Corvirsation

Tucson Corvair Association
Volume 24, Number 12

Tucson, Arizona
February 1999

Dues are due!

Brakke Stinger on the track

See CORSA Comminique Jan99 for SCCA Runoff results
and some great shots of the Corvairs that were there.

Tucson Corvair Association

Established 1975

Corvairsation is a monthly publication of the Tucson Corvair Association, which is dedicated to the preservation of the Corvair model of the Chevrolet Motor Division of General Motors. The Tucson Corvair Association is a chartered member of the Corvair Society of America (CORSA, chapter 857)

Monthly Meetings are held on the fourth Wednesday of each month except December. One technical/social event is planned for each month except August.

Membership Dues are $15 per year for singles and $18 per year for families. Initial dues are $15 for singles and $22 for families (includes name tags). Make checks payable to Tucson Corvair Association.

Change of Address: Report any change of address or phone number to the Membership Chairperson. Do not report such changes to the *Corvairsation* Editor.

CORSA Membership Dues are $27 per year and include a subscription to the *CORSA Communique*, a monthly publication. CORSA membership is not required for membership in TCA but is highly recommended. See any TCA officer for more information.

Classifies Ads are free to members and $2.50 per 4-line ad to all others.

Deadline for all materials submitted for publication in the *Corvairsation* is the 1st for that month's issue. Mail or deliver all materials to the *Corvairsation* editor.

BUSINESS MAILING ADDRESS: 2044 W Shalimar Way, Tucson, Arizona 85704

Board of Directors

President
Allen Elvick
4210 S Preston
Tucson, Arizona 85746
(520) 883-4337

Vice-President

Treasurer
Allen Elvick
4210 S Preston
Tucson, Arizona 85746
(520) 883-4337

Recording Secretary
Herb Berkman
210 S Daybright Place
Tucson, Arizona 85748
(520) 751-9500
hjberkmn@flash.net

Board Member-at-Large
Barry Cunningham
3725 E 32nd Street
Tucson, Arizona 85713
(520) 747-9028

Membership Chairperson
Beverly Baker
6110 E 5th Street #127
Tucson, Arizona 85711
(520) 747-0840

Corvairsation Editor
Don Robinson
2044 W Shalimar Way
Tucson, Arizona 85704
(520) 297-1356
fourcorvairs@hotmail.com

Previous Presidents
Don Henn (520) 743-3346

Lynn Bloom (520) 747-4842

Wheels & Spokes

Chaplain
Ron Bloom
4072 N 22nd Street, S-197
Tucson, Arizona 85711
(520) 747-4842

Assistant Editor
Van Pershing
4842 W Paseo de las Colinas
Tucson, Arizona 85745
(520) 743-9185
vanp@flash.net

Librarian
Dave Baker
6110 E 5th Street #127
Tucson, Arizona 85711
(520) 747-0840

Merchandise Chairman
Don Robinson
2044 W Shalimar Way
Tucson, Arizona 85704
(520) 297-1356

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE...

Man did this year fly by. I really didn't think it would, but here is my last memo to you all. Thanks for the support this past year. All in all I think it went pretty well. We had several very good outings and several very good tech sessions, but enough of that. I am happy to report that our nominating committee has again come up with a full slate of officers for the following year. I'm not sure if it proper protocol, but what the hey, it's too late to impeach me, here is the slate that will be presented at the next meeting. Come and show you support for the new/old group.

President.....Dave Baker
Vice President.....Barry Cunningham
Secretary.....Herb Berkman
Treasurer.....Allen Elvick
Board Member at Large..Don Henn
Membership Chair.....Beverly Baker

A huge thank you to Gordon Cauble, Don Henn, and Barry Cunningham for the time and effort that I know went into this process.
We have been receiving money for a memorial fund in memory of Larry Dandridge which will be transferred to Ethel Moore. Anyone who has not had the opportunity to donate may still do so. The donation can be sent to Allen Elvick, 4210 S. Preston, Tucson, Az 85735. Made out to Tucson Corvair Assoc. (TCA), memo Larry Dandridge memorial.

Allen

Coming attractions....

