

## 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 FDJeremy - 09 Nov 2015 09:38

---

I actually think it happens when the trans gets hot and the rubber bushing gets spongy. Would love to have a solid piece in there.

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by cgktexas - 09 Nov 2015 10:39

---

My \$0.01 (since I am in the process of building and haven't turned a wheel in competition in this class)

1) Wheels: abstain (I don't know the marketplace for cookie cutters because I have to run the late offset Phones due to the chassis I picked for my build)

Some wheel designs (at same weight) could possibly provide increased/better brake cooling.

2) shifter: Yes

Only 944 shifter is already approved replacement (make no change here). Ok with also replacing remaining parts (short shifter & linkage) with 944 only parts. Require the use of the stock movement location on short shifter if installed. Purpose - Removes slop from old rubber bushings without reducing side to side throw, which I believe addresses initial reason for request.

3) bumper: yes

Cheap, easy, fix attainable by all at low cost.

4) dyno: Abstain.

no opinion since I have not raced under existing rule.

5) crank scraper: No.

Crank scrapers in my experience have primarily been used as a performance mod rather than reliability mod. Reduces windage in the crankcase freeing up a little HP. Reliability mods usually involve oiling restrictors to keep flow higher where needed (Bottom end, rotating assy such as rod and crank) and reduced where it isn't (Top end, generally valvetrain).

6) spare tire well: No opinion other than if approved, I won't be doing it.

Coolshirt mounted there.

7) Rear coilover: No.

While I absolutely prefer coilovers on all four corners in a racecar, I believe approval of this could likely result in an expensive case of haves and have nots. The advantages of having coilovers - Spring rates (additional springsets), more adjustable shocks, quicker adjustments/tuning etc. are not in keeping with what this class was built upon and increases the cost to play, given the current ability and availability of racing t-bars.

The class is a spec class and from when I started watching from the outside (since 2010), the racing has been pretty good...and a driver's class.

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by RacerX - 09 Nov 2015 12:24

---

[quote=&quot;AgRacer&quot; post=20085]rd7839 wrote:

Is the following what people are saying is currently legal? Doesnt shorten the throw or improve performance, just repairs worn out parts similar to what the front shift lever fix does with needle bearings.

[only944.com/partscatalog/only/shiftlinkagearm/](http://only944.com/partscatalog/only/shiftlinkagearm/)

From my understanding of the rules, I'd think that part would be legal, as long as the length was adjusted to the stock length. You can buy all those components from a hardware store. If the original Porsche part is worn, that would be something that someone could make and be in the original spirit of the rules. I think an OFFICIAL ruling on that needs to be made. Eric/Dan, is this part legal under the current ruleset?

14.3.1 Transmission shift linkage may be modified to remove slop or to repair worn components.

The length of the shift lever and the distance of throw of the shifter may not be modified. "Short Shifters" are not allowed. The shift lever (only) from Only 944's is considered an acceptable

factory alternative: [only944.com/partscatalog/only/shifter/](http://only944.com/partscatalog/only/shifter/)

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by afonseca - 09 Nov 2015 12:47

---

### **rd7839 wrote:**

The part Alberto proposed is \$130.

I wasn't proposing we change the rule to that part from 9xAuto which is \$130 vs \$90 for the shifter up front. I'm saying that we should be able to pick either of those, or even this one that is listed at \$160.

[www.lindseyracing.com/LR/Porsche/LRA-944-SSL.html](http://www.lindseyracing.com/LR/Porsche/LRA-944-SSL.html)

Now I've gone mad! The price has crept from \$90 to \$160 you say? No, my point is that all three are equivalent and should be allowed. The \$90 part looks good, it fixes the problem. The \$130 part looks beefier and not any different performance though it might last longer so if I like that one I'd like to use that. The \$160 part looks exactly like the same design as the \$130, but it's painted black! Maybe I want to spend the extra \$ on that (for illustration only, I don't). Does that mean everyone has to? No.

That is my point.

=====

## Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by cgktexas - 09 Nov 2015 13:25

---

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.

I believe that the first two provide a generous amount of adjustment that in conjunction with a transaxle mounted short shifter (if approved) could likely reduce front to back throw by more than 60%.

=====