

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 Items)

Posted by joepaluch - 02 Nov 2010 06:20

Ok,

Here is my personal opinion. (Just me and does not represent anyone but me).

2011-1) - 3 piece crossmember - NO - While the intent is fine it opens the door to some adjustments and non uniformities that we do not know about. The only way to be close is to spec a certain part number. Then we need to validate that part number and manage and track it.

Seems better to stay stock. Pulling the crossmember is not that hard IMHO.

2011-2) Larger jack pad - YES - fine with me. I see now drawbacks.

2011-3) 924 Carrara GT flares. I see it from one standpoint that it may allow more cars to participate. I know of at least one car locally with these rear flares and it is shame to not let it run. I also see the that potential gains are slight. - So mixed, but lean toward no.

2011-4) Lexan rear qtr windows. - NO. Lexan should not be used on these cars at all. We allow the windshield for "safety" and lower replacement costs, but guys are thinking about it for weight. No.. better to keep it stock. The plastic you get home depot maybe clear, but what will happen in crash. The stock glass was designed for automotive use so lets just leave it at that. If you need a fresh air duct use the passenger's door window.

So No, Yes, Maybe, No. Is my personal view. We series directors have not agreed on these yet and the comment period is still open.

(remember no all proposals are my idea, it is just my job to present them).

=====

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

Posted by Atteberry - 02 Nov 2010 19:45

I have read all the comments in this discussion stream and do not see where these changes add

anything to the class from the standpoint of helping us add drivers to the class. I can see where it could add a small advantage to those who implement them all. However none of these ideas are original equipment to the cars and in the end this is spec class is racing. I would vote no on all four if given a chance to do so in the dictatorship which is 944-Spec racing. I will say so far the dictatorship is working fairly well

=====

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

Posted by jaje - 02 Nov 2010 20:35

I have the 3 piece Lindsey crossmember which I put in to help make rod bearing changes quick and easy. It uses the same geometry as the oem unit (it was just measured / cut and fabbed to allow easier maintenance. It has no performance potential. The rules do not state it is allowed or disallowed. No need to change it. The only drawback I've seen is some of them are cracking (some knockoffs I've seen done) and a couple Lindsey units. Though I think it is from some off course excursions that caused it.

=====

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

Posted by cbuzzetti - 03 Nov 2010 07:36

The current rules definitely do not allow it. You are required to have the OEM piece unless the rules specifically say so.

Again there is no reason to support an aftermarket part that now looks to be inferior by your admission. The factory cross member does not have a cracking issue that I have heard of.

=====

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

Posted by jaje - 03 Nov 2010 07:57

cbuzzetti wrote:

The current rules definitely do not allow it. You are required to have the OEM piece unless the rules specifically say so.

Again there is no reason to support an aftermarket part that now looks to be inferior by your admission. The factory cross member does not have a cracking issue that I have heard of. I've seen a factory crossmember crack so they are not immune to it. I put it on my car before I was to race it - for the reason so I can maintain it much easier to do rod bearings. To me I read it as not in the rules but does not add a performance measure to the car then it doesn't violate the spirit of the rules. It was like those

who cut holes to index their torsion bars long before it was allowed. It eased maintenance of the car but did not add to performance (or can we make the point that cutting out that hole helped with aero or lighted the car!).

=====

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

Posted by bay924s - 03 Nov 2010 20:56

2011-1 - In favor

2011-2 - In favor

2001-3 - No opinion

2011-4 - opposed

=====