

Suspension Rules changes. (17)

Posted by joepaluch - 07 Nov 2009 22:52

These are PROPOSED changes gather from the various discussions. Use this area to further discuss these. Based on the feedback we get the rules will be changed (or not) to reflect these updates. It is anticipated that some rules changes will NOT be accepted, but all are up for debate.

17 Front Ball joints using bronze cups

Any material may be used in the ball joints cups on aluminum A-arms when rebuilding. Aftermarket ball joints may be used. Pin diameter must remain stock at 17 mm. Longer than stock geometry correction pins are not allowed

=====

Re:Suspension Rules changes. (17)

Posted by Bamf3000 - 04 Aug 2011 20:26

Sorry to bring an old thread back from the dead but I was wondering why exactly we keep the same 17mm pin length, how does a 19mm that is offered provide a performance advantage?

Also why are rear coil overs not something that is being considered? It would seem a lot easier to set up and I doubt the cost would really be that significant, seeing as how a set of welt torsion bars cost around \$350 and up. Just some odd questions I thought of as I work on the car.

=====

Re:Suspension Rules changes. (17)

Posted by Sterling Doc - 08 Aug 2011 09:23

We can deal with this more in detail in rules change season, but the brief answer is the current rules are more cost effective.

Everyone has 17mm pins already. Allowing the 19mm pins adds cost. The 19mm pins improve geometry on a lowered car to a degree. You can argue about how much, but there needs to be a good argument for why it is needed before we'd open that door.

As far as the rear coil overs, they can get very expensive, and there is no question they improve performance. Even if they are cheap, you have to consider that making this change impacts the cars that are already built. Once a better performing option is made legal, than the 100's of cars already built have to spend money to be competitive - that's why rule changes are a big deal.

=====

Re:Suspension Rules changes. (17)

Posted by Big Dog - 08 Aug 2011 20:38

"Even if they are cheap, you have to consider that making this change impacts the cars that are already built. Once a better performing option is made legal, than the 100's of cars already built have to spend money to be competitive - that's why rule changes are a big deal."

Well said, Eric. I think that putting something like this into these words helps make it more clear for everyone. Rule changes are a big deal because of the impact they can have on cars built years ago. Spending \$\$\$\$ on torsion bars and then, later, having to throw them away and spend money on coil overs would suck. That was what happened several years ago in So. Cal. with chips and headers. A number of guys left the group in disgust.

Big Dog

=====

Re:Suspension Rules changes. (17)

Posted by joepaluch - 09 Aug 2011 04:45

Not only that rear coil overs don't work on the Koni's we run. As such we need different shocks. Then that increaes the cost of shocks as well.

T-bars however create a limit rear suspension and are a key to controlling overall suspension cost and equalizing performance.

I still don't understand why people are so afraid of them. Set them once and forget them. They really work well.

=====