

## 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by dpRacing Dan - 31 Oct 2016 10:34

---

Ok boys and girls, the time has come for us to propose/discuss/debate any proposed rules for the 2017 season.

NASA is already pressuring me to have the rules wrapped up in an unrealistic time, but we WILL need to expedite this this year. Let's try to keep this constructive. If you have an idea, please post it up on the thread, voice your reasons, and be prepared to have them dashed or supported. I will read all comments and hear all reasoning. I will ONLY do this here- no phone calls please. Emails are ok, but THIS is where we go to discuss rules. PLEASE keep this civil- I dont want any huge arguments to spin out of control. Lets all be grown ups, and keep this friendly.

Please remember, only rules that will increase reliability, or performance WITHOUT significant spending or changes will be considered. Remember EVERY change effects not only cars in your region, but EVERY car in the country running under these rules. I wont consider anything that cannot be quickly or easily done to EVERY car in the country competing (this is about 175 cars nationally). My main goal is to keep our cars as reliable and competitive as possible, without spending lots of money.

Ready?

Set.

GO!

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by tcomeau - 05 Nov 2016 21:27

---

KJZ, you're digging too deep. This class is simpler than that. If we go to Dino testing, it is directly after a racing session or qualifying session. You can't change tires and wheels before Dino testing.

Short shifter is not the same as suspension bushings.

It is foolish to buy a set of wheels without spinning them up first to make sure they are true and not bent.

The guy who you tried to catch running light and drove around you in tech inspection should have been pulled from his car and beaten to a pulp because he's a cheater. His crew should also be beaten to a pulp. They shouldn't be allowed to play in any more reindeer games.

=====



## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by dpRacing Dan - 07 Nov 2016 08:06

---

KJZ, Agree with Tim on the Dyno procedure. This is a procedural process, not a rulebook issue. When competitors are asked to report to dyno, it's always post-race/qual where they are impounded and sent directly to the dyno. If they deviate from this plan, or do some shady shit like what you reported its up to the regional director to take action against them. I promise you if that happened at one of my events I'd DQ the competitor from that session. Period.

As for the wheels, I can promise you I've looked plenty. I'm not interested in finding cheap sub-par wheels from China. I talked with SEVERAL quality brand wheel manufacturers at PRI, SEMA, and from my previous racing life. The main issue with with the bore spread. Most companies dont offer rims that will work with our a bolt-pattern spread, unlike the close sizes of 5 x 100 vs 5 x 114.3

I do agree the short-shifter is not a significant cost (\$93), and somewhat comparable to bushings. The most attractive part of the short-shifter is the improvement to shifts.

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by AgRacer - 07 Nov 2016 08:17

---

**tcomeau wrote:**

We can't have some people using short shifters and others not using it. Not a good idea.

Why is this not a good idea?

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by norman#99 - 07 Nov 2016 10:19

---

Great thread everyone:

Original intent: If it makes your car go faster, you can't do it, PERIOD

1) light weight batteries, I just had to buy another one which is \$200. As I am spending this extra money I had to think why? It's only for a performance advantage and very much less reliable than a full size battery, I would like to see the stock size battery be our only option which will make us more equal, cheaper, with less push starts in the grid.



2) And here I go again...if we had these rules when the first person rammed air, it would have been shot down without question. So, I am asking everyone again, to consider the stock air box, the change to ram was solely for performance advantage, but snuck in before we had to get serious about keeping the cars equal. Advantages are, we know the HP/TQ on a dyno vs not knowing what it increases to at speed, plus we will be dead nuts equal with the same type of factory air box. There are plenty of them around too.

3) 3 piece cross member, no performance advantages. As discussed many other advantages: The only disadvantage is nuts coming lose, that is from the lack of not checking your car before racing it. So check your nuts and make this legal.

4) Short shift, that's either perceived or actually a performance advantage. Since new parts are available in stock form, I would vote for equality.

5) Wheels, if they can be can be accurately tested for equality, sure why not. I think our wheels are kind of ugly and we could use a nice looking wheel to replace them with (if we want to) The better we can make our cars look, the more attractive the class to potential newbies joining in.

6) I'm not a piston guy, so I don't know, however when we run out of replacements, then of course keep them the same.

Dan, thanks for keeping the class as we originally intended it to be.

GO VOTE tomorrow! My favorite quote so far is "all I know is that I hate our next president"; Sad but funny!

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by Manuel\_M - 07 Nov 2016 10:29

---

### **dpRacing Dan wrote:**

Chuck thanks for mentioning the short-shifter.

I have been a proponent against them from day 1. I still believe if everyone does the allowed Only944.com components, the shifters are more than adequate.

Currently, Spec miata doesnt allow any type of short- shifter. Spec E30 does. I *AM* for components that



make our cars easier to drive/more reliable/less junky. After analyzing the components offered by Only944.com, I'm definitely more open to the idea of allowing it. The reality of it is if we DO allow it, EVERYONE will feel inclined to purchase it. Sure it's only \$93, but multiply that across the 944 Spec field currently competing and that's about a \$15,000 decision.

If we do allow this, does this mean EVERYONE WILL STOP BITCHING ABOUT MIS-SHIFTING AND SLOPPY SHIFTERS?! Lol- I kid.

Please folks- weigh in here: Power in numbers.

I would agree with this, fixing the shift lever itself removes most of the slop. I used a bolt and thrust washers (the shift rod is what is wearing but the thrust washers/bolt keep the lever/rod square.) I'd assume using the 944 locating arm fixes the remaining slop by removing the worn rubber bushings. No on the short shifter this go around.

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by AgRacer - 07 Nov 2016 12:39

---

The shift lever assembly is still available as a special order part for \$190 brand new on Pelican Parts. I couldn't find the bushing alone for sale anywhere. When I did find it, it was listed as discontinued. I think we established last year that the bushing was most of the problem.

[www.pelicanparts.com/More\\_Info2/477%20711%20103%20D.htm](http://www.pelicanparts.com/More_Info2/477%20711%20103%20D.htm)

A word on the Miata and E30 shifters. The Miata is 10+ year newer technology and likely an adequate design to begin with. Both transmissions are mounted directly behind the engine and right beside the driver which reduces the complexity and distance the shifter has to operate within. The equal era design of the E30 shifter was found to be inadequate for whatever reason, and Spec E30 decided to allow an aftermarket shifter. I havent driven any of them to know how they feel.