

2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by joepaluch - 27 Oct 2010 06:04

These are **PROPOSED** Changes only based on driver and director suggestions. Please comment below. These are proposed NEW allowances to the 944 spec rule set.

2011-1) 3 Piece Crossmember

Proposal: Allow 3 Piece engine mount support cross member as manufactured and originally sold by Lindsey racing. PNxxxxx (TBD)

Justification: Allows for faster and easier rod bearing changes which improve the maintainability of the cars. No change in performance.

2011-2) Larger Jack pad reinforcement

Proposal: Increase size of jackpad described in rule 16.3.14 from 4" by 4" to 6" by 6".

Justification: The larger size better matches up with jack saddle sizes on larger floor jacks

2011-3) Allow 924S models to use 924 Carrera GT type flares on the rear.

Proposal: All 87 and 924S chassis to install fiberglass 924 Carrera GT/ GTS type rear flares. Flares limited to units produce by GT racing part number xxxx (TBD). Track width may be increased the limit of the 944. If rear flares are installed the front must also convert to 944 steel fenders.

Justification: This allows a simple easy way for a narrow 924S to achieve the same track width as allowed by the 944. Front bodywork will be identical to the 944 and the rear flares are a cheaper solution than using 944 rear qtr panels.

2011-4.) Lexan rear Qtr windows

Proposal: Allow rear replacement of glass qtr windows with lexan and to allow air ducting to be installed in these lexan windows. No changes to rear hatch.

Justification: Makes it a nice clean way to provide fresh air ducting.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Item

Posted by Litespeeds - 05 Nov 2010 23:32

I'm ok with the first 3 but don't really care about #4.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by 944Racer72 - 07 Nov 2010 21:37

I was talking to one of my fellow competitors today about the lexan issue. I think this rule needs to happen but it should be re-phrased and isolated to only one of the two windows.

This is a safety issue in my opinion. I have a clear lexan NACA duct in my passenger window and it blocks my mirror. I would like to put one in a rear window so I can see my mirror.

In my opinion, the rule should be:

One rear quarter window may be replaced with Lexan for the purpose of air ducting into the cabin. Lexan may not be used to replace a glass window solely for the purpose of weight reduction; an air duct must be in place. Either window may be replaced in the manner above but not both.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by jaje - 08 Nov 2010 06:18

I think that replacing the rear quarter windows with lexan should be allowed on both sides regardless of whether there's a duct there or not. It takes away another glass component that will shatter if hit during a race or accident (possibly cutting the driver or worker helping assist them - especially in rollovers where you have to crawl on the ground). They are so small that it won't do much to help weight and lexan is not all that expensive.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by JerryW - 08 Nov 2010 07:33

I also like the requirement for the ducting to be in place. E.G. the argument is to allow cooling ducting to be installed - so make it part of the rule.

Given the back hatch is still glass - I don't see swapping the side windows reduces the amount of glass

shards in a wreck.

I'd support the lexan side window with the above change.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - New Allowances (4 Items)

Posted by 944Racer72 - 08 Nov 2010 07:45

jaje wrote:

I think that replacing the rear quarter windows with lexan should be allowed on both sides regardless of whether there's a duct there or not. It takes away another glass component that will shatter if hit during a race or accident (possibly cutting the driver or worker helping assist them - especially in rollovers where you have to crawl on the ground). They are so small that it won't do much to help weight and lexan is not all that expensive.

Jaje, I think the fear is that opening up the rule means "everyone HAS to do it" for competitive advantage. If it is only one of the two windows and MUST have a duct, there is no weight advantage. Surely the Lexan+duct+hose weighs about the same as a stock window.

=====