

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 AgRacer - 24 Nov 2014 17:50

Another post for the racer rear view mirror: Yes.

I use an All view. Make it mandatory to use any wide angle racer style mirror in place of the stock rear view. Provide a list of examples and only examples to point new racers in the right direction (not exclusive list of allowed mirrors): Allview, Wink multi-panel, Longacre 14/17" convex wide angle, etc.

I use the Allview Racers mirror and love it. It was on the pricier end but for heaven's sake, a 36" Wink 5-Panel mirror with mount is only \$37! What would this say to the class as a whole if we made a specific rule as a direct result of an incident at Nationals?

Car contact is not tolerated and make sure you don't do it!

www.pegasusautoracing.com/group.asp?GroupID=MIRRORWINK

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by joeblow - 24 Nov 2014 17:53

If it becomes mandatory at least leave the choice of brand and style free please. I for one do not like the 5 panel style.

AgRacer wrote:

Another post for the racer rear view mirror: Yes.

I use an All view. Make it mandatory to use any wide angle racer style mirror in place of the stock rear view. Provide a list of examples: Allview, Wink multi-panel, Longacre 14/17" convex wide angle, etc.

I use the Allview Racers mirror and love it. It was on the pricier end but for heaven's sake, a 36" Wink 5-Panel mirror with mount is only \$37! What would this say to the class as a whole if we made a specific rule as a direct result of an incident at Nationals?

Car contact is not tolerated!

www.pegasusautoracing.com/group.asp?GroupID=MIRRORWINK

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by AgRacer - 24 Nov 2014 17:57

joeblow wrote:

If it becomes mandatory at least leave the choice of brand and style free please. I for one do not like the 5 panel style.

Of course. Don't want to box people in on this rule. Words mean things as we say in the Flight Standardization world... (lots of rule interpretation)

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by joeblow - 24 Nov 2014 17:59

Amen

AgRacer wrote:

joeblow wrote:

If it becomes mandatory at least leave the choice of brand and style free please. I for one do not like the 5 panel style.

Of course. Don't want to box people in on this rule. Words mean things as we say in the Flight Standardization world... (lots of rule interpretation)

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by RacerX - 24 Nov 2014 18:01

AgRacer wrote:

Now for the shift linkage, I detest the stock shift linkage. I have personally missed 5th and gone into 3rd bending valves. We had a missed shift end a week end early at Daytona. Many dont know the tricks to shore up the feel on the shifter making them put up with the same hot dog down a hallway feel that many of our 180,000 donor cars come with. I believe that shifter setup is largely personal preference, and should be a positive action that provides confidence on track. The stock setup definitely doesn't do that. There are several examples of aftermarket products that are intended to improve the feel, both legal and currently illegal, that should be considered. Maybe something so simple as specifically allowing the modification of the end of the shift lever for a common hard mount knob to be added. I understand the concern of a new rule opening us up for a monster sized exploitation but I again, point to the first tenant of the rules.

"The spirit of the class is for all cars to be equal in weight and horsepower and be competitive with one another. The focus will be on driver ability and not dollar ability. This class is not intended to be an engine builder **OR INNOVATOR'S CLASS**."

All the cars are equal now. Nobody has a short shifter, unless they snuck it in. If we allow short shifters in now, it's just another piece to have to go out and buy. The fix takes care of the sloppiness and everybody is on equal terms then.

=====

Re: Official Rules Change Proposal Thread

Posted by joeblow - 24 Nov 2014 18:09

Ummm I do NOT intend to install a short shifter (you can if you want...unadvised). They make the shifting tighter and notchy making it easier to miss-shifts. I would like to change the linkage at the tranny to heim joints to remove all slop and go with the same at the shifter too.

One of the issues with the 944 shifting is the extreme temperature change at the shifter causing things to expand and get out of alignment. Heim joints are better at taking heat changes and staying in tolerance than a solid shaft riding in a solid bore (ie stock).

Also as I said in my original post the shifter position is required to remain as STOCK. This eliminated the back seat driving position and any other such tomfoolery.

This is NOT a performance mod or a big money 'must have' thing. This is basic upgrades to make things MORE reliable and less likely to FAIL. Seems like a no brainer to me.

=====