversight.
- **Approximately 30% of upper-tier, touring, or elite classes** would continue to operate under existing tire regulations and enforcement models during the initial phase.

This approach is not intended to create competitive inequality, but rather to acknowledge that different classes have fundamentally different cost structures, sponsorship models, and enforcement requirements.

7.10.1 Objectives of the 70/30 Framework

The tiered model is designed to achieve the following objectives:

- Provide immediate cost relief to the racers most affected by tire expense
- Reduce attrition and improve car counts at the grassroots level
- Maintain continuity and contractual stability in elite classes
- Limit institutional risk while reforms are evaluated
- Generate real-world operational data to inform future policy decisions

7.10.2 Governance and Controls Within the 70% Tier

Classes participating in the 70% tier would operate under a defined governance structure, including:

- Explicit differentiation between surface conditioning and compound alteration

- Use of approved conditioning products incorporating identifiable chemical markers
- Standardized application and handling guidelines
- Multi-sample and contextual evaluation when testing is conducted
- Proportional enforcement measures aligned with intent and impact

These controls ensure that cost-saving practices do not compromise fairness or safety.

7.10.3 Upper-Tier Class Stability (30% Tier)

Upper-tier classes would remain under current tire regulations during the pilot phase. No immediate changes to testing, enforcement, or sponsorship structures would be required. However, data from the 70% tier may be observed and evaluated in parallel to assess feasibility for future consideration.

This dual-track approach protects competitive integrity at the highest levels while allowing modernization to proceed responsibly elsewhere.

7.10.4 Review, Metrics, and Path to Expansion

The 70/30 framework should include a defined review period with measurable performance indicators, such as:

- Car count trends
- Safety and tire failure data
- Competitive parity metrics
- Enforcement disputes or appeals
- Racer and track feedback

At the conclusion of the review period, sanctioning bodies and stakeholders may evaluate whether expanded adoption, modification, or continuation of the tiered model is warranted.

7.10.5 Summary

A tiered 70/30 implementation model represents a balanced compromise between innovation and stability. It allows the sport to address affordability and fairness where pressures are greatest, without forcing abrupt or universal change. By proceeding in measured phases, racing can modernize with confidence, evidence, and broad stakeholder support.

8. Conclusion: Aligning Technology, Fairness, and the Future of Racing

Short track racing stands at an inflection point. Advances in tire compounds, maintenance practices, and materials science have outpaced the enforcement frameworks designed to regulate them. This disconnect has created unnecessary tension, economic strain, and mistrust—particularly among the everyday racers who form the backbone of the sport.

This white paper has demonstrated that modern, non-toxic tire conditioning is fundamentally different from historical softening practices that early testing protocols were built to detect. Independent forensic research confirms that chemical transfer between tires is possible under normal racing conditions, undermining the assumption that detection alone establishes intent. Long-term competitive data further shows that when properly governed, tire conditioning can enhance parity, safety, and sustainability without compromising integrity.

Equally important, this paper has shown that enforcement systems rooted in single-point determinations, opaque procedures, and disproportionate penalties risk undermining trust and participation. Competitive integrity is not preserved through rigidity alone—it is sustained through fairness, transparency, and accountability.

The path forward does not require abandoning enforcement or tolerating abuse. It requires modernization. Differentiation-based testing, marker-assisted identification, multi-sample verification, standardized custody protocols, calibration transparency, proportional penalties, and meaningful review mechanisms are not radical concepts. They are established best practices across regulated industries where outcomes carry significant consequences.

Racing has always evolved—through technology, safety, and competition. Updating tire testing and governance frameworks is a continuation of that tradition, not a departure from it. By aligning enforcement with modern science and economic realities, the industry can protect racers, support tracks, and preserve the competitive spirit that defines the sport.

Reform is not about choosing sides. It is about choosing sustainability, credibility, and a future where skill, preparation, and innovation—not unchecked cost or outdated assumptions—determine success on the track.

Authorship & Correspondence

Prepared by:

Edward "Buck" Parker
President & Founder
Daytona 1 Performance Lubricants
Magellan International Lube & Chemical Corporation

Industry Background:
Inducted into the **NASA Space Technology Hall of Fame** for Advanced Lubrication
Over four decades of experience in lubrication science, motorsports technology, and performance product development

Purpose of Submission:
This white paper is submitted in good faith to support constructive dialogue, evidence-based policy development, and the long-term sustainability of short track racing. The intent is to encourage modernization of testing and governance frameworks in a manner that protects competitive integrity, affordability, and trust across the industry.

Contact Information:
Cell: 386-299-3614
Email: bpdaytona@aol.com

Date: December 24, 2025
Document Classification: White Paper
Version: v1.0

This document is intended for professional review and discussion among racing organizations, sanctioning bodies, track operators, and industry stakeholders.