

## Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by Sterling Doc - 12 Oct 2015 19:03

---

OK guys, time to hear out RCR's for next years rules. We'll keep this open through the end of the month, and then get the new rules, if any, hashed out.

As always, please bear in mind that rules changes need to be cost effective to existing cars, as well as new builds, and the burden of proof is on why the new rule is needed, not justifying the existing rule - rules stability is key here!

Stay tuned for a big announcement in about a week, as well!

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by afonseca - 09 Nov 2015 13:32

---

**cbuzzetti wrote:**

The most popular classes are spec classes. The reason for that is cost control...

Spec means, equal not different.

I understand and agree with the reasoning behind encouraging low cost for a spec class. However, my interpretation of spec leans more towards equivalent rather than equal (identical).

For example, with the question of wheels, if it is decided we can run any wheels, then I think the rule should specify one piece wheels with a 15lb min weight, no modifications vs requiring a specific manufacturer. That means you can run cookies, phone dials, any aftermarket and they'd all be equivalent. No performance advantage for those that want to spend more for wheels that either look nicer or give them a greater sense of comfort with regards to safety.

Another example where it's pretty much open in the current rules is race seats. In our rules I believe it says the seat must comply with the NASA CCR, that's it. So I can get a basic Kirkey seat for about \$500 or I can get a Recaro carbon containment seat for about \$7,500. Yes, it costs way more than the car but maybe someone feels safer in it, who knows. My point being that they are equivalent and if someone has one of those \$\$\$ seats it's not going to make them go any faster or win more races. So it's not necessary that they be identical down to the manufacturer.

My 2c.

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by afonseca - 09 Nov 2015 13:38

---

**cgktexas wrote:**

All three shifters however are not equivalent.

The biggest difference between the 9xAuto/Lindsey shifters and the currently legal Only944 shifter is that the latter is non-adjustable as compared to the other two and therefore remains pretty much stock throw at that end of the equation.

Gotcha, that makes sense with regards to altering the throw. With that, I'd just add to the rule that the shifters must be adjusted to stock height. That would make all three equivalent.

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by rd7839 - 09 Nov 2015 13:41

---

Why not just fix the stock one? Boy , this rule book is getting thicker!

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by AgRacer - 09 Nov 2015 13:48

---

I found another rule discrepancy similar to the offset woodruff key.

13.4 mandates use of the stock filler neck as the only means of adding fuel, but if you install a fuel cell, I dont know of any situation in which you could still use the stock filler neck to add fuel to the car. Recommend modifying the verbage to allow an exception for those who have a fuel cell installed.

### 13.4 Fuel Filler Neck

Fuel filler restrictor and the steel spring loaded flapper door may be removed. The remainder of the fuel filler neck must remain in the stock location and be the only means of adding fuel to the car.

13.6.1 The stock fuel tank may be replaced with a fuel cell(s) conforming to the NASA CCR's, located in the rear of the car no farther forward than the forward edge of the stock tank. The maximum capacity of the fuel cell system is 21.1 gallons.

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by FDJeremy - 09 Nov 2015 13:50

---

**afonseca wrote:**

**cgktexas wrote:**

All three shifters however are not equivalent.

The biggest difference between the 9xAuto/Lindsey shifters and the currently legal Only944 shifter is that the latter is non-adjustable as compared to the other two and therefore remains pretty much stock throw at that end of the equation.

Gotcha, that makes sense with regards to altering the throw. With that, I'd just add to the rule that the shifters must be adjusted to stock height. That would make all three equivalent.

No need, that weak point has already been addressed and a suitable solution is already spelled out in the rulebook.

Need to stay focused on the problem that doesn't have a solution yet while being mindful of rules creep.

=====