

2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here

Posted by joepaluch - 07 Oct 2010 08:28

Ok,

Time for 2011 rules change proposals.

List them here and I will work them into something we can formally evaluate.

I will start with 2.

1) Change - Clarification on use of Fog light hole(and other holes) for air intake (ie ram air)

Reason - Clearly define that fog light hole can be used for air intake. Also make clear what other holes need to filled in vs used as in take for cooling air, and engine air.

2) Change - Larger jack pad

Reason - make pad size a close match for typical floor jack pads.

=====

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here

Posted by jaje - 20 Oct 2010 07:17

Sterling Doc wrote:

Let me throw this out there:

Any car may have a data system (i.e Traqmate or similar) system put in, and the data made public at the conclusion of a given race weekend.

As we're into being transparent, this would be interesting. We do this locally, and everyone learns, and it

take the mystery out of why the fast guys are fast. Crazy? Maybe, but it would make a statement about our class...First off - most people don't have Traqmates yet so it causes another expensive item to be purchased just to race w/in spec.

As for the rule...I don't think we need it especially as a national rule. Maybe let the local regions make this call among their drivers (some regions will be more receptive to this than others - especially newer ones looking to get more drivers, etc.). As we all know Traqmate data does not give the entire picture and must be synched to video to provide other evidence such as drafting which will corrupt the data if you rely solely on it.

=====

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here

Posted by JB3 - 20 Oct 2010 07:58

jaje wrote:

First off - most people don't have Traqmates yet so it causes another expensive item to be purchased just to race w/in spec.

As for the rule...I don't think we need it especially as a national rule. Maybe let the local regions make this call among their drivers (some regions will be more receptive to this than others - especially newer ones looking to get more drivers, etc.). As we all know Traqmate data does not give the entire picture and must be synched to video to provide other evidence such as drafting which will corrupt the data if you rely solely on it.

Exactly correct. And, for example, in this part of the country G2X is more common at least in the 944s which I see and I am leaning at this time toward either G2X or the IQ3.

=====

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here

Posted by GaryM05 - 20 Oct 2010 08:10

Is the idea of mandated data-sharing to help improve the driving, or to help with the current discussion about HP limits?

In RM 944-Spec we frequently share our data and video amongst ourselves, and there are several classes in NASA that use GPS data for HP measurement. Controlled/limited access to GPS data collected for purposes of evaluating HP in order to determine who might be a possible outlier and thus who could be looked at more closely in tech could be one more good way to help enforce rules

compliance. But mandating that anyone who races in the class has to share all of their driving data from a given session with everyone else is not a good idea, IMO – if I want to share my (admittedly modest) driving or racing techniques with somebody, I will. But I shouldn't be forced to.

If I figure out a better line through turn 1 at Mid-Ohio, I shouldn't be forced to let everyone else know about it. Figuring out a line or a track faster than others (or experimenting with new things at a familiar track) is one of the core components of spec racing. In my opinion, mandating that I share that info reduces the incentive for me to think for myself and try new techniques on the track. Why try new things and develop my own skills, when I can instead just go copy everything that the fast guys are doing? Spec racing is supposed to be about determining who is a better driver, and not who can copy everyone else's driving skills the most effectively.

Sharing a few driving techniques around the Saturday-evening keg at the track is one thing – fully exposing all driving data to everyone is different.

So to summarize my view – data collected for the purpose of regional directors and tech to help enforce the rules is OK. Data collected for the purposes of everyone else determining how somebody is actually driving is not OK.

For everyone else reading this, there's a good discussion on this question going on at Rennlist in the Racing subforum that has some other general opinions on this topic that are worth reading through.

=====

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here

Posted by Sterling Doc - 20 Oct 2010 08:23

Yes, I also posted this as a query on Rennlist since the only feedback I got here was from Joe. The opinions there seem to be simialr to here.

There would never be a requirement to buy one (we're too cheap for that). The intent of the rule, is that a datalogger could be placed by a series director. I think sharing data helps to dispel allegations of cheating, and expose real outliers should they come up - both useful things, and knowing that your dta may go public may discourage those who would cheat. It could also be over analyzed, and cause issues as well.

Thanks for the feedback! Keep it coming.

=====

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here

Posted by cbuzzetti - 20 Oct 2010 11:00

After reading both sides to this argument it is a tough call. It should be the drivers decision to share the data with all if he so decides. I personally have no issue with that since I am very confident in my ability and prefer to have someone to race with instead of just lapping.

I can see Garys point of not being willing to share every thing every time. If you do figure out a corner better and you want to be able to use that to your best ability for that weekend to improve your finish position then that should be the drivers choice.

The Regional Directors should still have the option to look at the data to see if the car is within HP limits (whatever that is).

It will take all parties to agree to get this to happen. If one person does not want to play with the rest it will cause friction.

One issue with the director seeing the data and no one else is that the director could use that to his advantage in the race.

And then of course there is the cost. While not huge all drivers would have to pony up some portion of the cost. Those with DA already should pay a lower percentage.

We share video in So-Cal after the races if we have time. The faster drivers are sharing what they know with the slower divers. It seems to be working in our region.

=====

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here

Posted by JerryW - 20 Oct 2010 12:27

Those of us in NorCal with compatible Data also tend to share the data if asked. Many though still do not have a data system. Equally we share video from those that run it, (often when THEY have something they wish to share (brag)).

I don't think that mandatory sharing to data is reasonable, and might result in owners only running data on non race weekends.

Not sure how this could be applied in a fair fashion.

=====