1964 - 1965 Corvette: Chevrolet Inter-Organization Letters: Development and Demise of the Corvette Coupe Exhaust Fan

During the beginning of 1963 Corvette production, Chevrolet started testing various ways of adding a rear exhaust fan to Corvette coupes starting with the 1964 model year. During the latter stages of 1965 Corvette coupe production, Chevrolet deleted the exhaust fan for the 1966 Corvette coupe. Below are Chevrolet inter-organization letters outlining the development and deletion of the exhaust fan:

cc—D. F. Urban

TO—MR. E. J. PREMO

December 12, 1962

1964 — CORVETTE COUPE VENTILATION SYSTEM

This is a summation of the facts which apply to the ventilation systems which have been tested in a Corvette coupe. These conclusions are the result of conversations with all people involved in the test and development. Mr. Sauer, of the Development Group, as well as the design people who participated in the test work are agreed on these points.

—The test revealed that the efficiency of the three systems tested were rated with the roof vent the best, the side pillar vents second best and the fender vents least effective.

—All systems worked best with a blower to handle the low speed situation. The people on the test trip felt that the roof vent might be acceptable without a blower at speeds down to 25 m.p.h.

—Due to shapes required inside and outside the roof panel for the roof type vent, this particular approach to the problem is ruled out.

—Our efforts are directed toward the side pillar vent as the next most efficient location.

—A fan installation is required with the side pillar vent in order to provide adequate ventilation at lower car speeds and maximum ventilation conditions at high speeds.

—The side pillar vent must consist of two separate systems—one for each side of the car—since it is impractical to join these with a common plenum. Any cross-over pipe which would connect these two systems would intrude on the luggage area and would not be practical.

—Since the side pillar vents are separate systems, the fan must be installed on one side or the other.

—With the fan installed on one side there is a possibility that under maximum ventilation conditions the fan will suck dust in the vent on the opposite side.

—For the above reason, it is planned to have a vent on one side of the car only. The test car was equipped in this manner and found to operate satisfactorily.

—Dust entry through side pillar vents was experienced on the test trip—even without the fan—under certain wind direction conditions.

—The above would require that a damper be provided to shut off reverse air flow.

—The people who were on the test trip agreed that there is a possibility that the fan alone would be adequate without any vent other than a dump door somewhere in the body. This particular idea has not been tested. Therefore, this is an opinion.

—We are starting a design program on two versions of the ventilating system.

—The first version is a plenum for a left hand pillar vent only having a fan and damper door a part of the system. The fan is tentatively located behind the left wheelhouse and will use the left rear corner of the luggage compartment. In this design, the right hand side would have dummy louvers only with the interior remaining as is.

—The second design is strictly a blower design which would consist of a blower package mounted behind the compartment panel outside of the luggage compartment. There would be a grille opening in the left rear corner of the compartment area which would consume very little space. The fan itself would be a unit with a damper door which would dump the air into the area below the gas tank. This unit would be one which can be easily marketed as an accessory and could be installed very quickly and simply by the dealer for those persons who wanted to spend the money for this feature.

—We intend to do some test work on the fan design minus exterior vent in order to confirm our opinion that this can be as efficient as the fan with the pillar vent.

he above statements outline our program in regard to the ventilation system. he purpose is to obtain costs for a decision. In my opinion, we could narrow his down to the fan system alone right now; however, we have discussed this ossibility and it has been rejected.

e will attempt to limit the design detail to that necessary to obtain a airly accurate cost on both systems in order to expedite the decision since e should do this in 1964 if we are going to do it at all.

INTER-ORGANIZATION LETTERS ONLY

CHEVROLET

Mr. W. T. Burwell	ADDRESS	Engineering Center, Room 1-206
E. E. Buckler	ADDRESS	Central Office
Rear Exhaust Fan Corvette Coupe Models	DATE	April 5, 1965

As a result of our conversation last Thursday, the Sales Department would like to recommend the deletion of the exhaust fan currently installed as standard in all Corvette Coupe models.

We are definitely of the opinion that this item is not necessary to the comfort of the passengers and is seldom used by the Corvette owner. Its absence would not be missed.

Prior to the installation of this item in 1964, we were not aware of any particular complaints from customers on the 1963 Sting Ray Coupes, which did not have this fan installed. We feel it would definitely not be missed in 1966.

Very truly yours,

E. E. Buckler
National Merchandising Manager -
New & Used Cars

INTER-ORGANIZATION LETTERS ONLY

CHEVROLET

Mr. E. J. Premo — ADDRESS — Engineering Department - 1-328

Mr. W. T. Burwell — ADDRESS — Engineering Department - 1-206

Corvette Coupe Ventilating Fan — DATE — April 6, 1965

Following our recent discussion on subject equipment, we have received a request from the Sales Department for deletion in the 1966 Model.

Mr. Buckler's memo is attached for your reference.

W. T. Burwell
Special Products

WTB/scw
Attchmt

cc: Mr. C. C. Jakust

INTER-ORGANIZATION LETTERS ONLY

CHEVROLET

ADDRESS

ADDRESS — 1-328 Engineering Center

Rear Exhaust Fan
For Corvette Coupe Models

DATE — April 7, 1965

MR. C. C. JAKUST:

Mr. Buckler's letter attached speaks for the Sales Department in stating that deletion of the exhaust fan currently in production on Corvette Coupe models will not affect sales of that model.

To help our objective of reducing costs wherever possible, we should accept this position and cancel the equipment.

Since the ventilation provisions are much less effective without the fan, a further opportunity of reducing costs by eliminating them entirely exists. Mr. Burwell will explore this possibility with Mr. Buckler and report the Sales Department wishes.

E. J. Premo
Chief Engineer

EJP:lee
Attach.
cc: Mr. C. W. Pearson
Mr. L. H. Averill
Mr. R. D. Lund
Mr. E. E. Buckler
Mr. W. T. Burwell

Custom Fields

- **Source:** Vette Vues - October 1998

Online URL:
https://www.corvetteactioncenter.com/tech/knowledgebase/article/1964-1965-

corvette-chevrolet-inter-organization-letters-development-and-demise-of-the-corvette-coupe-exhaust-fan-1247.html