Saturday Feb 20th is Sons of the Pioneers at Triple C Chuckwagon
We will meet in the vacant lot at the intersection of Kinney and Bopp RD At 5:00 pm. We will leave for CCC at 5:15. The Gates open at 5:30 and The first group will stake out our table until the rest arrive. Dinner is at 7:00 so if you need to, bring something to keep you entertained. The reservation number is 49. You will have to tell the people the reservation number as you go thru the gate. Beef 16.00, chicken 18.00, combo 18.00,ribeye 21.00. Groups of 20 or more can get the combo for 16.00 You can pay at the CCC but call and let me know how many by the 17th so I can give them the final number.

TO GET THERE.....

Go west on AJO WAY to light at KINNEY ROAD. (west of the Tucson Mountains. Turn right and go north to BOPP ROAD(the first intersection) Turn left (West) and continue to the Triple C. It is not far past SanJuaquin The group will meet in the vacant lot located just as you turn on to BOPP. FOR THE FINAL COUNT AND/OR INFO CALL ALLEN @ 883-4337

NOTHING FOR MARCH YET!!!!!

APRIL 18TH IS PICACHO PEAK WITH CACTUS CORVAIR
MAY 28TH IS THE GASLIGHT THEATER

DECEMBER 98 /JAN 99 TREASURER'S REPORT

BEGINNING CASH ON HAND.....1100.51

INCOME: (ACCOUNTS RECEVABLE)

Ads.....5.00
Badges/Pins.....00.00
Raffle Tickets.....00.00
Can Money.....00.00
Christmas party.....375.00
Merchandise.....00.00

DUES:

Dave & Beverly Baker..... 18.00
Dick Cannon..... 15.00
Paul Dunn Family..... 18.00
Allen & Marianne Elvick..... 18.00
Tim Gree.....18.00
Vern & Ruth Griffith.....18.00
Vic & Ingrid Howard..... 18.00
Don Robinson.....15.00

TOTAL INCOME (ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE).....518.00

EXPENSES: (ACCOUNTS PAYABLE)

Stamps.....21.12
Badges.....00.00
Save (2yr) subscription.....22.00
Copier Repairs.....289.31

TOTAL EXPENSES (ACCOUNTS PAYABLE).....332.43

ENDING BALANCE:(CASH ON HAND).....1286.08

Respectfully Submitted

Allen Elvick

from the editor.....

Elections at this month's meeting!!!. We need your vote and smiling face there. I hope you are looking forward to another great year in the club as I am.

Also, I'm looking forward to the upcoming Corsa convention at Lake Tahoe in June. I'm already planning an assault of the desert to get there. Plan for June and we will caravan there!

Congratulations to Herb Berkman for winning the trophy for the top 60s car at Little Antony's Classic car show. It was a nice sunny warm day and lots of fun seeing a great variety of old cars. Let's do it again!

Don't <u>forget</u> to pay your dues. They are due NOW!!

What's on the agenda at the tech session for the February meeting?? Hope it is fuel pumps and/or carburetors! I'm somewhere on the learning curve..... but where?

Tim Allen has been referred to as a "former" Corvair Owner. Tim Allen's first car was a Corvair that was handed down from his brother, Allen still owns Stinger #YS-043 and has vintage-raced it a few times. He now keeps it in California in the same shop with Jason Priestly's race cars.

The rag-top shown here, Yenko Stinger #YS-302, is the only known Yenko convertible in existence.

Thanks to http://magi.com/~gaubc/corvair/intro.html for the pictures

Editor's Note: In the late 70s John Wipff published a couple of volumes called The Compleat History of the Corvair for the Corvair Nutll In Volume I he presented several chapters of information that we would like to share (or reshare, as the case may be) with you over the next few months.

CHAPTER 5

NOW ABOUT THAT 'QUADRI-FLEX' IN THAT 'UNISTRUT' ...

Most readers at this point may be thinking that the Corvair was the first experience the Chevy had had with a compact car. This is not so, however, because in 1945-46 Chevy almost produced a car called the 'Cadet.' A very thorough history of this car can be found in *Special Interest Auto*, Number 20, Jan/Feb, 1974.

And all Chevys prior to 1933 had a less-than 110-in. wheelbase. Despite prior experience with more conventional but scaled-down cars (or perhaps because of it) the Corvair project began with no inhibitions whatsoever; Benzinger's 'clean sheet of paper.'

