

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 kimballkc - 08 Nov 2016 04:03

I would definitely back the allowance of the only944 short shift kit. It is an inexpensive item that would possibly help to tighten up some people's shifters (some of us *really* need to find something to stop it being so incredibly sloppy).

My own car has stock componentry for the shifter and feels like a perfectly modern gearbox however, but I do not think reducing the throws themselves would really even offer any performance benefit. I can shift much faster in the 944 than I can in my modern VW Golf- I don't know much about the mechanics of gearboxes, but throw distance \neq shift speed.

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by tcomeau - 08 Nov 2016 09:15

Kyle,

I've heard that guys are getting the slop out by installing the "only 944" rear linkage improvements. You should have a fresh shift lever or use the bearing system shifter part by the same company. No change in shifting speed/throw.

Karl,

Not sure what that dyno graph was? Certainly doesn't apply to 944's. You're welcome to dyno tune all you want. If you find a way to make your car faster than everyone else's and within the current rules, we'll change the rules to exclude it. That's why chips and headers were banned after several seasons. SOME guys were going to the dyno and spending 30 hrs to get an advantage before even getting to the grid. You can either BE fast, or BUY fast. This class is about driving well, not tinkering.

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by cbuzzetti - 08 Nov 2016 14:05

I propose to allow the battery to be moved to the passenger seat area. This will give the car a better weight balance, wont require a high cost battery and does not cost alot to upgrade.

I have the full 944only short shifter in my PTD car. It is better than the stock system but is not a true short shifter. It still has a pretty long throw but the gain in shifter accuracy was noticeable.

A transmission can only be shifted so fast. As much as I oppose rules changes I think this one is worthwhile.

If all cars were equal it would tighten the group as a whole but most likely will not change who is on the podium.

I do like the aftermarket wheels but dont think there is a true shortage yet. I have a set of late offset phonies for sale if anyone is looking.

A rule to allow an adjustable cam gear on LC cars may be needed. Any car under the power cap should be given leeway to get to the cap. This is a low cost option to help.

I am still opposed to having a DME with a higher rev limit. All should have the option for the higher rev limit or none should have it. If you are defending the higher rev limit please explain why you think it is fair and it is not an advantage. SPEC=SAME.

Do we need all the engine rules if we have a HP/TQ cap?

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by KJZ78701 - 08 Nov 2016 14:05

Thanks for the response Tim, but you didn't answer my question or reply to my suggestions.

The dyno graph came from a Dynojet (spelled out in the rules as the Dyno used for compliance) which, as you can see, produces different torque values in different gears. This goes directly to my suggestion that the rules should include a specification for the selected gear during the compliance run. If there is a counter-argument, someone should present it.

I am also concerned about your remark:

If you find a way to make your car faster than everyone else's and within the current rules, we'll change the rules to exclude it.

This is great if you are already in the class and have a less than optimized car, but you are also trying to encourage more people to build cars and join you. I am on the outside looking in and your approach bothers me. Am I am alone? I gave you another suggestion to replace the $(HP+TQ)/2$ formula with a torque table. Can you see how this would protect BOTH those already in the class and those like me who want to build and join?

...and how do you exclude a perfect build?

=====

Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by tcomeau - 08 Nov 2016 15:04

I don't think anyone, including the dyno operator would dyno a car in anything BUT 4th gear, but let's add that to the rules.

A "perfect build" car is still within the rules.

=====