

EAA Mount Rainier Chapter 326 Newsletter

Thun Field – April 2007

100

Meeting Notice

**Tuesday, April 10th, 7 PM
CAP Building, Thun Field**

Program:

**Operation Deep freeze
McChord's Mission in Antarctica
Greg Pyke**

**First Flight Series
Jim Triggs**

Refreshments: Bob Beisler

Jake then took us through a journey of the history of Molt Taylor's Aerocar project. From the early invention to where they are today, the consensus was it was a real flying car or more accurately from Molt's point of view a roadable airplane. He was mostly interested in solving the how to get to town once landing at the airport problem. Haven't we all been there? ☺ Hard to imagine what would have happened if Ford or GM were to have signed on to mass produce the aerocar. Jake still firmly believes that the concept will come around again in the future as materials and technology continue to advance.

From the Secretary

March 13th 2007 EAA Chapter 326 Meeting

Jeff called us to order this month.

Jake Schultz – Aero car presentation.

Visitors: Amanda Kisela – moved here from Michigan, Just got her license.

Elpedio Lanzaga – Visiting friend of Randy.

Mark Owens – building a Glasair.

Thanks to Smitty & the group of volunteers who worked the NW Aviation Conference & Gary for bringing out his RV4 fuselage to be viewed by the crowds.

Paid up members, 87 out of 115. This is the last call; if you have not, now is the time! \$15 is cheap entertainment.

Young Eagles is coming June 9th, 2007. Lance & Bernie are running the show. It's time for all of us to sign up to help out with the event. Recruit kids 8 – 17 yrs old to come fly.

Jim Triggs gave a presentation on first flights and the EAA Flight advisor program.

- EAA setup the program to increase sport aviation safety for first flights.
- Flight advisors are here to help the pilot self evaluate their skills and test plan.
- Advisor provides guidance on a proper test program.
- Advisor can provide ground or air support during the first flight.
- 20% of all homebuilt accidents occur during the test flight phase.

The Flight Review

Q. How often?

A. 24 months

Q. Can I fly solo without a current flight review?

A. No...well, not legally.

Q. Can I take my flight review in a single seat airplane?

A. No. The flight review consists of a minimum of one hour of ground and one hour of "flight training" thereby requiring a flight instructor on board. Don't confuse this with a flight test. Some practical tests can be given in single seat aircraft. A flight review is not a test...training is involved.

Q. If my flight review has expired, does my flight instructor have to be the Pilot in Command (PIC)?

A. Yes. You can log PIC time when you are the sole manipulator of the controls.... But you can't be the PIC if your flight review is expired.

Q. Can I take a flight review in my RV-4?

A. No. The aircraft must meet dual control requirements. It doesn't have to have dual brakes but it has to have dual flight controls and I don't have rudder pedals in the rear. Okay, but the cables are there within easy reach of either hand...hmmm.

Reference:

BULLETIN NUMBER: HBGA 00-08

EFFECTIVE DATE: 5-26-00

FAR 91.109.

"Based on FAA's long standing interpretation that brakes are not required controls under 14 CFR section 91.109(a), and upon determining that safety has not been impacted negatively, on April 27, the **Office of General Counsel clarified its position that the term "dual controls" as used under 14 CFR section 91.109(a) refers solely to the flight controls of an aircraft (e.g., pitch, yaw, and roll controls).**"

Q. What if I flunk the review?

A. You can't fail a review. Your instructor may decide not to endorse your logbook until you get up to speed, that's all. You don't have to stay with the same instructor either.

For a comprehensive look at this, here is a link to an AOPA "Pilot's Guide to the Flight Review"

<http://download.aopa.org/epilot/2007/sa03.pdf>

Shimming the Motor Mounts

When I positioned the cowl for trimming and fitting I didn't allow for any engine sag. I just fitted the cowl to be flush with the top of the spinner. I had heard one builder say that he allowed 1/8 inch and the engine never sagged at all...so he was unhappy about that. But I think my engine started sagging before I ever got it to the airport.

I put 1/8 inch thick washers between the bottom rubber mounts and the engine case. I ordered special washers of the same 2-inch dia as those that come with the mounts. I couldn't find any with 7/16th holes so I got 3/8" washers and drilled them out. They are steel. The 1/8 inch was just a guess. The spinner was about a half inch low. But that was a good guess...almost perfect. The spinner is now a smidge high if anything.

