

## **2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!**

Posted by Sterling Doc - 07 Oct 2013 18:25

---

Silly Season opens today!

Post up your rules change requests here.

We will collect them for a week or so, and assemble them in individual threads for debate.

---

## **Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!**

Posted by spec944#74 - 08 Oct 2013 08:42

---

My #1 request would be to drop the requirement to run balance shafts. These motors run perfectly fine without them and we see a host of problems associated with them, from breaking fuel rails due to incorrectly setting the timing to oil leaks from cracked covers, belt breakage, etc. Tage Evenson was knocked out of the championship race this year because of a massive oil leak from a cracked balance shaft cover that was virtually invisible until the car warmed up to operating temperature. I understand the reason the rule was adopted, but since there is now a horsepower limit I can think of no reason to retain it. They are just one more 25+ year old part that has to be sourced. In addition, it would make getting a motor to the horsepower/torque limit much more feasible and less expensive for racers that are just starting out or on a tight budget, not to mention cheaper to maintain.

---

My #2 request would be some kind of requirement to ensure that ECU settings cannot be changed between the end of a race and a dyno check. I know this is probably more of an issue at Nationals, as most of the regions don't do dyno checks, but Nationals is where it would probably be the most appropriate. The same procedure could be used if there is a protest about a motor being in compliance. 944 Cup has a rule that requires ECUs to be inspected and sealed that seems to be working well for them. We might want to take a look at how they do it to see if there are aspects of their procedure that could be done for little or no cost and a minimum amount of hassle.

---

## **Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!**

Posted by Sterling Doc - 08 Oct 2013 11:06

---

Steve,

We will put the balance shaft delete on the proposal list

We did seal most of the ECU's & AFM's at Nationals this year. Inspection tape works well for this. No changes of *any type* should be made from race time until the car is released from impound (that includes the dyno).

=====

## **Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!**

Posted by rd7839 - 08 Oct 2013 15:40

---

I know we've discussed this one before and I don't feel super strong about it but I had a chance to buy a set of rr's with 3 heat cycles for SUPER cheap from a spec miata.

Is there any reason we can't migrate to 205's? Deals like the one I had a chance to get come up occasionally plus using the same size as two other large class might make them more available, not to mention slightly cheaper. I would think the performance differential would be negligible.

What does everybody else think?

=====

## **Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!**

Posted by cbuzzetti - 09 Oct 2013 07:00

---

Silly Season!!! I like that, its funny.

As opposed as I am to new rules there are a couple of things that need fixing in my opinion.

1. There is no need anymore for the head thickness rule or the compression rule now that we have a HP cap.
2. Allow an offset woodruff key for early motors to make it easier to get to the max HP.
3. Allow the deletion of the counter balance shaft belt (belt only). I raced for two seasons in POC without one with no ill effects. Again allows the early engines to get to the HP cap.

4. Dyno Procedures: This one will require a separate thread for sure.

5. Outlaw the 88 DME as it has a higher rev limiter. This does not fit into the SPEC ideology.

---

## Re: 2014 Rules Change Requests - post here!

Posted by RacerX - 09 Oct 2013 09:07

---

As some of you know in 2012 I blew my oil pan gasket out in the last race of the season at Road America. I did not blow up the engine but a costly engine re-build took place because of this. I would not want this happening to anybody.

I would like to make the KLA industries or similar design oil pan gasket retaining bracket legal. [www.kla-industries.net/](http://www.kla-industries.net/)

If the pan gasket blows, oil is blown out and runs down the underside of the car which could catch fire or send you spinning out of control into some Armco or both. Luckily mine went out on the straight and did not catch fire. This bracket does not add any performance to the car whatsoever. In keeping with the theme of the class, low cost racing, I feel it's better to spend a little now than pay big bucks for an engine re-build or worse yet, a blown motor on track. I know some of you will not want to add this part because of cost or you might not feel it necessary for your car. I know it doesn't happen often but when it does, you'll wish you had one of these brackets. Because this part does not add any performance to our cars, it is a matter of preference if you want one or not. Just like cross drilling the crank journals, some people chose not to have this done. I would like to have the choice to run it. Please don't just shoot it down by saying NO NEW RULES.

This new rule would fit in the Engine Modifications to Improve Reliability section 12.9 and could read something like this.....

12.9.5 Any oil pan gasket retaining bracket, such as the KLA Industries, or any bracket of similar design may be used.

Thanks,

Ken Frey

#3 Midwest Region

=====