

2011 changes?

Posted by JB3 - 06 Sep 2010 22:45

Is there intended any discussion of possible changes for the coming year (2011)?

John

=====

Re:2011 changes?

Posted by joepaluch - 26 Sep 2010 01:54

Norm,

I have never supported a max dyno limit for the class. The reason is that it makes it a target for guys to reach or complain if they can't reach it. Typical dyno variation makes it difficult to set the number low enough to attainable by most, but not so low as one that is overcome by a "lucky home build". Remember our cars are old and 20 years of street use can leave some motors just better than others.

I personally don't see us at a crisis point. What I do see is that we had traqmate data in 4 cars with actual dyno runs to back up 2 of them. The first thought is can we use this data and technology to make the class better?

Frankly the jury is still out. I will say this however if traqmate could be used to provide accurate reliable hp numbers it opens us up to a lot of more tools ensure compliance and level the playing field more. The issue is we see some promise in GPS based systems, but also many flaws.

Again we directors need to be forward looking as well to prevent issue from becoming a problem. That is why we are tackling it now.

=====

Re:2011 changes?

Posted by Big Dog - 26 Sep 2010 07:53

Norm, bless your heart. You want our racing to be "equal". In concept, I certainly agree with you but we are NOT an "equal" car series. We allow too many different models and years of

car to ever be "equal". I am not saying that this is a great situation but it is the one we have and will continue to have unless you want to have a 924 series, an early 944 series, an intermediate 944 series and a late 944 series all running seperate classes but together on the track.

The other issue, as I see it, everyone perparees their cars to different levels making this series "unequal". Should we require part # specific parts for ALL non-stock parts allowed, require exactly the same allignment settings and require that all cars do all allowed (required) changes in order to be race and be "equal".

I think not. We have a reasonable set of rules that give us a reasonably equal racing series. We are amatures. Those that want to do more will go on to other series. Drivers that excel may also go on to other, more prestigeous series. So be it. I, for one, do not want/need the drama. I race to have fun. I had as much fun at nationals finishing in sixth as last year finishing in second because it is about the total experiences and not the finishing postion, for me.

Jim

=====

Re:2011 changes?

Posted by cbuzzetti - 26 Sep 2010 12:28

Ok let me see if I got this straight. The guy with out the pro motor won the race. Any questions?

There will never be parity. That is racing.

A reward weight system for regional racing would really be the only way to level the playing field.

But I can tell you with certainty that it will not change the finish order of our races. The fast guys will still win.

=====

Re:2011 changes?

Posted by norman#99 - 27 Sep 2010 00:48

Thanks to Joe, Jim and Charlie for your answers to:

"why is equal power in all cars a bad thing"

Joe said, "The reason is that it makes it a target for guys to reach or complain if they can't reach it.

Jim said, "Norm, bless your heart. You want our racing to be "equal". In concept, I certainly agree with you but we are NOT an "equal" car series.

Charlie said, "Ok let me see if I got this straight. The guy with out the pro motor won the race. Any questions?" "But I can tell you with certainty that it will not change the finish order of our races. The fast guys will still win."

If I am judgeing answers, Jim wins!!! Also thanks for blessing my heart Jim, I love you man! Charlie get's the best dance award! I love you too man!

After this years Nationals and having the opportunity to see all of NASA's classes more closely, I am glad to be a member of 944 spec and from all of those that I spoke with, we are the most looked upto class and we have the most fun and respect for each other.

I am happy with what ever the majority are happy with, it seems that a no limit legal h/p is a good thing, so I would like to thank John Milledge for sharing his expertise on engine building with us and I hope to have one of your motors in my car someday, I just wanted to make sure there would be no rule changes before I do it and after this thread, I feel good that there will be no h/p limits added to the rules.

Again thanks to everybody,

PS: Now it's time to start a discussion for a 2011 944spec championship race somewhere central for all of us, Like Pheonix!

=====

Re:2011 changes?

Posted by joepaluch - 27 Sep 2010 01:36

Norm,

1) I am not against equal hp. Not at all. However we need a realistic way to first determine if we are not equal (right now it is all conjecture with limited data) and then we need to find a way to balance that. This is not very easy to do and we must be careful to not create more problems that we solve.

2) Nationals will be in Ohio in 2011 and 2012. That is set in stone and I will not support any "nationals race" any place else. We can of course have friendly fun races that span multiple regions in a reasonable distance. Let see what the 2011 schedule holds and what makes sense.

Chuckwalla would be great place for an Az/So-cal crossover.

=====

Re:2011 changes?

Posted by Sterling Doc - 27 Sep 2010 02:39

Norm - one more try/clarification on the equal power thing.

Truely equal power is not possible, without new, sealed motors like the MX-5 cup does. No an option for us.

"Close" power is a good goal. Then the question becomes two fold.

1) How close can we reliably measure/split HP "hairs", and how much HP is a "significant" difference (and to whom)

2)How much cost, complexity and pain is involved in the reality of implementing and regulating this on an ongoing basis

#1 is tough because dyno variations are as big as what's a significant difference in our low HP cars, and TM data is worse yet. Hard to equalize a moving target.

#2 is really messy, again because we're trying split pretty fine hairs, and adds cost to everyone on an ongoing basis (once a year plus random checks for protests, compliance).

We don't want someone to get caught out because they changed their dirty air filter since they did their

official dyno, and the dynamometer that day is a little optimistic (or they changed to thinner oil because it's fall now, or their motor is hotter that day, etc., etc). Suddenly they are 7 HP up on their last dyno, and illegal, even if they're only making 135HP now. They're "equalized weight" was based on the old 128 HP reading they did 8 months ago with the dirty air filter, thicker oil, etc.. Now they're branded a "cheater." Not a good scenario, and not unrealistic at all. Living under this kind of threat is not good for morale either.

Make sense?

=====