I could tell from the textbook perfect cotter pin installation that I must have had a lot more room when I installed the bolts. Now with exhaust pipes and everything in the way it was a real bugger just to get the cotter pins out. I resolved to use self locking steel nuts instead of castellated. But that didn't work either because those nuts take a size larger wrench and the wrench wouldn't fit the cavity no matter how much the wrenches and sockets were ground down. So back to the cotter pins...not so pretty this time.

Figure this out. In cruise flight (before shimming) my elevator was down a little. On the RV-4 elevator counterweight arm is even with the leading edge of the stab. So from the cockpit I could see it sticking up some...more than I liked. I thought about raising the stab but then I would have to modify intersection fairing...oh boy. My keen engineering intellect surmised that shimming the thrust line upward would make matters worse at the tail. Nope, just the opposite. Now the counterweight arm is perfectly flush with the stab. Life is good.

jb

User Fees & Increased Fuel Tax

FAA Administrator Marion Blakey

You know, there are some hard facts that we've just got to face. One is that we'll vault past a billion passengers by 2015. The second is that the system as we know it today just can't stand up to that load. Those of us who stood on line or in the queue on the runway this year already know that. 2006 was the worst on

record for delays. If we don't move toward a next generation air transportation system, 2006 will look like the good old days.

Fortunately, we have a NextGen plan in place combining the firepower of five separate cabinet-level agencies. It will take us to 2025 and beyond with a heavy focus on delivering in the near term, too. When the traffic doubles, NextGen will have a string of seamless technologies in place that can accommodate it. Whether we're looking at A-380s or new GA aircraft, microjets, UAVs or the low-cost and regional jets that are driving the bus today, NextGen can handle it.

But there's one thing holding us back, and that's the funding stream the FAA has in place today. Now bear with me here. I know I have an uphill climb, but with an entire panel on Friday devoted to the "negative effects" of our proposal and the status quo being touted as the right method for the future, I do want to talk with you for a few minutes about it.

I'm going to start with a couple of questions for you. How many of you have long-range business plans in place that can only be funded a year at a time? How many of you tie those business plans to the price of an airline ticket?

No one does unless you're an airline. A funding system put in place decades ago, a funding system that didn't contemplate fare wars or Orbitz or Southwest. No one did.

But with the expiration of the FAA's financing system at the end of September, we have a chance to fix that. It's an historic opportunity. But unfortunately it's in danger of degrading into a stick fight over user fees. General Aviation's afraid of user fees. That's why GA is paying through a fuel tax. Under our proposal, the majority of GA will never pay a user fee. What they're missing is the \$4.3 billion in capital funding those user fees would finance over the next five years. We've put our money where our mouth is, increasing capital spending by 40 percent. We're putting big investments into ADS-B and other core NextGen technologies.

Some of the rhetoric out there is just flat out wrong. The criticisms that we can't be trusted with this plan just don't hold water. One hundred percent of our major capital projects are on schedule and on budget. I'll stack that up against any federal agency anytime.

When you hear horror stories about the FAA being "anti-GA," I want you to take a good look at the numbers. In our proposal, Joe pilot in a Cessna 172 will experience an operating cost increase of about four dollars per hour. In other words, the owner of a very expensive airplane is engaged in a heated dispute that hinges on the cost of a Starbucks latte. It's important to note here that if the fuel tax is increased, it still represents less than five percent of the overall cost to fly your GA aircraft.

This is about paying your fair share. While we're having a debate over who's going to pick up the tab, the passenger in the middle seat is footing the lion's share of the bill for operation of the system. The commercial traveler is paying 95 percent of the cost but imposing only 73 percent of the cost. A seat on a commercial jetliner is the most heavily taxed spot in all of aviation.

If I were a GA pilot, I'd be afraid of gridlock. When gridlock comes, we'll have to slow things down because of safety. That could spell an end to the first-come, first-served system we

know today. In a gridlock scenario, a plane carrying three hundred people is going to trump one carrying three.

There are a few other myths out there that warrant attention. The rumor and innuendo you're hearing about controller salaries is particularly vexing. It would lead you to believe that we're trying to undermine our own workforce. If we really wanted to undermine our controllers, as some allege, we wouldn't be paying them \$50,000 after a year on the job or \$94,000 after five years. That's pretty good money by anyone's standard. Veteran controllers, mind you, have been held virtually financially unharmed.

There's another contention floating around, a notion that somehow our proposal eliminates congressional oversight of the FAA. That's just not true. Our bill does nothing of the sort. The Congressional oversight that's in place today stays in place. I've got to tell you, a fee-based system is much more transparent and accountable, and therefore easier to review.

