# ASRS Database Report Set

# **General Aviation Flight Training Incidents**

Report Set Description	A sampling of reports referencing General Aviation flight training.
Update Number	.25.0
Date of Update Number of Records in Report Set	.October 30, 2015 .50
Number of New Records in Report Set	50
Type of Records in Report Set	For each update, new records received at ASRS will displace a like number of the oldest records in the Report Set, with the objective of providing the fifty most recent relevant ASRS Database records. Records within this Report Set have been screened to assure their relevance to the topic.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000



TH: 262-7

# **MEMORANDUM FOR: Recipients of Aviation Safety Reporting System Data**

#### **SUBJECT: Data Derived from ASRS Reports**

The attached material is furnished pursuant to a request for data from the NASA Aviation Safety Reporting System (ASRS). Recipients of this material are reminded when evaluating these data of the following points.

ASRS reports are submitted voluntarily. The existence in the ASRS database of reports concerning a specific topic cannot, therefore, be used to infer the prevalence of that problem within the National Airspace System.

Information contained in reports submitted to ASRS may be amplified by further contact with the individual who submitted them, but the information provided by the reporter is not investigated further. Such information represents the perspective of the specific individual who is describing their experience and perception of a safety related event.

After preliminary processing, all ASRS reports are de-identified and the identity of the individual who submitted the report is permanently eliminated. All ASRS report processing systems are designed to protect identifying information submitted by reporters; including names, company affiliations, and specific times of incident occurrence. After a report has been de-identified, any verification of information submitted to ASRS would be limited.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its ASRS current contractor, Booz Allen Hamilton, specifically disclaim any responsibility for any interpretation which may be made by others of any material or data furnished by NASA in response to queries of the ASRS database and related materials.

Lenda J Connell

Linda J. Connell, Director NASA Aviation Safety Reporting System

#### CAVEAT REGARDING USE OF ASRS DATA

Certain caveats apply to the use of ASRS data. All ASRS reports are voluntarily submitted, and thus cannot be considered a measured random sample of the full population of like events. For example, we receive several thousand altitude deviation reports each year. This number may comprise over half of all the altitude deviations that occur, or it may be just a small fraction of total occurrences.

Moreover, not all pilots, controllers, mechanics, flight attendants, dispatchers or other participants in the aviation system are equally aware of the ASRS or may be equally willing to report. Thus, the data can reflect **reporting biases**. These biases, which are not fully known or measurable, may influence ASRS information. A safety problem such as near midair collisions (NMACs) may appear to be more highly concentrated in area "A" than area "B" simply because the airmen who operate in area "A" are more aware of the ASRS program and more inclined to report should an NMAC occur. Any type of subjective, voluntary reporting will have these limitations related to quantitative statistical analysis.

One thing that can be known from ASRS data is that the number of reports received concerning specific event types represents the **lower measure** of the true number of such events that are occurring. For example, if ASRS receives 881 reports of track deviations in 2010 (this number is purely hypothetical), then it can be known with some certainty that *at least* 881 such events have occurred in 2010. With these statistical limitations in mind, we believe that the **real power** of ASRS data is the **qualitative information** contained in **report narratives**. The pilots, controllers, and others who report tell us about aviation safety incidents and situations in detail – explaining what happened, and more importantly, **why** it happened. Using report narratives effectively requires an extra measure of study, but the knowledge derived is well worth the added effort.

**Report Synopses** 

# ACN: 1294353 (1 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

C182 pilot on an IFR flight plan executing a circling approach noticed an aerobatic aircraft flying acrobatic maneuvers directly over the airport above and below their flight altitude. Reporter stated there was a waiver in place for the acrobatic box over the airport, but feels it was unsafe and should have been modified or withdrawn.

# ACN: 1292242 (2 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

An MQ-9 landing after a training mission, was delayed because the left main landing gear apparently did not fully extend. During extensive troubleshooting, communications with UAS was temporarily lost, but after communications' were re-established a normal precautionary landing followed. The gear was in fact fully extended.

# ACN: 1291543 (3 of 50)

### Synopsis

R44 Instructor Pilot reported an NMAC with a light aircraft in the pattern at LNA airport.

# ACN: 1289851 (4 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

C172 pilot experiences a NMAC with a drone at 2,500 feet.

# ACN: 1284746 (5 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

An instructor reported a close encounter with a drone (UAV) at an altitude of 5,000 feet, requiring an evasive maneuver.

