

## 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by dpRacing Dan - 31 Oct 2016 10:34

---

Ok boys and girls, the time has come for us to propose/discuss/debate any proposed rules for the 2017 season.

NASA is already pressuring me to have the rules wrapped up in an unrealistic time, but we WILL need to expedite this this year. Let's try to keep this constructive. If you have an idea, please post it up on the thread, voice your reasons, and be prepared to have them dashed or supported. I will read all comments and hear all reasoning. I will ONLY do this here- no phone calls please. Emails are ok, but THIS is where we go to discuss rules. PLEASE keep this civil- I dont want any huge arguments to spin out of control. Lets all be grown ups, and keep this friendly.

Please remember, only rules that will increase reliability, or performance WITHOUT significant spending or changes will be considered. Remember EVERY change effects not only cars in your region, but EVERY car in the country running under these rules. I wont consider anything that cannot be quickly or easily done to EVERY car in the country competing (this is about 175 cars nationally). My main goal is to keep our cars as reliable and competitive as possible, without spending lots of money.

Ready?

Set.

GO!

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by AgRacer - 18 Nov 2016 07:54

---

**rd7839 wrote:**

Interesting article on wheels. You can sorta read between the lines to see that we would be opening a can of worms by allowing aftermarket wheels.

One part I find interesting is where they say racing wheels are a wear item. I don't know of anybody having to replace their worn out factory wheels.

[nasaspeed.news/tech/wheels-tires/were-no...nderstand-it-better/](http://nasaspeed.news/tech/wheels-tires/were-no...nderstand-it-better/)

I read the opposite with respect to strength.

"Jongbloed's multipiece wheels are made of 6061 and heat treated to T6, which allows the material to give and return to its original shape. With one-piece cast wheels, they're not as forgiving to repeated flexing. Regardless of which material you have, racing wheels should be treated as a wear item, and should be replaced at the appropriate intervals."

I interpret this to mean that the Jongbloed wheel is better suited to a wider range of stresses, since it can flex and compensate to varying conditions. The stock cast wheel not being as forgiving, would be strong up to a certain point which would then break once stressed past that point.

Without testing, we cant say if it is opening a can of worms or not. But if the wheel weighs the same as the stock, and is the same off set, what else would make it an advantage over the stock wheel?

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by rd7839 - 18 Nov 2016 09:10

---

Placement of the weight or weight distribution, and brake cooling among others. Where the majority of the rotational mass is located will make a huge difference even if they are the same weight. The only way to make sure they are the same as stock is to make them exactly like stock, in other words reproduce cookie cutters and what would be the point of that.

As it's been said before stock wheels are very strong and are not suffering failures and are cheap and easy to find. Looks is not a good reason to fix what aint broke.

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by rd7839 - 18 Nov 2016 09:17

---

Have you ever noticed that most, if not all big sanctioning bodies like F1, Indycar and NASCAR control wheels and tires? Usually they issue the teams the sets and check them after use. The reason is that they know there is room for big improvements with them and teams could make their own wheels, putting the weight exactly where they want it and gain an advantage. Plus cheating would be relatively easy.

The lesson to learn is that wheels, even of the same weight are not equal and if the new ones are faster,

we all have to upgrade, even if it's just perception.

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by code3pro - 18 Nov 2016 09:48

---

Looks really don't matter to me, but having 924s, finding decent phone dials that aren't corroded or bent was a challenge as the pool of available wheels is much smaller than cookie cutters. It took me a while to amass three good sets. I realize the 924s is more rare. I am neutral on cookie cutters because I don't use them.

=====

## Re: 2017 Rules Proposal Thread

Posted by Brian Evans - 18 Nov 2016 10:10

---

### **rd7839 wrote:**

Placement of the weight or weight distribution, and brake cooling among others. Where the majority of the rotational mass is located will make a huge difference even if they are the same weight. The only way to make sure they are the same as stock is to make them exactly like stock, in other words reproduce cookie cutters and what would be the point of that.

As it's been said before stock wheels are very strong and are not suffering failures and are cheap and easy to find. Looks is not a good reason to fix what aint broke.

YMMV, but I've never seen a single 944-Spec car overcook its brakes so I don't know that increased brake cooling would have any affect on performance.

I have any early offset car and can run either cutters or early phonies (which, I would assume, have different rotational masses) and have never considered performance testing one wheel vs the other beyond comparing the weight of the 2 wheels.

Given that the early offset cars have the option of two wheels of equal weight wouldn't it fair to give the late offset cars the option, too? Otherwise, I could within the rules, figure out if a phonie or cutter had better rotational mass and get an advantage on a late offset car whose only option is phonies.

\*\*\*I have no intention of doing so, I can't imagine it would make .0000000001% of a difference if weight

and offset were the same. While I have no plans for purchasing the aftermarket wheels I'm fine with the proposal to add them.

=====