

Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by Sterling Doc - 15 Nov 2014 11:15

Since we have everyone's attention now on the board, it seems, I'll open up the rules change proposal thread for this year.

As always, a proposal must include justification on how it

A) Improves competition for all (not just "for me/my situation")

B) Decreases, or at least manages cost

C) Stays true to the intent of the class

D) Is worth disrupting rules stability (which is important in Spec classes).

The more points it hits, the better chance it has. Remember the burden of proof is on the new rule, not shooting it down.

The proposal and review time will have to be compressed a bit due to the late start from the late Championships.

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by Sterling Doc - 15 Nov 2014 11:19

I'll add one. While I think this year's dyno results were atypical, and am talking to NASA about it, I want to hear what you guys think about expanding the dyno variation factor to $4 \text{ HP} = \text{TQ}/2$, while keeping the cap at 138. This would make the effective DQ point 142.

Good idea or bad? This should get the thread rolling...

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by Kurt R - 17 Nov 2014 14:58

I would say the rule is fine the way it is. However, I'd like some wording as to when to throw out the

dyno, or any measuring device. Let's say you had a measuring tape that measured two inches too long. Would you ask everyone to modify the track of their car to comply with the "official" tape measure? Then why modify cars to conform to a miscalibrated dyno? Or scales? Define "out of spec" and procedure to follow.

On to the proposed rule changes and questions-

16.4 - Clarify "associated parts". Can I remove the parking brake shoes? springs? adjuster? Portions of the brake drum?

16.7 - Pretty sure the OEM brake rotors are cast iron, not steel.

Don't hold me too it, I ground the edge of one last night and it sparked more like cast iron.

17.1.7 - someone mentioned welding the bumper shocks for bump drafting. My interpretation of this rule would make that illegal. Correct?

17.2 - allow modification of the stock pedals for driver comfort. Allow pedal covers no more than x inches thick. (I'm thinking 1/4 inch, you might think 4 inches thick if you'd like to move your seat back to improve driver egress)

18.2 and 18.3 incorrectly reference section 17.

13.6.3, 13.6.4, 17.1.5: replace the word "maybe" with the phrase "may be".

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by Sterling Doc - 17 Nov 2014 16:26

Kurt, some good work here! I will look at cleaning those areas up.

As far as the bumper shocks, I need some input from you guys. Is there any real utility to this? I think the impact absorption does serve a purpose, and modifying them for weight loss under the current rules would be illegal. I don't think this is needed, but I want to make sure I'm not missing something.

As far as the pedals, while there is some potential for performance benefit from moving the driver back, I think that is outweighed by safety concerns with Halo seats, and limited egress.

As far as the dyno, I hear you on the calibration issue, but how do we determine dyno calibration without a reference? I think it would be hard to make this into an actionable rule, but I am open to ideas.

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by RacerX - 17 Nov 2014 19:19

Isn't there some standard or calibration unit for a dyno? Can't they be tested and recalibrated? Maybe we should be using units that have been recalibrated within the last 12 months/ current race season.

On the HP cap, I believe that the 140 limit should be it. We don't need to be looking for more HP. If you want a 4 HP variation, we should set the limit to 136 + 4.

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by afonseca - 17 Nov 2014 22:36

Sterling Doc wrote:

Kurt, some good work here! I will look at cleaning those areas up.

As far as the pedals, while there is some potential for performance benefit from moving the driver back, I think that is outweighed by safety concerns with Halo seats, and limited egress.

I'd like to chime in here in favor of this allowance because my car has pedal extensions bolted to the stock pedals. This was done because I have short legs and given that race seats don't recline much it was necessary for me to both be able to reach the pedals and not be so far forward that I couldn't comfortably reach the shifter. I sit almost all the way forward on my seat rails as is so it's not about moving the seat back in my case but simply "fitting"; in the car with a proper driving position.

=====