

## 2011 Rules change Proposal HP limit 2011-8

Posted by SvoChuck - 04 Nov 2010 22:28

---

### proposal 2011-8)

**Dyno Max HP limit 142.0 =  $(hp+ tq)/2$  on a Dynojet.** Pulls done in 4th gear, SAE net corrections Smoothing factor (TBD). Rear tires and wheels must be legal during runs. - (Note other classes that use dyno's for limit will be consulted to validate all the dyno nuances to limit variability.)

**Justification:** Prevent expanding the performance envelope beyond the current demonstrated limit. This is being proposed as an upper limit to ensure future builds do not exceed the current performance levels. It is understood that continuing minor gains might increase effective hp output levels of the class. These minor gains while small in individuality can add up to noticeable gains. Such minor issues may also negatively impact the reliability of both engines and chassis. This overall limit will help to reduce the drive to make modifications that sacrifice reliability for minor hp gains. Items such as super light weight engine and gear oils may increase wheel hp, but at the expense of reliability.

=====

## Re: 2011 Rules change Proposal HP limit 2011-8

Posted by Sterling Doc - 06 Nov 2010 06:39

---

### Litespeeds wrote:

Is there any way to set up a minimum car/driver weight with maximum HP scale? Let's say you can cap the maximum HP to 145hp but that car will have to carry extra weight so the minimum after a race will be 2,750 lbs car and driver?

Is there a ratio that will be fair for horsepower and weight? For each 1 hp, you need to put on 10 lbs?

That means if you have a car that dynos only 130hp, you can drop your car down to 2,600 lbs.

This could be done for those who race locally as everyone could dyno their car on the same day and place but how would you do that for visitors? I think this new change would be very difficult to enforce.

This has been discussed, but adds a lot of cost and complexity.

The guys shooting for the podium will dyno with or without this rule, the budget guys won't (and won't need to), unless they get a free one through rules compliance process. I don't see this changing much, if at all from this rule. One side benefit, is that more racers will get dynos paid for by NASA. NASA has balked at putting spec cars on the dyno (at their cost) when there is nothing in our rules set that references a dyno. This is not a reason to do this in and of itself, but a nice side benefit.

The series directors, together, have been involved in building and dyno testing dozens of motors in the last 8+ years. We have a pretty good data set about what a well built motor should develop, and the dyno variation we've seen. We are concerned about some of the HP enhancing methods we're now seeing. We are listening to the concerns out there, on *both* sides of this debate, and working on the least intrusive, yet effective change to address this issue, hence the evolution of the proposed changes.

Again, this is not a power/wt. series like GTS. No need to dyno if you're building a good, standard motor. You won't get caught out at this cap. If you are going to spend the money to really push the envelope, you are already dyno testing your motor to tune it. I see little if any *necessary* added cost with this proposal, and this was a critical point in arriving at this compromise.

JB3, your points are well taken, and probably the best argument weighing against this. This is still a proposal, though one with a lot of thought behind it. I'd like to formally hear from some of the guys who have been vocal on these boards about their concerns about the motors out there. ***Does this proposal address your concerns to a reasonable degree?***

=====

## Re: 2011 Rules change Proposal HP limit 2011-8

Posted by rd7839 - 06 Nov 2010 08:23

---

Nobody in my region needs to be dyno'd, does anybody think there's somebody in theirs that does? If the answer is no, then who is this rule targeting? All this rule does is add cost and divides the regions. The motor that pulled 145 was ten hp more than anybody else that day. How does SAE correction fix that? If I pull 144 now what? Do I have to rebuild, or get a new computer? New intake or exhaust? Mo money, mo money, mo money! The fast guys will still win and the budget guys will go home!

Come on guys, our ruleset is fine, lets not tinker with success! This bickering is souring my experience at nationals. I met alot of great guys and look forward to racing with them again some day. I did hear there was some bellyaching about the have and have nots but I didn't think they were serious. I saw nothing but talent up front, those that deserved to be there were!

