

Ram Air Rule Clarification Issue

Posted by Sterling Doc - 14 Nov 2013 21:33

Guys,

Since the rule change discussions, I've had several emails questioning the routing of ram air, and what is OK, and what is not. Specifically, if, and where holes can be cut for routing the ram air. This came up about 9 months ago, here: www.944spec.org/944SPEC/forum/race-car-b...old-air-intake-on-87 .

It has been pointed out to me that the provisional allowance made then seems in conflict with one reading of this rule:

17.3 Body Structure

The chassis structure must remain intact and stock except as noted

17.3.1 Headlights and headlight motors may be removed. If the headlights are removed, the stock covers must be installed in the front body work in the stock location in a secure fashion.

*Headlight cover gaps may not be filled in or taped over. **Headlight positions may not be used for ducting of air in any way.***

"Headlight positions" can be read in multiple ways, but in the end it's just not clear as is, and needs to be fixed.

The ram air rules proposals did not address the routing of ram air or cutting holes, just where it came from, or getting rid of it entirely (which were voted down).

As we did not clarify this in the rules debate, and it is a source of confusion and contention, it need to be dealt with, even at this late date.

So moving forward, we need to decide if cutting holes in the headlight buckets (or elsewhere) to allow for straighter/cleaner ducting of ram air should be allowed. We should also address cutting holes for ducting oil coolers, etc for clarity.

Ram air has become such a headache, that it may need to be done away with if we can't sort this out.

Re: Ram Air Rule Clarification Issue

Posted by michaelreich - 16 Nov 2013 13:05

Tater-

Where did you get the scoop? Did you make it?

Re: Ram Air Rule Clarification Issue

Posted by JerryW - 17 Nov 2013 12:55

norman#99 wrote:

17.3

Body Structure

The chassis structure must remain intact and stock except as noted.

Since cutting holes is not noted in 17.3, Eric had a request to do so and he gave temporary permission until we could discuss it to possibly put the wording into 17.3 starting in 2014, so those that have done this up to this point in time are legal even at National's.

With that said, for anyone new that may not know how or why we started 944spec, it was to have as equal, as possible cars for the purpose of keeping it as inexpensive as possible and to make it a drivers class. That will be changed when we as a group allow it by discussions and voting, so if you joined 944spec for the original intent and are sitting back and not saying anything, you are actually saying a lot! So speak up either way, it's your right.

I will stick with the intent of the class, no changes that are only for performance advantages and most certainly not something that all cars can not achieve. Changes for longevity or safety, hell yes!

Cutting holes for more cooling to oil coolers:

1 - 0% performance advantage, so go for it!

Cutting a hole for ram air in the head light bucket area:

1-is 100% for performance advantage

2-cars with head lights are at an unfair disadvantage

3-as mentioned, unless every car could do this in the same exact way, hp/tq will vary from car to car at speed and is undetectable until in car GPS type systems are perfected to the point of calculating hp/tq for us.

4-This is a FACT - The more we change these cars the less equal they become!

Using the signal light or fog light for ram air, since it was unanimously voted on should be gotten to without cutting out sheet metal behind the head lights area to keep it equal for cars with head lights.

amen,

norm

This represents my position totally - just said way better than I could.

Re: Ram Air Rule Clarification Issue

Posted by rd7839 - 18 Nov 2013 02:07

In theory I'd like to race a street legal car but since I would need headlights I couldn't have ram air. I think ram air is not in the spirit of our rules so if you want it you should do it without cutting any sheet metal. The "Ken bracket" to me is not a bracket at all but an integral part of the chassis structure as it's completely welded in in my car.

Now, I did cut into it on the passenger side for ducting to my oil cooler. I have a scoop with two hoses from the turn signal and a scoop with one hose from the fog light. I could easily have fed the two hoses from the fog light and not have cut the Ken bracket at all and still would have plenty of cooling.

I vote for no cutting and those that have for performance gains, ie: ram air should remove it and find another solution but no need to replace the sheet metal. Having said this, I have the scoop already and brake duct hose so I can do this at no cost but to me it is pretty clearly against both the letter and spirit of the rules. Every little bit gets us further from where we started and the original intent!

By the way, I've never seen a 944 stock without that sheet metal. Granted, I don't look at a ton of cars and I haven't been paying that close of attention, but as far as I've noticed it's welded in on the cars I've owned, pilfered for parts or worked on.

I just took the fenders off my 83 parts car to get ready for paint and I had a pleasant surprise. A factory plastic plate that covers the intake opening. It's in perfect shape and is ready to go on the race car, pending the outcome of this discussion.

=====

Re: Ram Air Rule Clarification Issue

Posted by michaelreich - 18 Nov 2013 08:23

Where did you get the scoop to go in the bumper hole? Did you make it?

=====

Re: Ram Air Rule Clarification Issue

Posted by rd7839 - 18 Nov 2013 08:54

Pegasus racing sells several different scoops in 1, 2, or 3 hose configurations. I get a lot of stuff from them. Easy ordering and quick delivery. For the bumper I had to cut it on a bandsaw to get the curvature right.

=====