

2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by dpRacing Dan - 31 Oct 2016 10:34

Ok boys and girls, the time has come for us to propose/discuss/debate any proposed rules for the 2017 season.

NASA is already pressuring me to have the rules wrapped up in an unrealistic time, but we WILL need to expedite this this year. Let's try to keep this constructive. If you have an idea, please post it up on the thread, voice your reasons, and be prepared to have them dashed or supported. I will read all comments and hear all reasoning. I will ONLY do this here- no phone calls please. Emails are ok, but THIS is where we go to discuss rules. PLEASE keep this civil- I dont want any huge arguments to spin out of control. Lets all be grown ups, and keep this friendly.

Please remember, only rules that will increase reliability, or performance WITHOUT significant spending or changes will be considered. Remember EVERY change effects not only cars in your region, but EVERY car in the country running under these rules. I wont consider anything that cannot be quickly or easily done to EVERY car in the country competing (this is about 175 cars nationally). My main goal is to keep our cars as reliable and competitive as possible, without spending lots of money.

Ready?

Set.

GO!

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by AgRacer - 01 Nov 2016 07:21

We have some other avenues we can seek out to help the low compression motors be more desirable to run before we dive into allowing aftermarket pistons. I still maintain that parts are very regionally based. What is plentiful in one region is nowhere to be found in another. I have seen those in the Mid-South attempt to find 88 pistons on several occasions but I don't know if they were successful.

Some intermediate, easy solutions IF the class deems this to be required:

1) Simplest: weight penalty for running 88 pistons/parts (50 pounds?). I am consistently 50 pounds overweight with a pure 88 engine and I feel equal to most other cars within reason.

2) Better research to inform the current rules to determine the appropriate amount of cam timing offset for a fully head shaved LC motor. This would include more dyno testing on a fully shaved LC motor to include using a variable cam sprocket to properly test the effects of timing beyond the simple 2 degree offset key. I also read somewhere (rennlist) that moving a tooth on the stock cam sprocket equals 6 degrees, therefore if you do that plus a 2 degree offset key retarding timing you could get 4 degrees advanced under the current rules. I have a feeling 2 degrees isn't enough.

3) Restrict exhaust to factory Y pipe and even specify an exhaust for 88 engines (stock or cheap, specific aftermarket Y pipe back system). I noticed about 4 HP difference with a little more bottom end when I had the spec dump truck exhaust and hanksville pipe installed like everyone runs in the GL/MW.

4) Biggest departure from current rules: Allow LC engines to run a specific aftermarket chip. Problematic for some who run the early DME without the ability to change chips. Also problematic in compliance but insurmountable.

There might be other simple solutions available but these were the quick ones I could come up with.

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by dpRacing Dan - 01 Nov 2016 07:54

Agreed these problems can be much more dramatic regionally. This is another reason we created the 944 Spec Facebook page. I encourage all of you to contact any of us- or post there what you need.

I agree the 88 motor seems to be the best plug-and-play solution, but I'm not sure its a big benefit over the early LC motors. I won 2 regional championships, as well as eastern nats on a 5-year old LC motor. It broke out in 2016 at a regional event on the dyno. The early motors seem to make better low-end tq than the 88 motors, but the 88s seem to make more power up top. Trade off? I dont nec think they cost more to build either. That motor finally died for me this season (after 7 season of racing) and I bought a used 88 motor from Neal. But the only real difference in the machine work would be the ammount shaved off the head? Its not like the machine shop would charge more for shaving MORE off a cylinder head though.

I think the Y-pipe idea could be smart to curb power numbers, but the factory Y-pipes are actually hard to find and prone to cracking. We do rely on people to keep their cars compliant- so this may be an advisory vs a rule?

Good thoughts here - keep em coming!

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by Manuel_M - 01 Nov 2016 09:12

Just to note, I am definitely not saying that I'd be winning more with an 88 engine, my talent level isn't there yet. Also am not advocating bringing the 88 numbers down. The gap isn't significant between the two engines but I know it's there. The mechanic part of me knows I could make a better engine but have issues finding the part.

There are a considerable amount of variables but my power numbers are skewed towards TQ like Dan mentioned. I think the only thing left I can do is change the cam from early to late.

Also, I'm using the 2 degree key but can anyone have them machined? They are \$50 from the only source I know of.

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by tcomeau - 01 Nov 2016 09:18

Before proposals, ask yourself, "Is this helping me, or the class?" "Do we really need this change?" I encourage new ideas, but please think them through just like you would before going before your board of directors at your business. "Is this idea going to make me look smart or short sighted...? Will it impact other things? DOES IT KEEP WITH THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CLASS? EQUAL, CHEAP, SIMPLE, VERIFIABLE.

You don't need 88 pistons to be competitive or win. MOST guys don't have them, right? Shave your head to 22.62 mm and use a cam key.

Going to an aftermarket piston only helps the piston builder.

We DON'T DO weight penalties for mods in this class. It's 2600 lbs for everybody. Simple. Easy to verify.

I have two sets of 88 pistons on the shelf if you're still convinced you need them.

This e-mail address is being protected from spambots. You need JavaScript enabled to view it

Use your experiences tempered with your love and respect for this class and let's get the best ideas out there for the 2017 season.

True to the class since 2003. Tim

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by Manuel_M - 01 Nov 2016 09:26

My head is at min with the cam key, tubular headers, afm tuned, ect... Completely agree they are not needed to win races but as Brain listed (some not all) go out of their way to find them which unintentionally adds additional cost (and time searching). Not to mention the perceived advantage. I'll shoot you an email shortly.

=====