

---

Subject: ahhh.....

Posted by [Adam](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2002 10:39:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well that's just a stupid on my part then... I didn't notice that part at all. All I saw were sections for higher frequency horns off to the right and I completely ignored them. I punched in the wood thickness and the woofer displacement and low-and-behold, the numbers match up very consistantly with the proportions now. PIALIGN recommends the same tuning (hmm?) but has a new box volume of 1.79 cuft. I did indeed plot the 2.2 cuft box in unibox a while ago and things looked good. I just did it again now. Oddly enough, the response curves for the two alignments (1.8 cuft and 2.2 cuft) are nearly identical, but I suppose upon further examination there isn't a \*lot\* of difference between the volumes. In 1.8 cubes, response is down almost exactly 6 db at 50 Hz, while in 2.2 cubes tuned to the same frequency, response is down about 5 db. So either one seems to work. I'm glad we cleared that up. It still leaves the excursion issue unexplained, but I'll leave that to rest for now. I don't know. Unibox tells me that the motor will still handle 400 watts over most of the frequency band and you're telling me the same thing, so maybe I'll just shutup. I'll stiffen up those panels and get everything good to go, and I'll let you know the \*finished\* results. Thanks for your help dude!!! Adam