As has been stated, the advantages of a rear-engine/unit-body car are: flat floor for more center passenger room, lower center of gravity, heat and noise away from the passengers, to name a few. There are also some disadvantages, the most obvious of which is a tail-heavy car. However, Chevy engineers found out that a compact front-engine car carries fifty-five percent of its weight on the front wheels, but when fully loaded, the rear wheels carry fifty-five percent. This switch creates some fairly nasty problems, trying to keep handling consistent.

On the other hand, the rear-engine car presents handling problems of its own, but there is no serious change in load distribution from driver-only to six passengers. Approximately sixty to sixty-two percent is on the rear wheels at all times, about the same as a fully-loaded station wagon.

Though not new to the automotive industry, unit construction was new to Chevy, so to provide the integral body/frame structural strength, the Corvair body was especially reinforced and side rail-like members extended into both front and rear sections.

The principle reinforcements to the underbody were special box-like section members concentrated close to the box-section sills at the front and rear ends. Front and rear side-rail-like extensions were integrated into these heavily reinforced underbody sill areas. Front and rear rail extensions were flanged channel sections that were completed as box sections, then welded to the fore and aft wheel houses.

Corrosion protection was considered of prime importance, particularly with unit construction, so all principle underbody structural members were coated on the inside with zinc primer and after assembly, with paint.

Unit bodies are noted for 'drumming' (as witness, the 158 Lincoln) so insulation material was liberally used throughout the Corvair body to 'tune-out, the resonance, with the greatest concentration being behind the rear seat, both inside and outside of panel. On the engine side was an inch-thick layer of fiberglass, with a layer of polyethylene to keep out water and oil. On the passenger side was a 5/8-in. thick blanket of jute. Roof and dash panels were insulated with a sound-absorbing panel of asphalt-impregnated felt.

Forward of the front seat in the passenger compartment, insulation consisted of hardboard, asphalt-impregnated felt, and jute under the floor mat (rubber). The rear floor was insulated in the same manner.

The unit-body Corvair is thirty percent more torsionally rigid than a regular Chevy with frame/body construction. Most cars average 4000 ft-lb/degree, so this would put the Corvair at about 5000. Weight saving is another reason for unit-construction, as approximately sixty percent of the weight of a separate frame is eliminated. A separate frame would have weighed in the neighborhood of 225 lbs., so there was a savings of 135 lbs., approximately.

The overall dimensions of the finished package, the four-door '500' were: Wheelbase 108 in., 67 in. wide and 52 in. high. A minimum ground clearance of six inches was high for such a low car. The rear-mounted engine made that low-silhouette easy to achieve and a front-of-dash line only nine inches behind the front wheel centerline proved to be feasible. Front legroom was generous at 42 in., and in the rear there was 37 in. Hiproom in the rear was wider than if the seat had been between the wheel wells, and was the same as the front, 57 in.

Because of the flat floor, center passengers front and rear had full cushion-depth, with 39 in. headroom.

Another disadvantage in a rear-engine car is lack of trunk space. Since the rear wheels don't steer the car, a rear trunk only needs to provide for jounce. A front trunk, while it can be deeper because of no differential, needs to also allow for left and right movement of the wheels.

The front trunk had a volume of 9.8 cu. ft. Unfortunately, a lot of this was taken up by a spare tire and a gas heater, the protuberances of which precluded much more than that previously-mentioned 'sack lunch.' There was, however, a well behind the rear seat which added another 4.5 cu. ft., and there was an optional-folding seat that, when folded forward, allowed another 10.4 cu. ft. including the well, for a total of 20.2 cu. ft. This was good and bad. People could see what you were carrying in the back seat space, just as in a station wagon. The front trunk, while it did lock, (as, of course did the doors), realistically wasn't cavernous enough to hold much. So prying eyes could inspect all uncovered items stored inside the car, much like the '78 and later Corvette. Unlike the 'Vette there was no window-roller type covering to alleviate the problem in the 'Vair.