# ACN: 1284007 (6 of 50)

#### Synopsis

An instructor with his flying student was entering a 45 degree left downwind for PAO Runway 31 at 1,000 FT when he detected a UAV about 2-3 FT wide, approximately 100 FT beneath his aircraft.

# ACN: 1283984 (7 of 50)

#### Synopsis

An Instructor reported his student took evasive action at 1,000 FT from a radio controlled (RC) aircraft, which was apparently being flown with intent toward and around their maneuvering aircraft. They were near an RC park northwest of Utah Lake.

# ACN: 1283969 (8 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Pilot took evasive action to avoid a UAV and the chase airplane behind it at 8,500 FT near a local airport.

# ACN: 1283361 (9 of 50)

### Synopsis

HS125 pilot, preforming a simulated engine out circle to land approach, reported landing long and fast and being unable to stop before departing the end of the runway. The aircraft may have touched down nose wheel first with 2500 feet of runway remaining.

# ACN: 1283027 (10 of 50)

# **Synopsis**

Two pilots report their Pilatus PC-12 was unresponsive to braking upon landing as the aircraft vibrated and skidded straight ahead. Upon exiting the aircraft both main tires were found flat spotted and blown out.

# ACN: 1283002 (11 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

C172 instructor pilot departing Runway 33 at IYK reports a NMAC with a departing jet on Runway 33. Evasive action is taken by the C172 instructor, at low altitude near midfield. CTAF procedures were in use and the reporter had communicated with a helicopter planning a departure but the jet pilot was apparently never on the CTAF.

# ACN: 1282668 (12 of 50)

#### Synopsis

A C172 pilot reported he taxied into a work area to avoid a conflict with opposite direction air carrier aircraft.

# ACN: 1281996 (13 of 50)

# Synopsis

While on a practice instrument approach, there was a disagreement between the pilot and the Controller about the assigned altitude being below the published approach segment altitude.

# ACN: 1281993 (14 of 50)

Synopsis

An instructor with a student at OKV observed nonstandard pilot behavior at this airport, while flying the ILS RWY 32 Approach. In discussion with other pilots, the instructor discovered an attitude that the AIM is just advisory and that their flight and ground pilotage did not require adherence.

# ACN: 1281888 (15 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

C172 pilot reported finding the NDB at T85 out of service and advised ATC who still showed it in service.

# ACN: 1281346 (16 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

A pilot departed CTAF SQL before the Tower opened and attempted to get an IFR clearance while airborne from NorCal. The Controller was busy and before clearance could be given, the pilot entered SFO Class B.

# ACN: 1281001 (17 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Instructor pilot, practicing landings with a student and using CTAF procedures, finds himself nose to nose with another aircraft on the takeoff roll. After stopping with room to spare it is discovered that Comm1 had failed due to a tripped circuit breaker.

# ACN: 1280428 (18 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

BE9L pilot reported a CRJ taxied onto his runway as he was on his takeoff roll. After takeoff the pilot noticed his radio was tuned to Ground frequency.

# ACN: 1280396 (19 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

F-33A student pilot reported an airborne conflict with another aircraft in the pattern at P08.

#### ACN: 1280077 (20 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

C172 pilot reported losing directional control after landing resulting in a runway excursion that did minor damage to the aircraft.

#### ACN: 1280072 (21 of 50)

#### Synopsis

C182 pilot reported jumpers in the air in the vicinity of CCC VORTAC even though there was no notice of the activity.

# ACN: 1279980 (22 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Power lines and towers within the airport boundary at TLH to the north and east of Taxiway A are unlit and unmarked.

# ACN: 1278777 (23 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Helicopter instructor pilot reports a NMAC with a fixed wing aircraft after both craft had been cleared for takeoff by the Tower. The fixed wing pilot had reported the helicopter in sight but begin a right crosswind turn before he was well past the helicopter.

# ACN: 1278763 (24 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

PA-44 instructor pilot reports an airborne conflict with a drone at 2,700 feet 4 NM south of FFZ. Evasive action is taken.

# ACN: 1277369 (25 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

PA28R student pilot reported an airborne conflict with another aircraft at TTA, a non-Tower airport.

# ACN: 1277101 (26 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Two instructors working together reported an NMAC on approach to DAB. Reporters were critical of ATC handling.

#### ACN: 1276810 (27 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

L39 pilot reported ATC questioned his speed in the DC SFRA and appeared confused about the difference between IAS and ground speed.

