

Gyroplanes are fast becoming a larger part of the aviation world with models that are capable of long cross-country's. I fly a 2 seat, enclosed cabin RAF gyro with 2-way radio, transponder and encoder in the San Diego TCA, having been cleared and flown into Lindbergh's, North Island N.A.S.'s, Montgomery's, Gillespie's, etc. airspace and into the L.A. basin on several trips. Two gyro fliers are completing a trip that will have them landing in all 48 contiguous States and terminating at Oshkosh. Two RAF gyros recently crossed the English channel several times.

My suggestion regards the terminology of rotorcraft. Most larger airports publish a "rotorcraft" pattern altitude which would include gyros and helis. However, some of the FAR's refer to helicopters specifically. It becomes confusing to the gyro pilot as to whether these rules, such as minimum safe altitudes, also refer to gyros. It's confusing to be using the lower rotorcraft pattern inside the traffic area and then needing to climb rapidly to maintain the minimum safe altitude published for fixed-wings. It doesn't seem to make sense that gyros should follow the helicopter rules for some duration of their flight and fixed-wing rules for another portion. Some rules refer to "rotorcraft" and thereby there is no confusion.

I am suggesting that because gyros can autorotate as well or better than helis (we're already in autorotation when we're flying), and to eliminate confusion as to which rules refer to "rotorcraft", the term "helicopter", where published, should be replaced by the word "rotorcraft", as it has been at most almost all airfields designating a pattern altitude for "rotorcraft". Thank you for your consideration.