

### **16.3.14 Factory Jack Point Reinforcement**

Posted by JB3 - 27 Sep 2010 22:50

---

The present allowance for a 4"x4" 1/8" plate works fine especially for 'track' lightweight aluminum jacks etc or when utilizing an adapter or 'hockey puck'.

The average steel shop jack saddle is 5" and usually closer to 6" diameter and concave so that the actual lifting edges are farther apart than the edges of the present allowance.

A reinforcing plate 4" wide and 6" long would allow lifting with the larger common jack saddle. 6"x6" would be even better but don't want to appear greedy.

Weight and strength changes resulting in a competitive advantage would appear to be non-existent.

I did search but did not find previous discussion on this recent rule. If I missed same and this is redundant I apologize in advance.

Thanks

---

### **Re:16.3.14 Factory Jack Point Reinforcement**

Posted by joepaluch - 27 Sep 2010 22:54

---

4x4 was assumed to be good enough.

However a little larger probably won't change much of anything other than making it easier to work with.

I will consider this for 2011 rules changes and let everyone weigh in on the idea.

Remember the reason for the limit is two things.

- 1) to prevent it from being used as ballast.
- 2) to prevent it from being a chassis stiffener.

---

### **Re:16.3.14 Factory Jack Point Reinforcement**

Posted by Big Dog - 28 Sep 2010 04:56

---

A larger pad does not seem to be an issue for me. We DON't want more ballast on the driver's side. We DO want more on the passenger side.

Requiring that both sides be the same would take away any "perceived" ballast advantage (better on one side and worse on the other side). If it makes things easier for guys in the paddock, great.

A 6X6 pad will not stiffen the chassis enough to matter.

Jim

---