# ACN: 1276781 (28 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

R22 instructor pilot experiences a NMAC with a powered glider in the BDN traffic pattern. The glider was apparently thermaling with no intent to land and was not using radios.

# ACN: 1276421 (29 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

A flight instructor with 2 students became distracted and started the engine with the tow bar still attached to the nose landing gear of a Piper Cherokee, causing damage to the propeller.

# ACN: 1276092 (30 of 50)

# **Synopsis**

Cessna 172 pilot reported losing directional control after landing and hitting a taxiway sign.

# ACN: 1276051 (31 of 50)

### **Synopsis**

Intending to file an enroute IFR flight plan, the pilot of a Cessna 182 misunderstood instructions from ATC to do so with Flight Service Station as an order to change frequencies. With only a single radio, this caused a loss of communication with ATC Center.

# ACN: 1276045 (32 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

An instructor pilot reports departing BRD VFR and discovering airborne that the field is IFR. The tablet software showed VFR while the weather in the avionics (G-1000) showed IFR when zoomed out. The ASOS was not transmitting at departure time but later reported 2.5 miles visibility.

# ACN: 1276043 (33 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

PA28 Instructor reports using the tow bar to position his aircraft at the fuel pump then forgetting to remove it before attempting to taxi. The propeller strikes the tow bar during taxi and the aircraft is shut down.

# ACN: 1274952 (34 of 50)

# Synopsis

Cessna 172 instructor pilot reported an NMAC departing OPF airport.

# ACN: 1274931 (35 of 50)

# Synopsis

Cessna 170 Instructor experiences engine stoppage beyond gliding distance from the airport and lands on a narrow road. A hard landing ensues and the aircraft cannot be kept on the road as it curves to the right and a fence post is struck with left wingtip.

# ACN: 1274929 (36 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

C152 Instructor with student reports landing on Runway 18 at 3TE and noting that the runway looked rough. Upon returning to home base the Notams are checked and it is discovered that Runway 18 at 3TE has been closed since early June.

# ACN: 1274927 (37 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

PA28 pilot under training experiences a normal landing with the aircraft drifting towards the left despite right rudder input by both the reporter and the instructor. A runway excursion occurs with the aircraft contacting an airport sign.

# ACN: 1274926 (38 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Cessna 152 student pilot reports being instructed by the Tower to exit on Taxiway B after landing, but mistakes the intersecting runway for Taxiway B.

# ACN: 1274923 (39 of 50)

#### Synopsis

Pilot did not adequately clear runway when given hold short of parallel taxiway instructions. Designated Pilot Examiner took control and taxied the aircraft forward which nearly created a conflict with an aircraft on the parallel taxiway.

# ACN: 1274913 (40 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Student pilot reports being cleared to land Runway 22R after expecting to land Runway 22L. The clearance for 22R is read back but the student lands Runway 22L.

# ACN: 1274183 (41 of 50)

#### Synopsis

A local pilot is concerned that ATC instructions that are incomplete or unclear may lead to a less experienced or unfamiliar pilot into a runway incursion.

# ACN: 1274179 (42 of 50)

#### Synopsis

DA40 instructor is cleared to track the localizer Runway 36L at APC, but advised that the approach must be broken off outside the Class D as opposite direction approaches are not approved. Approaching the boundary, traffic is issued and a change to Tower frequency. The Tower issues instructions to circle west and land on Runway 18R, which is accomplished. The Tower believes the reporter entered the Class D airspace before contacting the Tower.

# ACN: 1273508 (43 of 50)

### **Synopsis**

During a training flight with a simulated engine failure, the pilots neglected to extend the landing gear, but were able to go around after minimal contact with the runway. The gear warning horn sounded the entire time prior to the go-around as the throttle was retarded to simulate zero thrust.

# ACN: 1273496 (44 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

R22 Instructor reported a runway incursion after a miscommunication between the student pilot and the Controller.

# ACN: 1273488 (45 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

A pilot and his examiner took off with a clearance out of Class C and began Commercial licensing maneuvers. Unknown to the pilots, ATC had filed an IFR flight plan and threatened a track deviation violation.

# ACN: 1273473 (46 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Pilot executed a precautionary landing in a Robinson R-44 due to vibration. After landing, he determined that both rotor tip caps had flown off.

