

## 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 tcomeau - 30 Nov 2014 11:43

---

The dipstick must match the pan type for accurate reading.

Who is Joe Blow? Could you put your name in your signature. I'm not ready to shoot the messenger but like to know who's who.

Changing the shifter from stock is plain silly and a waste of money making it a non-starter for rules changes. The stock shifter system , if in good repair, is fine. I have never missed a shift in any of my 944 cars. The shift lever is a softer metal (brass ?) than the black shifter rod going back to the tranny. It is designed to wear out before the shifter rod. Lever is cheap and easy to swap, the rod not so much. I don't mind the needle bearings on the lever cross shaft, as Ron Dale states. If you run a harder steel cross shaft on the lever, expect to be replacing your shifter rod soon. I *do* want to know who's running a short shifter with stock components, though. Email me at

This e-mail address is being protected from spambots. You need JavaScript enabled to view it

Lowering the car excessively will cause CV joints to wear out, yes. Also, If you install a tranny in a car with a dead right motor mount or a torque tube not aligned well at the clutch bell housing, or an engine crossmember that was pushed too much to either side, this will put more angle stress on the CV's. Remember that the engine, torque tube, and tranny are all nailed together as one piece. This all effects how the tranny hangs.

Tranny coolers have been legal for a while now though I have never used one in the SoCal heat.

=====

---

## Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by tcomeau - 30 Nov 2014 12:21

---

Also, as previously stated, convex mirrors are inaccurate for distance reading. A small, bubble, stick on for the side mirrors creates the same problem of distance judging. You can tell a 944 is back there, but can't tell if it's 20 ft or 30ft back because the image is so distorted. Our entire car length is less that 14 ft. How do you know if it's safe to turn in?

Here comes a 911 Cup car with a 50 mph closing speed. You didn't see it during your last glance up because it was 200 meters back and just a speck in your convex mirror. Now it's on you just as you start to turn in.

Neither of these scenarios are a problem with the wide, multi section mirrors. I don't care what brand they are, though there may be some room for a sponsoring price reduction if one brand is selected as mandatory.

It's possible to install these mirrors upside down, which will be immediately evident because you'll get 5 separated images instead of one continuous, complete side to side view!

Whether it's the fish eye lens of a Go Pro camera or a convex mirror, we know not to fully trust the car to car distances. How many times have you heard, "Oh, I was farther up on him but the camera doesn't show it because of the wide angle."

We know a better, safer way. Even if it doesn't become a rule, I strongly suggest installing a wide view, distortion-free mirror. It's safer and will result in less contact forms.

=====

---

## Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by Sterling Doc - 30 Nov 2014 18:19

---

Good discussion this year guys. Many good points made, often on both sides of an issue. We have run out of time, and will now take this back to the series directors, and hash things out. If you have further thoughts on these things, lobby your series director, as he will have a direct say in the decision.

New proposals will have to wait until next year.

=====

## Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by Robbie - 01 Dec 2014 21:17

---

Absolutely against opening up shifters to heim joints. Buy new bushings and be done with it. Unneeded rules creep.

=====

## Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by capt squid - 02 Dec 2014 20:54

---

I have been busy fixing my wrecked car and have not been looking at the forum. In the future I suggest that the local series directors contact all their members when the thread first starts so they know that new rules are being discussed.

I would of like to have proposed that removal of the balance shaft belt be allowed to get low HP cars closer to the cap.

=====

## Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by tcomeau - 03 Dec 2014 09:56

---

Removal of the balance shaft belt is an expensive way to get a few more HP.

We've found the extra vibration it causes kills fuel rails, oil pick up tubes, dipstick tubes.

=====