When the Corvair was introduced, a huge ad campaign was mounted by the competition trying to show that a front-engine/rear-drive car was better in every way than a rear-engine/rear-drive. Ford ads showed an arrow with the arrowhead in the rear, intimating that cars and arrows had something in common. So to counter this and later accusations in court, Chevy

brought up the big guns to show that they had every reason in the world to put the weight where they did, most of which have already been stated. A few more to round out the list are: rear engines help rear traction and add weight transfer on braking. (Corvair owners were proud of '50/50' braking, as were the admen.) But this abundance of dead weight behind the rear axle did provoke some challenges in the handling department.

Providing proper handling for a rear-engine car was not breaking fresh ground for GM. In 1938, engineers, Maurice Olley among them, worked on an experimental car, weighing approximately 2,250 lbs. with sixty percent of the weight on the rear wheels of a 107 in. wheelbase. It oversteered tremendously with front/rear tire pressures of 23/ 28. They found that by changing the differential to 19/ 35 (or loading 400 lbs. of sand in the nose) they could balance the handling. The final solution was to install a front anti-roll bar along with a de Dion rear suspension, change the tire pressure differential to 23/33 and hang on. It then understeered just like a front-engine car and cornered sixteen percent faster than previously.

In 1953 Maurice Olley had delivered a technical paper titled "European Postwar Cars." In it he sharply criticized rear-engine cars with swing-axle suspension systems. Such vehicles, he pointed out, did not handle safely in the wind even at moderate speeds and even with a "large pressure differential between the front and rear tires to distribute the weight as evenly as possible.

In 1956, Olley filed yet another critique of the Corvair-type suspension in a patent application: "The ordinary swing-axle, under severe lateral forces produced by cornering, tends to lift the rear-end of the vehicle so that both wheels assume severe positive-camber positions to such an extent that the vehicle not only oversteers, but actually tends to roll over. In addition, the effect is non-linear and increases sharply in a severe turn, thus presenting potentially dangerous handling characteristics." (Positive camber is when the bottoms of the wheels are closer together than the tops, the closer together, the more positive the camber.)

Yet in July 1959, he was called in by Chevy to explain to the press that a rear-engine car could and would work, contrary to accusations by Ford and Simca. I would have liked to have been there.

Olley had retired in 1955. In fact when serious work on the Corvair suspension had begun, he was no longer active. During the 30's though, he had been a pioneer in the English-speaking world, in the use of new handling techniques developed by German researchers. These included a compensating rear-spring, which reduced the roll stiffness below that which normal road-springs would provide; and the anti-roll, bar which ups the roll-stiffness on the end of the car on which it is used.

There are several kinds of compensating springs. There are those that 'decouple' the rear suspension. British Formula 3 cars did it early in the 501s, Kieft with an elastic cord in tension and Erskine with a coil-spring in compression. In the 356B Porsche, introduced in 1959, there was a transverse leaf-spring at the rear, taking some of the car's weight, while the torsion bars were softened, lowering the rear roll-resistance, which transferred more of the cornering roll-couple to the front wheels, increasing the understeer.

Most automotive writers were sure that Chevy would at least include an anti-roll bar in the front to help eliminate at least some of the oversteer. (The terms 'understeer' and 'oversteer' describe the condition that occurs when a car is turned around a corner a little faster than the suspension and the tires can tolerate. If the car tends to go off the road front-end first, this is called 'understeer' because it steers less than the amount of steering input from the driver, in the direction desired. If on the other hand, it tends to go off the road rear-end first, it 'oversteers' or turns more than the input of the driver in the direction desired. A front-engine car will always eventually understeer and a rear-engine will always eventually oversteer. This is because a body in motion tends to remain in motion in a straight line, and the heaviest part of a car is usually the motor, and it wants to keep going in the same direction the car was traveling before the driver turned. Compensating devices will only change the point at which the car over- or under-steers, not eliminate that tendency. But with no compensating devices, cars tend to under- or over-steer sooner.) A front anti-roll bar had been included on the Corvair up until the last minute, and in fact, appeared in some publicity photos, but was left off the production model. The reason? Test drivers said it wasn't necessary. At least, that's GM's story.

That being the case, why were anti-roll bars offered as part of a handling package in '62? And why were they made standard from '64 on?

My personal opinion is they were left off because they cost money and the Corvair was an economy car. As soon as it became a 'sports' car ('62), on went the anti-roll bars. They were charged as an option to the customer and many options have a larger margin of profit than the car on which they are installed.