# ACN: 1273241 (47 of 50)

#### **Synopsis**

Cessna 180 instructor pilot reported his student lost directional control after landing and the aircraft nosed over, causing damage to the prop and cowling.

# ACN: 1272916 (48 of 50)

#### Synopsis

PA-28 pilot reports a NMAC with a UAV at 3,800 feet approximately 8 NM east of FFZ.

# ACN: 1272664 (49 of 50)

### Synopsis

C172 pilot hears traffic make an "8 mile call" on CTAF at JYO while they prepare to take the runway. Thinking 8 miles was plenty to takeoff and make a crosswind turn the C172 takes off and on turn to crosswind is told by pilot of the other traffic they were cut off by their crosswind turn. The aircraft entering the pattern slows and maneuvers behind the C172.

# ACN: 1272336 (50 of 50)

### **Synopsis**

C172 pilot reports a near miss southeast of PNS while talking to TRACON. C172 pilot, while looking for traffic, climbs to 2100 FT to avoid the PA28 traffic Controller advised was at 1700 FT. Aircraft miss each other by an estimated 100 FT.

**Report Narratives** 

# ACN: 1294353 (1 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201509 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : CVO.Airport State Reference : OR Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 500 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 860

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight

### Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : CVO Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Skylane 182/RG Turbo Skylane/RG Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : Runway 27 Flight Phase : Final Approach Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class E : CVO

#### Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y ATC / Advisory.CTAF : CVO Make Model Name : Small Aircraft Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Mission : Aerobatics Flight Phase : Cruise Airspace.Class E : CVO

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 16000 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 80 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 780 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1294353 Human Factors : Situational Awareness Analyst Callback : Completed

# Events

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 499 Miss Distance.Vertical : 499 When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

# Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure Primary Problem : Airspace Structure

# Narrative: 1

While on an IFR flight plan and executing the ILS 17 approach to circle to land Runway 27, we encountered an airplane conducting acrobatic maneuvers (loops, rolls) directly over the airport at our flight altitude, above and below. A NOTAM was issued that the "acrobatic box" was active and we were aware of it. Reviewing the NOTAM we learned that the FAA had issued a waiver for pilots to conduct acrobatic flight within one mile from the center of the airport between 700 and 4300 feet AGL. This was not a public airshow. There is a direct conflict between IFR and VFR aircraft. No separation exists.

This is an unsafe waiver - should be withdrawn.

Sec. 91.303 -- Aerobatic flight.

No person may operate an aircraft in aerobatic flight--

- (a) Over any congested area of a city, town, or settlement;
- (b) Over an open air assembly of persons;

(c) Within the lateral boundaries of the surface areas of Class B, Class C, Class D, or Class E airspace designated for an airport;

- (d) Within 4 nautical miles of the center line of any Federal airway;
- (e) Below an altitude of 1,500 feet above the surface; or
- (f) When flight visibility is less than 3 statute miles.

For the purposes of this section, aerobatic flight means an intentional maneuver involving an abrupt change in an aircraft's attitude, an abnormal attitude, or abnormal acceleration, not necessary for normal flight.

# Callback: 1

Reporter stated airport involved is CVO. Reporter further stated he heard no communication on CTAF frequency from the aerobatic aircraft.

# **Synopsis**

C182 pilot on an IFR flight plan executing a circling approach noticed an aerobatic aircraft flying acrobatic maneuvers directly over the airport above and below their flight altitude. Reporter stated there was a waiver in place for the acrobatic box over the airport, but feels it was unsafe and should have been modified or withdrawn.

# Time / Day

Date : 200508 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ ATC / Advisory.TRACON : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Government Make Model Name : UAV - Unpiloted Aerial Vehicle Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 0 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Descent Airspace.Class E : ZZZ Airspace.TFR : ZZZ Maintenance Status.Maintenance Deferred : N Maintenance Status.Released For Service : Y

# Component

Aircraft Component : Indicating and Warning - Landing Gear Aircraft Reference : X Problem : Malfunctioning

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person : Hangar / Base Reporter Organization : Military Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1292242 Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Human Factors : Troubleshooting Human Factors : Workload Human Factors : Confusion Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Other

# **Events**

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe Detector.Automation : Aircraft Other Automation Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.General : Maintenance Action Result.Flight Crew : Landed in Emergency Condition Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory

# Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Aircraft

#### Narrative: 1

[Government Agency X] conducted a joint operational flight between [Government Agency Y] and [Government Agency Z]. At XA: 14 [Government Agency Y] turned over control of [Aircraft X] to [Government Agency Z] for recovery at [ZZZ]. Conditions were daylight, VMC with unlimited visibility. At XA25, while conducting landing checks, the nose- and starboard-gear extended normally indicating down and locked. The port gear, however, was minimally extended as verified via the onboard optics and system indicators. The crew began troubleshooting and a [Drone operator instructor] joined the crew to assist. A maintenance [crew] on the landing gear system also joined the crew in to provide additional resources and discussion. The [Commander] was joined by several personnel including additional crew and the Operations and Safety Supervisors in order to delegate workload and ensure completeness of administrative functions. The Mishap Checklist was reviewed for additional considerations. At XA46 the crew [notified the] Approach Control which was relayed to [a local] Tower and Base Ops. Approach Control did not require the [special instructions] and the assigned airspace code was maintained. The pilot requested a block altitude of 14,000-16,000 feet MSL. [Aircraft X] was safely within the assigned Temporary Flight Restriction (TFR) airspace at 15,000 feet MSL with 2,700 pounds of fuel on board. [ZZZ] has a parallel runway configuration with 13L being [X,000 feet] and 13R being [Y,000] feet. However, scheduled maintenance was being performed on 13R, leaving the shorter 13L as the active runway. After close coordination with airfield manager and air operations office, the longer 13R was cleared and made available as long as necessary for a landing. At approximately XB00, the crew commanded a gear retraction resulting in both the nose- and starboard-gear retracting normally. However, the port-gear actually extended further to approximately halfway down. The crew then commanded gear down resulting in the nose- and starboard-gear extending normally and the port-gear remaining in place. In accordance with the Gear Will Not Extend checklist, the crew proceeded to "bump" the gear. This action resulted in an approximately 1-2" port-gear movement down. While monitoring servo temperatures closely, this procedure was repeated approximately 25 more times. During the bump procedure, C-Band downlink signals began to degrade. [Aircraft X] was operating Line-of-Sight (LOS) and the crew had made no changes to the datalink configuration. The signal strengths dropped to zero on both Downlink 1 & 2. [Aircraft X] was approximately 16 nm from the Ground Data Terminal (GDT) and had uplink signal strengths of approximately 50%. The crew lost all video and telemetry, and the aircraft was no longer being displayed on the tracker map. The LRE crew tried changing [Aircraft X]'s heading and switched GDT receivers with no change. The crew initiated the Inflight checklist. However, the loss of the C-Band downlink lasted for 3-4 minutes then suddenly came back on its own. Signal strengths displayed normal and did not degrade for the remainder of the flight. With C-band link re-established, the IP LRE left the to call [Government Agency A] regarding the landing [,] when its nose gear failed to extend. Additionally, the Safety supervisor requested the written findings from that incident be sent for review and application of any lessons learned. When the port-gear stopped responding to "bump" commands, the visual indications were that it was approximately 2" from locked as compared to the starboard-gear. Several attempts were made to induced further movement through G-loading with negative results. At XC01, with agreement that there were no other alternative actions that could be performed and clearance received to land on 13R, the decision was made to dump fuel down to approximately 600 pounds and commence the approach to land. Cursory research indicated that the unsafe gear indication would not clear via a gear "bump." Visual observation was the only method of ascertaining gear status. ZZZ was contacted and briefed on UAV differences and safety considerations to include no personnel on board, the

600 pound fuel load, composite material construction, wing pods were inert, and that the aircraft would land on the right side (starboard-gear) of the runway and shut down where stopped. Another available supervisor was dispatched to the airfield control tower to act as liaison, if necessary, throughout the landing. All checklists were completed for landing and clearance was received at XC36 with winds reported at 110/14. At XC44 the crew executed a successful landing on 13R, gradually slowing the aircraft down with reverse thrust while being careful not to use the brakes. The gear remained down and the aircraft responded to steering commands. [Aircraft X] rolled to a stop approximately midfield and was shut down. Link was maintained to monitor the aircraft to tow it to the hangar. [Aircraft X] was towed without incident and it was discovered that the gear was down and on the stops. [Aircraft X] completed a modification to Trailing Arm Landing Gear (TALG) [recently]. Since completion, the port-gear electric servo accumulated 76.9 flight hours, 17 gear cycles (extensions-retractions), and 10 landings.

