

### 3 peice crossmember

Posted by JRichard - 16 May 2010 10:46

---

Are the three peice front crossmembers leagal? I don't see any reference to it in the rules, so I'm thinking not, but it would be a nice maintenance item...

=====

### Re:3 peice crossmember

Posted by JRichard - 20 May 2010 10:59

---

Joe, at least the ones I've seen are built from factory crossmembers that are sectioned and fitted with splice plates. All the original mounting points stay, and the geometry of the crossmember remains as factory. It seems easy to confirm with visual inspection. A fabbed peice would be hard to control.

=====

### Re:3 peice crossmember

Posted by jaje - 06 Jul 2010 07:47

---

I have the Lindsey 3 piece crossmember in my car - was an item I wanted to do in order to make it easier to maintain. I see no performance advantage out of it b/c it simply replaces the stock crossmember and does not change the geometry of the car. It does create another stress / bend point in the car so it may actually slightly impede performance (I have no proof of such).

Didn't Porsche for the Firehawk 944 cars they build have custom fabb'd removeable crossmember for easier access to the oil pan?

=====

### Re:3 peice crossmember

Posted by SvoChuck - 06 Jul 2010 11:36

---

on Saturday one of the rmr cars had a 3 piece X member fail ... he was racing in a enduro 30 minutes into it .

=====

### Re:3 peice crossmember

Posted by Sterling Doc - 06 Jul 2010 20:33

---

Wow, good to know. Where did it fail?

=====

### Re:3 peice crossmember

Posted by jaje - 14 Jul 2010 03:47

---

I've heard of homemade / custom made ones fail.

=====

### Re:3 peice crossmember

Posted by joepaluch - 15 Jul 2010 02:37

---

#### **SvoChuck wrote:**

on Saturday one of the rmr cars had a 3 piece X member fail ... he was racing in a enduro 30 minutes into it .

Chuck please get more info on this. Sure it maybe nice, but I have not see regular crossmembers fail. I would rather not allow a non-stock part that has been known to fail to replace part that never fails. It just makes me a little concerned.

Seems to me we should consider this as part of the 2011 rules package. When I mean consider I mean propose, evaluate and discuss for possible 2011 rules.

=====