Robert Schilling, a very capable and original-thinking German-born engineer supervised the design of the early-model Corvair suspension. The detail work was outstanding. It had coil-springs in the front suspension, which were light, simple and; strong, with a steering box located ahead of the front wheels. (This would later be a bone of contention with Ralph Nader.)

The rear-suspension was very similar to that of the Fiat 600, semi-trailing swing-axles pivoted around an axis of 37° to the car centerline. The swing-axes of the rear suspension system were arranged to pass through the universal joints on each side of the differential, so each half-shaft needed only one universal and no telescoping slip-joint.

A single control-arm in the shape of a wishbone was used on each side made up of two stampings welded together to form box-sections. The inner-ends pivoted on rubber bushings, but the outer attachment was directly to the braking-plate and wheel bearing housing. Chevy avoided undue strain on the half-shafts by using a double-row wheel bearing of the 'spherangular' type. They absorbed about 3° of misalignment. But since the brake drums were carried by the axle shafts, on bumps there tended to be an angular difference between the drums and the shoes. To eliminate binding in this condition, Chevy backed the brake adjustment off eight clicks looser than the front drums.

The rear-suspension control arms were attached to an independent crossmember, making a complete sub-assembly. This member was attached to the body by large rubber-insulated bolts. Even the coil-springs had rubber insulation where they seated in the cross-member. Rear toe-in was by means of adding or removing shims between the transmission and its cross-member. This moved the whole 'Unipack' forward backward to the desired position. The chances of any service person knowing this technique required for adjusting toe-in on an early model are about as good as finding cherry '64 Spyder convertible in a barn, and the farmer giving it to you to 'make way for some hay.'

Because the front-end was loaded lightly, the front springs were soft, 168lb/in. deflection, according to John Bond. The assembly was unitized, complete with crossmember. At the rear of the unit, rubber insulation was used on the arm pivots, at the tops of the coil springs, and at the six body attachment points. Jounce was 3.62 in., rebound was 3.50 in., very generous for a car this size. The reason may have been that Chevy was looking for a big car ride, and had not yet begun to think of the car as a 'poor man's Porsche.' Ball joints were used, but the lower ball was inverted and carried its load in tension. This allowed a shorter steering-knuckle, reducing unsprung weight. Tapered-roller wheel bearings were used, along with 9 in. drums, 13 in. wheels, 5.5 in. wide.

Steering linkage and rear suspension geometry were designed to give the Corvair an initial understeering feel, which it did have. But the high roll-center in the rear, 13.6 in. worked in the opposite direction, as did the high rear-spring rates, 550 lb/in., (jounce 3.48 in., rebound, 4.86 in.) needed to hold up the rear of the car even unloaded. These two factors worked to give the car a final oversteer, which began at relatively low cornering speeds, even for that day. And it was "...non-linear," just as Olley had said it would be. That meant, it usually happened, when you weren't expecting it and gave little warning. The rear-end just went around and you found yourself facing where you had been, assuming you collided with nothing during this gyration.

Now before every Corvair nut in the country writes me, asking, "What about the DOT report?", let me stress that his was the first production run and they did oversteer, much more than even the '61 or later models.

If Schilling had been asked, I'm sure he could have done better. In the 1953 Firebird (no relation to the Trans-Am) he used single-leaf springs, a de Dion rear-axle and joined the rear-ends of the springs together with a transverse balance-beam, pivoted at the center of the chassis. He said,

> "The balance-beam was necessary to assure proper car handling in view of the unusual geometry of the car. Because rear springs were located high inside the body, the rear roll-center is almost as high as the center of gravity, but the front roll-center is low (just as in the Corvair). If front and rear roll-rates were about equal, the rear wheels would have carried too much of the overturning-couple under lateral acceleration,
> causing dangerous oversteer. To avoid this, the front roll-stabilizer bar is provided, nearly doubling the front roll-rate and the rear balance-beam is used to reduce the rear roll-rate to less than fifty percent of its original value."

In other words, if Schilling hadn't used the anti-roll bar and the rear balance-bar, there would have been a large amount of oversteer. Since he did design the Corvair suspension the way he did, without such compensating devices, there was a large amount of oversteer.

