

2011 Change Proposals - Clarifications (2 Items)

Posted by joepaluch - 27 Oct 2010 06:02

These are **PROPOSED** Changes only based on driver and director suggestions. Please comment below. These are clarifications to existing rules and do not represent a change to established rule enforcement.

2011-5.) Clarify use of Fog light openings for "ram air"

Proposal: Fog light openings may also be used to duct air into the engine intake.

Justification: Make clear the official ruling on "ram air" made at the 2010 Nationals. The effect on performance is expected to be minimal at best and the cost to use the fog lights for ram air is minimal. There are other more complex and costly methods to achieve ram air by not using the fog light holes that are already allowed by the "open intake" rules.

2011-6.) Publish rules in maximum head shave

Proposal: Head may be shaved to a minimum thickness of 0.891in(22.62mm) for 9.5:1 pistons and 0.927(23.54mm) for 10.2:1 pistons as measure on an uninstalled head in factory specified location – Factory manual page 15-16a dimension A. Installed heads measurements are as follows .934in(23.72mm) for 9.5:1 and .970in(24.64mm) to the surface of the block. Engines must comply with both minimum head thickness and compression ratio limit of 10.5:1.

Tampering with the measurement surfaces in a way that distorts the actually head thickness measurement will be subject to penalties. For reference stock head thickness is 24.0mm +/- 0.1 (.945 in +/- .004) and stock head gasket is 1.1 mm (.043in).

Justification: Publishing the limit on head thickness will make it easier to validate compliance of compression ratio when tools such as a whistler or more direct volumetric methods are not feasible. Cars will need to meet both the limit on head thickness AND the 10.5:1 limit.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - Clarifications (2 Item)

Posted by Big Dog - 16 Nov 2010 08:04

1. Reluctant yes. I was not aware that ram air was allowed until Nationals. If "ram air" is legal then using the fog light seems right.

2. A strong NO. We have a compression limit and should only have one criteria for "legal". Using thickness as a "guide" during tech is fine to determine if more scrutiny is warranted but having another, separate rule to DQ someone is wrong and unnecessary and NASA has plenty of rules now to deal with the compression issue. If it ain't broke, don't fix it, NO NEW RULES.

In addition to the above, it should be pointed out that there is no "proof" offered up that the proposed limits equate to a head that is over compression. The head is only part of the volume of the compression chamber. The height of the pistons in the block (is that deck height?), the depth of the valves in the head and the thickness of the gasket all contribute to the compression chamber volume. There was discussion about Charlie's head thickness vs the proposed standard. His head was legal with the standard gasket and would be legal even if thinner than the proposed standard with a thicker, legal Porsche gasket. How does it make any sense to DQ someone if their compression is at or below 10.5 just because of the head measurement?

Use the head thickness as a "guide" for more checking but do not make it another "rule". Making rules up without proper "proof" that they are, in fact, correct makes for bad rule making and this one is bad.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it. NO NEW RULES.

Big Dog

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - Clarifications (2 Items)

Posted by cbuzzetti - 16 Nov 2010 08:54

I Agree with Big Dog, use as a guide line if anything. (head measurement)

New Rules for the sake of rules will kill this class. Stability is what we need.

Lets use the in place NASA rules to weed out cheaters. The protest forms are available at all events.

NO NEW RULES

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - Clarifications (2 Item

Posted by Sterling Doc - 16 Nov 2010 20:57

No definite rule these item yet. Stay tuned.

=====