

2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by joepaluch - 27 Oct 2010 06:04

These are **PROPOSED** Changes only based on driver and director suggestions. Please comment below. These are proposed NEW allowances to the 944 spec rule set.

2011-1) 3 Piece Crossmember

Proposal: Allow 3 Piece engine mount support cross member as manufactured and originally sold by Lindsey racing. PNxxxxx (TBD)

Justification: Allows for faster and easier rod bearing changes which improve the maintainability of the cars. No change in performance.

2011-2) Larger Jack pad reinforcement

Proposal: Increase size of jackpad described in rule 16.3.14 from 4" by 4" to 6" by 6".

Justification: The larger size better matches up with jack saddle sizes on larger floor jacks

2011-3) Allow 924S models to use 924 Carrera GT type flares on the rear.

Proposal: All 87 and 924S chassis to install fiberglass 924 Carrera GT/ GTS type rear flares. Flares limited to units produce by GT racing part number xxxx (TBD). Track width may be increased the limit of the 944. If rear flares are installed the front must also convert to 944 steel fenders.

Justification: This allows a simple easy way for a narrow 924S to achieve the same track width as allowed by the 944. Front bodywork will be identical to the 944 and the rear flares are a cheaper solution than using 944 rear qtr panels.

2011-4.) Lexan rear Qtr windows

Proposal: Allow rear replacement of glass qtr windows with lexan and to allow air ducting to be installed in these lexan windows. No changes to rear hatch.

Justification: Makes it a nice clean way to provide fresh air ducting.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Item

Posted by rd7839 - 29 Oct 2010 18:11

I agree with charlie, NO new rules!!!! A stable rules platform is very attractive, new rules every year seems like change for change's sake. Lexan side windows? Who needs them?

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by spec28 - 29 Oct 2010 19:13

Chuck, RD and others.....really? Why do you care if I have lexan 1/4 windows with naca ducts or a 3 pc crossmember? You dont have to run them, but why downgrade to a no vote to impede someone else enjoying them?

This goes out to all that vote on issues. How about voting No if you think it will cause an unfair advantage, and vote yes if you dont care one way or the other.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by JerryW - 29 Oct 2010 19:29

Because that's their opinion on the proposal.

There is a lot to be said that each non stock change to the car allows wriggle room by the rule readers. Some feel that changes from stock components need to be justified more than just because it's easy/no big deal/no advantage.

Both Charlie and Ron (and to a large extent me) feel the statement

No New Rules

Meets the best way to end each year. We all recognize that some changes are occasionally needed but like to see a good justification.

(I'll also let them talk for themselves - this is my opinion not theirs)

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by SvoChuck - 29 Oct 2010 20:51

spec28 wrote:

Chuck, RD and others.....really?

by "chuck" you mean Charlie right ? It all sounds fine to me .

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Item

Posted by cbuzzetti - 29 Oct 2010 23:25

I am with Jerry and Ron on this 100%.

Rule changes for the fun of it does not fit well with spec classes.

Both of those things have some merit but are not needed.

I am going to take a head count personally at the next NASA race to see where so-cal stands.

Jerry if you or Ken would do the same it would be appreciated. Please write down each persons name and their opinion about any of the posted changes.

If there are going to be any changes it should be by majority rule. Not by dictator rule.

Now repeat after me "NO NEW RULES"

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Item

Posted by joepaluch - 30 Oct 2010 07:36

cbuzzetti wrote:

If there are going to be any changes it should be by majority rule. Not by dictator rule.

Now repeat after me "NO NEW RULES"

Charlie,

This class has always been a dictatorship. We have never had any straight up/down votes to determine class rules. That said the regional directors have always sought input from the drivers and discussed things together. The reason we operate this way is I rather not have politics be a large part of rules process. Sure there is ways an aspect of that, but quite simply not every visit is the forums. So voting is flawed.

I will say we all take driver feedback seriously. It is major factor in any decision and I have always said all it takes is one good strong argument to override the gut feel of 10 other drivers.

So far I have only commented on 2 rule proposals of the 7 presented. The rest are presented based on feedback from various drivers. Give me a day or two and I will present my evaluation of these 4 items.

=====