So why didn't he (and Chevy) do it differently? Charles Rubly explained in 1960. At the April 1 meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers, (SAE) he presented a paper, in which he stated:

"There are swing-axle rear-suspensions that permit transferring more of the roll-couple to the front. (However,) this particular type (the final Corvair type) was chosen because of:

1. Lower cost
2. Ease of assembly
3. Ease of service
4. Simplicity of design
5. Ability to use coil-springs
6. Reduction of unsprung weight
7. Ability to isolate the body from distortion stresses."

Putting it bluntly, in spite of all the engineering ability of Olley and Schilling, and all the knowledge GM had acquired from its foreign division, it was cheaper! As we stated in Chapter 3, the engine cost too much, so they had to scrimp in other places.

But, believe it or not, in comparison with its contemporaries, Corvair was better in the handling department. They all went off the road, eventually; Corvair just went off tail-first. According to the DOT report, " '60-'61 Corvairs (body-style and options unknown) cornered 0.60g, while Valiant of the same vintage and unknown body-style and options pulled 0.58g. Falcon 0.57g, full-size Chevy did 0.52g (what a surprise there!) as did Rambler."

So why all the ruckus about handling in the Corvair? Probably because more people drove (or tried to drive) the Corvair at, or close to, its limit of adhesion (maybe due to the whispering campaign that it was a 'poor man's Porsche'). With its floor-mounted gearshift, it almost begged to be 'sported.' It might be interesting to see how many alleged accidents occurred with drivers of standard transmissions compared with those driving automatic-equipped cars. I would almost be willing to wager there was a higher percentage of accidents with standard than automatic.

And speaking of the limit of adhesion of the tires, the Corvair required special wide-section tires, wheels 0.5 in. wider than the big Chevy (5.5 in. vs. 5 in.) and an 11lbs. differential in the front/rear tire pressure(15 front, 26 rear). Many owners were not aware of this differential and many gas station attendants, on seeing those 'low' front tires, just aired 'em up to 30 lbs. and watched you 'plow' right out of their driveway.

The wide-section tires, the wide wheels and the pressure-differential were necessary because, as Chevy said later, "They promote vehicle stability by introducing proper steering characteristics, under all road conditions." (Read: do it or pay your insurance premium.)

Twelve-inch tires and wheels had been part of the program in the beginning, to the great dismay of the stylists. (One told me that the early postwar Opels and Vauxhalls had looked like shoeboxes on roller skates, mostly because of the 12 in running gear.) The final decision was made by Ed Cole himself, to go to 13 in. because tires were much more readily available.

Schilling's steering gear was a recirculating-ball type with a ratio of 18:1. As stated previously, the housing was aluminum and the pitman-arm turned directly in the housing without any bushing. The worm-shaft ended just outside the housing, with coupling to connect the long steering shaft from the steering wheel. This coupling had no flexibility or cushion. The reason for this joint was ease of assembly. Steering linkage was the usual double-relay system with an overall ratio, boosted by the linkage to 23.5:1. With stops, this gave 4.8 turns of the steering wheel, lock to lock.

Chevy engineers said this ratio was about ten percent faster than might have been apparent, as compared to larger cars. The reason they gave for such a slow maneuvering wheel, was that they felt a large segment of Corvair sales would come from the owners of large U. S. cars, who might have been quite disconcerted during their first demonstration run, if the steering action was completely unfamiliar. (Read fast!)

While the steering was extraordinarily light (because the engine weight was in the rear), it was also extraordinarily slow. Perhaps Chevy also thought that if it were SLOW, drivers wouldn't be likely to turn the wheels fast enough to get themselves into trouble. But, unfortunately, once in trouble, it was almost impossible to get out. Once you lost it, it was gone.

After-market manufacturers had a gold mine with the Corvair and many produce 'fast-steering' arms which lowered the turns to about three but increased both the turning circle and the effort needed to turn. It wasn't until the 1965 model year that faster-steering box and arms were produced by Chevrolet. Not many dealers ordered them, even then, and you had to almost be somebody or know somebody to get them. That these boxes and arms are in large demand today, is an understatement.

