21 September 2008

California Energy Commission Chair,

If it is currently the desire of the California Energy Commission to become a liable party to a claim of liability against the City of Hayward for the FAA grant to construct rotorcraft accommodations at the Hayward airport, this could be arranged:

1.Where the testimony of Gary Cathey (CALTRANS) was inappropriately and arbitrarily dismissed, prior to the fact, by the former "Commissioner" Geesman concening aviation issues with the "Russell City Energy Center", this was repeated at the July (2008) "Business Meeting" concerning the same.

2. Where CEC Staff concerns about aviation issues with the "Russell City" site have been largely set aside by the former "Commissioner" Geesman, this will be a continuing issue for the CEC to respond to the appropriate federal authorities, not to mention the disregard of former "Commissioner" Geesman, of CALTRANS testimony.

J.V.McCarthy
(USAR Retired)

Commissioner- J.Pfannenstiel

to DOCKET show details Sep 19 (4 days ago) Reply

Given that all comment or testimony concerning aviation issues, including that from CALTRANS (Gary Cathey) was excluded from consideration at the July 2008 CEC "Business Meeting" for the "Russell City Energy Center" agenda item, this will be a recurring issue. If the CEC has decided that no further consideration is in order, there is a disaster management issue in the environment.

J.V.McCarthy
(USAR Retired)

DOCKET
01-AFC-7C
DATE SEP 21 2008
RECD. SEP 24 2008

In the matter involving a proposed "Russell City " Energy Center (RCEC, 01- AFC- 7C), what response was there, specifically, from either/ or of the Hayward City Council Airport Committee or the Hayward Airport Manager, specifically. Between time of original application and time of city approval for RCEC, 01- AFC- 7-. the response from Hayward City Council Airport Committee or Hayward Airport Manager is in question here.

MISSTEPS ON THE PART OF THE CITY OF HAYWARD WITH REGARD TO THE AIRPORT:

1. Cited elsewhere
2. Inadequately qualified City Council Airport Committee as where aviation background is minimal/ vacant. (Hayward has recently dropped it's aviation industry periodicals from Hayward public library materials.)
3. Cited elsewhere
4. Cited elsewhere
5. Cited elsewhere
6. Cited elsewhere
7. Cited elsewhere
8. Cited elsewhere
9. Cited elsewhere
9. Inadequate coordination with other local airports, such as in the "Russell City" Energy Center decision, is the City of Hayward's evident lack of concern about Oakland runway approach and SFO layered air space.
10. Cited elsewhere

Among the most intensely crowded airport approach intersections in the bay area, Hayward clearly stands out. With Hayward 28L under SFO 28 (L/R) adjoined by Oakland 29 under SFO 28 and holding patterns which at some one or more points are likely to stack all three loops in vertical succession, every remaining square foot of horizontal airspace becomes more important. With less than 500' of vertical separation between each of these loops, aircraft moving at between 150 and 250 knots have little space for decisions, which may include IFR, fuel shortage, flameout, fire, storm fronts, other aircraft, etc., etc.

"Russell City" Energy Center documentation (for 01- AFC- 7-) has noted that the principal air traffic area for rotorcraft, on the west side of the Hayward airport, is in a cone shape which comes to point just short of RCEC.

Having attempted an explanation of factual differences, that are critical flight control differences, between rotorcraft technology and fixed wing aircraft, a repetition of this is as follows. Where rotorcraft have their direction of lift and thrust (equivalence) aligned in the same direction, fixed wing aircraft have their direction of lift and thrust separated by a perpendicular angle. As rotorcraft have their flight control surfaces separated from cable controls by a rotating hub and a full cycle delay, fixed wing aircraft have flight control surfaces directly/positively connected to cable controls with a more immediate and direct response. All of this means that lift and thrust are more substantially/ directly affected by vertical velocities/ drags on rotorcraft and the rotorcraft pilots need to exercise greater anticipation in the use of flight surface controls, as a full rotor cycle is required for flight control changes to take full effect. While rotorcraft may fly as low as 200' (see page# 156, Docket# 06- AFC- 6, Volume II, 12/18/07) this may be too low for emergency auto- rotation recovery in the event of a sudden power loss, or too low for recovery in the event of sudden flight control problems. A low plume cloud effect (see page# 161, Docket# 06- AFC- 6, Volume II, 12/18/07) after sunset could suddenly put rotorcraft approach into IFR conditions where avoiding faster moving aircraft may become critical.

J.V.McCarthy
(USAR Retired)