=====

## Re: 2011 Rules change Proposal HP limit 2011-8

Posted by cbuzzetti - 06 Nov 2010 11:31

---

So-Cal is Racing this weekend and were planning on sitting down tonight to discuss all proposals and take a head count to see where we are as a group.

Will report later.

I am with you Ron Dale.

This is not an issue in So-Cal.

=====

## Re: 2011 Rules change Proposal HP limit 2011-8

Posted by cbuzzetti - 06 Nov 2010 20:11

---

The following poll was conducted to see if there was a trend or consensus about the proposed rules.

Some of the results are from opinions stated on this forum and some from the So-Cal drivers.

Proposed rules 2011-1 (3 piece crossmember) 12 for/ 6 opposed

2011-2 (Larger Jack pad reinforcement) 16 for/ 2 opposed

2011-3 (924s GT Flares) 5 for/ 13 opposed

2011-4 (lexan rear qtr windows) 8 for/ 10 opposed

2011-5 (fog light opening clarification) 10 for/ 1 opposed

2011-6 (minimum head thickness rule) 4 for/ 7 opposed

2011-7a (DA w/ sharing) 5 for/ 8 opposed

2011-7b (DA w/o sharing) 3 for/ 10 opposed

2011-8 (HP Limit at 142 rwhp) 2 for/ 5 opposed ( does not include forum opinions)

=====

### **Re: 2011 Rules change Proposal HP limit 2011-8**

Posted by rlofgren - 06 Nov 2010 21:09

---

no new rules! dyno variation, increased costs, if we have cheaters, they can be protested via NASA rules.

=====

### **Re: 2011 Rules change Proposal HP limit 2011-8**

Posted by joepaluch - 07 Nov 2010 07:11

---

#### **rlofgren wrote:**

no new rules! dyno variation, increased costs, if we have cheaters, they can be protested via NASA rules.

Yes they can, but rules can't capture everything.

Guys here is the deal. We all want to see this series stay what it was years ago. Take junkyard car and build it up for reliability and have at it.

That is what we all want to see. We know some guys will put more effort in things than others and that has never been an issue until now.

The reality is that part of the problem is our own doing. The more popular a series gets the stronger the competition. While that is good it can force people to look in to ever more creative way to make thier car fast. We all seem ok with chassis tuning as in general that costs little in parts and is about dialing in what you have. Motors are different.

The benchmark in the class used to be mid 130's. If you had 132 to 135 hp you were doing good. Then it became upper 130's. 138 is now the expected for top car. The differnce on track between 138 and 139 is not that much from 132. However once you start pushing over 140 that 132 hp typical car is getting father and father behind.

So how do you ensure going forward that new standard for performance does not reach 145 hp? We have drivers here that have explained that getting from 138-140 to 145 is as &quot;easy&quot; as thin oil in engines and gearboxes. To me that is scary. Running thin oil is a great way spin rod bearings and our motors are not cheap enough to just change them every race.

Put yourself in our shoes and tell me how you guys would plan to PREVENT us from breaking over the 140 hp barrier? How do you stop thin engine oil, thin gearbox oil. Years ago we found out about chips and headers. It was starting to be an issue and it was addressed. That was painful, but effective. Now we see progress, but in a poor direction as well. This time around we don't see any &quot;part&quot; that we can point to. If we cannot find the special part it is hard write a rule around it.

So we directors felt after much thought the least of all evils was to put max hp limit on the class verified by dynojet. I have been against dyno limits for years as they always created a target to build to. However I personally can't see any other way to prevent a power build up.

If any of you have a plan to keep the max performance level where it is now tell us. Don't just say since we don't see the issue it does not exist.

BTW... It seems like many of you don't want to published the head thickness limits that have been in effect for years. Funny because here is a rule that is not dyno based and can help validate rules compliance without major disassembly and will have zero impact on all legal cars and yet many of you are saying no.

If you want to keep the class cheap and equal to run you have to actively work at it.

=====