

## HP limit / power to weight / pro built /low cost

Posted by SvoChuck - 24 Sep 2010 14:41

---

Racers

We the series directors are looking into an issue and more input is better.

My desire is to keep/return 944-spec to low cost equal racing the issue we are interested in finding more information about is do you need a "pro built" engine to compete like spec miata or can you just freshen up a non 88 piston engine. ? If we continue to go the spec miata route then maybe we could add more cars to our racing by allowing other high cost items .

story

I did some work on Scott Boves 4th place car before Nationals when I shared the dyno with Tim C. He asked that I look deeper for non compliance ( the car was built for Cup before I fixed it) as it turns out those numbers were a bit lower than what we saw from others at Nationals...

Another director spoke about how 130-133hp used to be great dyno numbers but now it seems that those numbers will not run upfront.

Ram Air ? does this work and or does it fit with 944-spec in the future ?

Claimer rule ? If you finish in the top 10 you can buy the winners engine for \$4,000 ??? I will chime in on this one right away I have never seen a claimer series where the competitors can be or remain friends ...

HP vs weight ? Dyno HP ? Traqmate HP ?

Could we add a restrictor plate to cars making over 130 HP/135TQ or have them make a small change that would give them a smaller advantage while keeping most of our other rules intact ?

=====

## Re:HP limit / power to weight / pro built /low cost

Posted by joepaluch - 30 Sep 2010 03:38

---

A little history lesson guys.

Why 88 pistons were allowed.

When we created this series in 2002 we wanted to make sure we had the largest pool of possible cars, but maintain performance.

So we allowed the 88 944 and 924S. We restricted the 89 2.7L 944. I have had guys complain about not being able to run an 89 2.7L.

Now we were aware of the increased compression of the 88 motors and for the first 3-4 years the rules stated that 88 motors might see a weight penalty. We kept on looking to see if a clear trend would emerge. None ever did even with dyno's to support. It seemed clear that race winners were the better drivers. Looking back allowing the 88's still ok in my mind because our compression limit. Also having run an 88 block in my 944 compared to 84 block using the same minimally shaved (for truness only) head, I found the CONDITION of the motor to be more important the piston type.

I don't see us at a crisis. Certainly not in Arizona.

Now that does not mean the series director cannot or should not try to look into the future. We directors are working hard to **prevent** this from getting into an Arms race. That is one we cannot win.

=====

**Re:HP limit / power to weight / pro built /low cost**

Posted by JRichard - 07 Oct 2010 16:55

---

something to consider...the demise of 944 supercup due to similar issues...lets not go this way:

[forums.renlist.com/rennforums/racing-an...f-944supercup-2.html](http://forums.renlist.com/rennforums/racing-an...f-944supercup-2.html)

=====

**Re:HP limit / power to weight / pro built /low cost**

Posted by joepaluch - 08 Oct 2010 06:02

---

Jim,

We director will never let things go that way. Our rules, class and directors may not be perfect, but we do try hard to make sure we keep to the spirit of the class and stay in tune with driver concerns/demands.

Like I have said before... This discussion is about being "proactive" rather than reactive.

Nobody in this class wants \$10k motors to be "competitive". As such the directors need to be constantly aware and watch out for things that might drive us that way. It is tough to both minimize constant tinkering and tweaking of the rules, but also be proactive to ensure we keep to our "driver skill over dollars spent" concept alive and well.

=====

**Re:HP limit / power to weight / pro built /low cost**

Posted by SvoChuck - 04 Nov 2010 22:42

---

ok it's up there 2011-8 .

=====