Then there's the matter of the \$600 million less that our critics claim is raised under our financing system versus the current one. No. Ours is a cost-based system, meaning we raise exactly what we need.

Another common criticism we hear is that there is no specific map for NextGen. Let me be clear on this. There is a specific road map for NextGen. We're moving to a satellite based system that's going to provide terrific benefits to pilots all the way across the board and to the flying public. We have a detailed concept of operations, and we know exactly how we're going to spend the money over the next five years. We know the cost of NextGen.

This is particularly troubling because a next generation system is not a novel idea. If you head overseas, you'll find that the rest of the world is moving forward on plans of their own. They're not mired in an argument of how to pay for it. They don't have time for the world leader in aviation to get all the ducks in a row.

Let's keep our eye on the big picture here. The people who are rejecting this proposal aren't offering one of their own. They're telling us to stick with the status quo. I'm drawing a line in the sand, and I'm telling you that the status quo is a recipe for gridlock. What we need here is constructive discussion, resolution. We — that's all of us; that's each and every one of us — need to get it done. Time is not on our side.

Marion Blakey

#####

For an overview of NextGen here is a short video:
<http://www.jpdo.aero/NextGenVid.html>

For a detailed report, look at this:
<http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NextGenConOpsv12.pdf>

My observations / opinions:

1. NextGen is for 2025, but to get there development is under way now and that costs money.
Is it necessary? Yes. Is it for us? No.
2. NextGen is about solving anticipated air traffic gridlock.

3. The FAA is proposing a whole new approach to funding that costs me more and benefits me not. All the improvements are for the airlines to solve problems created by the airlines.

4. The airlines have gotten huge bailouts from the taxpayer, extracted huge concessions from their employees, and now want to shift the cost of FAA services to me. They would rather operate at a loss and use bankruptcy to corrupt the market than raise the price of a ticket.

5. The passenger in the middle seat is not complaining about a seat tax. Why should they...round trip coast to coast for under \$300. Such a deal. The airlines are going broke doing that and then they are allowed to file bankruptcy. It is the airlines, not the passengers that are complaining about the seat tax. Airlines will get that money of course.

6. For us, NextGen means new avionics and more restrictions on where we can fly. It ain't for us, so why should we have to pay more?

7. We have a great country with a thriving general aviation industry. In Europe it is practically non-existent because of fuel taxes and user fees.

8. Yes I wrote to Maria, Patty and Adam.

jb

Cell Phone Disrupts GPS?

In the installation manuals for Garmin's 400W and 500W series units, it states the following:

"Ground-based cell phones that are on, even in a monitoring state, can disrupt GPS performance."

Bill Denton

FAA Proposes to Revamp Pilot Certification

The FAA is proposing a major overhaul of its pilot certification regulations—FAR Part 61—that includes more than 200 changes. Many of those improvements stem from years of AOPA advocacy. The FAA is proposing three of AOPA's four major recommendations: Allow CFIs to renew their privileges every two years while keeping the original certificates; extend the duration of a student pilot certificate to coincide with the duration of a third class medical certificate; and allow the use of personal computer-based aviation training devices (PCATDs) to meet instrument currency, requirements for logbook entries, and credit for use of a flight simulator or flight training device (FTD) for the private and commercial pilot certificates. Using a driver's license medical for recreational pilots is the only AOPA recommendation the FAA rejected.

Dopeler Effect:

The tendency of stupid ideas to seem smarter when they come at you rapidly.

end

Chapter 326 Staff

President	Jeffrey Liebman	253-531-6123	
Vice President	Robert Barra	253-988-2676	
Secretary	Andy Karmy	253-333-6695	
Treasurer	Norman Pauk	253-630-6396	
Newsletter Editor	John Brick	253-846-2617	jebrick@comcast.net
Photographer	Drew Karmy	253-333-6695	
Webmaster	Andy Karmy	253-333-6695	

Young Eagles Coordinator	Vacant	
Technical Counselor	Harold Smith	253-752-5480
Technical Counselor	Charlie Cotton	360-893-6719
Chapter Flight Advisor	Terry O'Brien	206-244-3619
Chapter Flight Advisor	Jim Triggs	360-438-1482
Chapter Flight Advisor	Marv Scott	253-691-5496
Program Coordinator	John Brick	253-846-2617
Biographer	Vacant	
Property Custodian	Vacant	

Chapter 326 Website <http://www.eaa326.org>

EAA Mount Rainier Chapter 326
C/O John Brick
8304 242nd St. E.
Graham, WA 98338