

2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!

Posted by Sterling Doc - 07 Oct 2013 18:25

Silly Season opens today!

Post up your rules change requests here.

We will collect them for a week or so, and assemble them in individual threads for debate.

=====

Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!

Posted by cbuzzetti - 11 Oct 2013 14:00

I am surprised by how few drivers are participating in this discussion.

Speak up guys if you want to see your ideas discussed and possibly made into a new rule.

If it has validity it will be given a serious debate.

=====

Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!

Posted by RacerX - 11 Oct 2013 18:39

cbuzzetti wrote:

I am surprised by how few drivers are participating in this discussion.

Speak up guys if you want to see your ideas discussed and possibly made into a new rule.

If it has validity it will be given a serious debate.

Thats cause everyone is content with the rules as they are. LOL

=====

Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!

Posted by RacerX - 14 Oct 2013 11:35

I have two more....

Now that we have a HP cap people will want to build to that 140HP limit. We should build to that limit and not over. Building over and then reducing the HP by restrictor will net you more HP/TQ in the lower rev range. In order to keep people from doing this we should impose the following rules or something similar...

11.1.1 Air and fuel flow shall not be restricted to meet the 138 + 2 HP cap. Restrictor plates and throttle stop screws are illegal.

13.6.6 The fuel rail and injector size will remain stock and unmodified. Fuel pressure regulators are illegal.

2 or 3 HP over isn't that bad now. HP/TQ are very close and you can add thicker engine and gear box oil, change to a longer exhaust etc., but I can see it being more than that in the near future. If we limit this now, I believe it will cause less headaches in the future.

=====

Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!

Posted by Robbie - 14 Oct 2013 11:42

I would again call to remove ram air, or restrict the inlet to the front left turn signal area. As stated last year I don't feel this fits the spirit of our rules for the follwing reason:

1. This is supposed to be a drivers class and not an engineering class. Spending the time to test and develop a ram air system that is effective crosses this line. You are not working to make the car as optimal as possible within the limits of the factory equipment but working outside it.

2. We have made a big deal about instituting a cap for power that involves a dyno, but we allow a

system that cannot be tested on a dyno. Also, given that Miller is currently a Nationals track, we are rewarding those who spend the money and time to develop a car that makes max power on the dyno and then can exceed that on the track that currently is not enforced.

3. There is evidence that the best place for drawing air for the 944 is the foglight area. Given the differences in the shape of the front bumper for the 924S and 944, we are giving an advantage to the 944 as this area is not available as an opening for the 924S. Since we cannot take back the use of the 924S, we should at least limit the inlet area for ram air to a location that can be accessed by both cars in the category.

=====

Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!

Posted by michaelreich - 14 Oct 2013 11:58

I do not know if I understand the last post. If the best place is the foglight area, then why should one care if you use the bumper? Will a 944 bumper fit on a 924S? I thought they would.

=====

Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!

Posted by Robbie - 14 Oct 2013 12:07

I and any other 924S driver would have to update/backdate to a full 944 conversion of any year. Either way, what is the smarter, lower cost change?

=====