

## Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by Sterling Doc - 12 Oct 2015 19:03

---

OK guys, time to hear out RCR's for next years rules. We'll keep this open through the end of the month, and then get the new rules, if any, hashed out.

As always, please bear in mind that rules changes need to be cost effective to existing cars, as well as new builds, and the burden of proof is on why the new rule is needed, not justifying the existing rule - rules stability is key here!

Stay tuned for a big announcement in about a week, as well!

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by AgRacer - 20 Oct 2015 11:17

---

**dpRacing Dan wrote:**

Hey Jason,

This is not to take away from your rule change suggestion- but If you're having trouble sourcing cookies, contact Mike Dearstyne. He seems to know a place around Tennessee that has a ton of them. I've been buying them locally around Chicago for between \$175-\$300 per set.

Just FYI-

No taking away, this is exactly the kind of information that we need when deciding which rules are of benefit. I'm sure there are pockets of cookie cutter wheel supply for cheap all over the country that onesie twosie racers know about. Upon survey of ebay, craigslist, and the other racers in my region, there wasnt easy access readily available to us without doing a lot more searching.

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by Crooks - 21 Oct 2015 12:25

---

Add to dyno testing;

At any event when a dynamiter is used; At such time as the Dyno operator indicates that all set up including compensation factors is complete. The Dyno will be deemed as the standard for that event. In the case of a Dyno that is erratic or more than marginally inaccurate this rule may be waived if and only if the series director and a unanimous and anonymous vote of competitors deem it necessary.

We all understand that dyno use has become problematic, I am not casting dispersions. Our series directors have done the best possible with the rules as outlined, but it is unacceptable to have a Dyno provided at an event and then ignore the readings. NASA and PCA do the best they can at providing good systems but results are often questionable.

To leave the decision to abandon dyno readings up to the series director is not fair to him or to his successor.

I am new to 944 Spec, so far I love the car and find most of the competitors to be a great bunch. One reason I got into 944 is that we race cars that are close to equal, If we choose to allow this to get away from us, it will reduce the number of new racers in our class. If I had understood that dyno readings could be ignored I would not have gotten into the class.

It does not matter how sure we all are that a Dyno is wrong, we treat it as though it is correct, tune to it and go racing.

□

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by S2k4j - 24 Oct 2015 18:33

---

I'm proposing the addition of a crank scraper purely for reliability reasons. It's a relatively inexpensive part that is easily installed. Best time to install is when we have to change out rod bearings. From what I know they come in plastic or metal. The link below is to Paragon Products and they sell it in metal form for \$80.

[www.paragon-products.com/Crankshaft-Scra...5l-crank-scraper.htm](http://www.paragon-products.com/Crankshaft-Scra...5l-crank-scraper.htm)

I'm not that mechanically inclined so I'm not aware of the potential advantages it may or may not have. The Paragon website states "During normal engine operation a significant amount of oil adheres to or becomes entrained in a cloud surrounding the spinning bottom end. This oil eats up horsepower your engine is making by increasing the rotating mass and also creating parasitic drag. A crank scraper mechanically strips off excess oil by coming close to, but not touching\*, the moving crankshaft and rods. It also interferes with the pressure differential that draws oil into the so-called windage cloud."

The last sentence of the quote is what interests me, especially with number 2 bearing. These cars are appx. 30 years old and I've found parts have slowly increased in price while ease of availability has gone down. Anything we can do to keep them on the track inexpensively, will only sustain the popularity of the class and racing fun! Given the low cost and affect it can have upon reliability, I believe it should be considered for approval.

=====

### Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by wera44 - 27 Oct 2015 16:18

---

I propose that we allow short shifters. I have driven several of these cars and they are all plagued with the same sloppy shifting which promote mis- shifts. I believe that allowing this modification will allow for better racing.

=====

### Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by AgRacer - 28 Oct 2015 05:34

---

#### **wera44 wrote:**

I propose that we allow short shifters. I have driven several of these cars and they are all plagued with the same sloppy shifting which promote mis- shifts. I believe that allowing this modification will allow for better racing.

I second this. Short shifters are cheap in racing terms and completely enhance the feel of the shifter over the sloppy hot dog down a hallway feel it has now. Let us shift with confidence and precision!

=====