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 cbuzzetti - 11 Oct 2010 18:46

_____

I think we know someone who can tell us.

I will see what I can find out.

To me there is no doubt that something can be found. How much that something is is what we need to know.

It would be very expensive to test all the options.

==

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here
Posted by 944Racer72 - 11 Oct 2010 21:45

_____

Have adjustable cam gears been explored before? It seems that would be a cheap/easy way for those shaving the head for compression to equal the '88 piston engines with no ill effect to cam timing. Jon Milledge said in the power thread that there is no gain to be had by alternating cam timing on an otherwise stock engine so that may not be an issue.

There is no gain for me here as I have the '88 pistons - just a thought to relieve some concerns over the cost of the pistons and potentially lower the cost to build an engine.

==

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here
Posted by JRichard - 11 Oct 2010 22:44

_____

Opening up cam timing is a can of worms, IMHO... There are too many tricks you can play with it. The intent is good but it will have the opposite effect.

And can someone definitively say that there is or isn't an advantage so we an put this one to bed? I need a new motor And the one I'd like to buy is an 88 I don't want to blunder and build the wrong motor and have it deemed illegal or carryy a weight penalty...

==

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here
Posted by cbuzzetti - 12 Oct 2010 08:32

_____

If anyone knows it is Milledge. He has done thousands of hours of dyno work with the 944 engine in all forms.

Do not allow adjustable cam gears or sprockets only allow an offset woodruff key to correct back to stock timing. This will equalize the non 88 piston motors to those who have them. That is of course if they decide to do that.

Porsche optimized the timing from the factory. It only gets worse if you alter it from stock.

Jim if the powers that be decide to do anything drastic it will most likely backfire. There is no easy solution to the problem but if you start penalizing racers for maximizing their cars with in the current rules then why continue racing in Spec? We can all go to GTS-1, SCCA, PCA or POC. It has happened before and it can happen again.

I believe they know that and want to make the right decision but they are between a rock and a hard spot.

I think it is important that we get a complete head count from all the Spec racers to see if the rules need altering on this subject.

It sounds as if there is only a few who are having an issue with it. IMO

==

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here
Posted by joepaluch - 12 Oct 2010 15:03

_____

JRichard wrote:

Opening up cam timing is a can of worms, IMHO... There are too many tricks you can play with it. The intent is good but it will have the opposite effect.

And can someone definitively say that there is or isn't an advantage so we an put this one to bed? I need a new motor And the one I'd like to buy is an 88 I don't want to blunder and build the wrong motor and have it deemed illegal or carryy a weight penalty...

Jim,

 Pull the trigger on the 88 motor. There is not enough data to put a weight penalty on the 88 motor for 2010. Eric Kuhns did some dyno testing back in the mid west. Results did not support 88 pistons as power house motors. In fact a shaved head 9.5:1 motor put out the biggest hp number that day.
Darren's Motor is a low comp motor and he runs fast even with weight. While it is easy enough to put xx lbs on 10.2:1 pistons I don't know what that will solve. We still have no hard data to show 10.2:1 pistons are clearly better. Again CONDITION of the motor is actually more important.

So build whatever motor you want. 88 pistons or not. Built it for realiablity to the rules and you will be fine.

Now maybe if we got a whole lot smart in 2010 we might make change, but it just won't happen fast.

==

Re: 2011 - Rules change proposals - List ideas here
Posted by Sterling Doc - 13 Oct 2010 10:00

_____

Joe's right.

We dyno'd 5 cars at the last event. Interestingly, this was the same mobile dyno used at Nationals.

HP ranged from 129-138. TQ from 133-137.

The two lowest cars had high compression motors that were built last year, but had very choppy dynos, suggesting suboptimal fuelling or ignition.

The 138HP/137 TQ motor was a low compression, shaved head motor, with a very nice, smooth dyno curve, indicating a good state of tune. It did have fresher plugs, good plug wires, etc. This motor was a budget pro build (around $3K), and had never seen the dyno before, or had any special massaging/tricks applied.

==