Brakes consisted of, as mentioned before, 9 in. drums, cast iron, with linings in. wide, giving an effective area of 120.8 sq. in. The shoes had Bendix duo-servo action with wheel cylinder diameters of 0.875 front, 0.9375 rear. This put 54 percent braking effort in the front and forty-six percent in the rear. It was primarily designed for the best possible stopping in crash conditions, and gave almost equal wear, front and rear. The master cylinder had a bore of 1 in. and the linkage provided a mechanical advantage of 6.55:1. Initial production found a quite unusual type of parking brake nestled at the left side of the steering wheel. It was of the usual pistol grip type, but required two pumps to apply, and on application, a little knob popped out from the dash about two inches. This was to give visual indication that the brake was on. The knob was not pushed in to release, however, it had to be pulled first before it would release. In theory, this was to avoid accidentally releasing the brake. In practice, it was a pain in the neck, so it was quietly dropped after a short time, and a standard pistol-grip-type used, with a trigger release.

Interiors, as snickered at in my Ford training film, were sparse. So much money had gone into the Corvair's engine and chassis that interiors had to be stark indeed, to get the cost of the initial offering, the four-door 500 (actually model 569) down to $1,869. Items like armrests and a right-hand sunvisor were on the option list, and initially weren't even available. The seats were available in a gray only, cloth covered, gray cloth headliner, gray vinyl-coated door panels, gray painted glovebox door, and black rubber floor mats, front and rear.

The 700 (769) at $1,920 was a little more habitable, with a choice of gray, green or blue pattern cloth-covered bench seats, with matching cloth headliner and vinyl-coated door panels, anodized-aluminum glove box door applique and vinyl-coated color-keyed rubber floor mats, front and rear. Rear-coat hooks were standard on this model, as were automatic interior-light switches on front doors. On both models, the interior sidewalls were painted exterior body colors, as was the dashboard, with these exceptions: dash painted Shadow Gray with Ermine White or Sateen Silver exteriors; dash painted Jade Green with Cascade Green exteriors; dash painted Royal Blue with Horizon Blue exteriors.

So the Corvair was introduced to the public, bland as it looked, on October 2, 1959. It immediately began having its postpartum depression.

Vairs and Spares

For sale: 1967 Monza 4 door sedan. Restorable. Minor front end damage. No rust. $500 OBO. For more info call Eddie (520) 748-8507 or (520) 740-1234 or call Gordon Cauble (520) 299-1122.

For sale: 1965 convertible 110/auto, new mist blue paint new white top and upholstery, good tires. $4300/make offer, call Don Henn (520) 743-3346.

For sale: Corvair parts–large outdoor yard full of great Corvair parts. Call Barry Cunningham at (520) 747-9028

For sale: 1966 Monza sport coupe. AC, AT, look nice, runs well. $2495/OBO will consider nice truck or van in trade. (520) 629-0257 leave message.

From one Corvair lover to another...

Corvairs

By

Creative Stitches

2710 Cancun Court
Grand Junction,Co. 81506
(970) 245-4722
Member of Corsa and Tucson Corvair Association

LOCAL CORVAIR PARTS

from

TUCSON CORVAIR ASSOCIATION

TCA has a large stock of new and used parts for all models of Corvairs.
Support the Club and save a little money!

Tucson Corvair Association

Contact Al Crispin
722-9445

Ads are free to TCA members. $2.50 for up to four lines for non-members.

TUCSON CORVAIR ASSOCIATION REGULAR MONTHLY MEETINGS

FOURTH WEDNESDAY of each month (except December)

DENNY'S RESTAURANT 6484 E.BROADWAY. Tucson,Az.

6:00 pm: Parking Lot Bull Session
6:30 pm: Dinner (optional)
7:30 pm: Meeting starts

COMING EVENTS

PLEASE CONTACT A BOARD MEMBER WITH ANY SUGGESTIONS

Regular Monthly Meeting, Wednesday, Feb.24,1999
TCA Executive Board Meeting: Thursday, Mar. 4, 1999
DENNY'S RESTAURANT 6484 E.BROADWAY

Tucson Corvair Association
4072 E. 22nd St. Suite 197
Tucson, Arizona 85711
Fax [520-745-5454]

TUCSON PM ARIZ

FIRST CLASS MAIL

USA First-Class Rate

Van and Vickie Pershing
4842 W. Paseo de los Colinas
Tucson AZ 85745