# **Synopsis**

An MQ-9 landing after a training mission, was delayed because the left main landing gear apparently did not fully extend. During extensive troubleshooting, communications with UAS was temporarily lost, but after communications' were re-established a normal precautionary landing followed. The gear was in fact fully extended.

# ACN: 1291543 (3 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201508 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : LNA.Airport State Reference : FL Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1000

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 2500

### Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : LNA Make Model Name : Robinson R44 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : Runway 9 Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : None Airspace.Class E : LNA

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y ATC / Advisory.CTAF : LNA Make Model Name : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : Runway 9 Airspace.Class E : LNA

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 1200 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 100 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 350 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number : 1291543 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

#### **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 200 Miss Distance.Vertical : 300 When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

At LNA helicopters perform right traffic for all runways, while fixed wing traffic performs left traffic for all runways.

After turning into a 1000 ft downwind and reporting position I observed a fixed wing aircraft passing close below us and just barely behind our track. I alerted my student to the traffic and we amended our path to the right in order to maximize clearance.

It is unfortunately not uncommon for aircraft to enter left crosswind legs 'from the right' at LNA and I am keenly aware of the danger this poses. This aircraft however was not performing any standard pattern entry.

I instructed my student to extend our downwind and amend the plan to perform a straight in autorotation instead of the 180 degree autorotation we had originally intended. As is my habit when I fail to hear any radio calls from an aircraft in the pattern I performed a comm check, to which another helicopter on field at the time confirmed we were loud and clear.

We continued to observe the airplane enter a low left downwind, turn left sharply and land on runway 9. We performed a straight in autorotation to runway 9 after his clearance.

After observing another full pattern without radio calls, my student and I were in a position to depart after the airplane. I made the radio call for departure for my student, specifically mentioning that we had the airplane in sight, identifying him by callsign. After our departure we observed the airplane turn to the west and depart the area.

It is my opinion that the presence of heavy flight training traffic, and the right pattern for helicopters should be marked on sectional charts, and re-added to AWOS broadcasts in addition to their current presence in Airport Facility Directories. These types of problems arise not with traffic that is based at LNA, as the flight schools gather for meetings and discuss these topics regularly, rather they are most frequently involving transient aircraft that are completely unfamiliar with the airport and its typical operations.

# Synopsis

R44 Instructor Pilot reported an NMAC with a light aircraft in the pattern at LNA airport.

# ACN: 1289851 (4 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201508

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ANQ.Airport State Reference : IN Relative Position.Angle.Radial : 9.1 Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 200 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2500

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 12000 RVR.Single Value : 10

### Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.TRACON : FWA Aircraft Operator : Military Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : Direct Airspace.Class E : FWA

#### Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y Make Model Name : UAV - Unpiloted Aerial Vehicle Airspace.Class E : FWA

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Military Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Private Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 600 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 20 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 250 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1289851

#### **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 20 Miss Distance.Vertical : 20 When Detected : In-flight

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

We were flying training sortie for a photo reconnaissance mission flying level at 2,500 feet MSL when a Fluorescence Orange small drone appeared to the left of the wind screen for approximately 2 seconds before passing just over the left wing of the aircraft. Approach advised and pilot provided telephone number to ATC for additional info once on the ground. The brevity of the encounter did not allow for evasive action.

#### **Synopsis**

C172 pilot experiences a NMAC with a drone at 2,500 feet.

# ACN: 1284746 (5 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201508 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZAB.ARTCC State Reference : NM Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 5000

### Aircraft : 1

Reference : X Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Small Aircraft Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Airspace.Class E : ZAB

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : UAV - Unpiloted Aerial Vehicle Flight Plan : None Route In Use : None Airspace.Class E : ZAB

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1284746

# **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Other / Unknown Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 50 Miss Distance.Vertical : 0 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure Primary Problem : Airspace Structure

#### Narrative: 1

Drone was 2 feet in diameter at exactly 5000 MSL on PXR 030 at 23 DME, evasive action was taken. It was silver and cylindrical.

# Synopsis

An instructor reported a close encounter with a drone (UAV) at an altitude of 5,000 feet, requiring an evasive maneuver.

# Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : PAO.Airport State Reference : CA Relative Position.Angle.Radial : 220 Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : .5 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1000

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 15 Light : Daylight

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : PAO Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Small Aircraft Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Approach Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class D : PAO

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : UAV - Unpiloted Aerial Vehicle Flight Plan : None Route In Use : None Airspace.Class D : PAO

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 1000 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 25 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 250 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1284007 Human Factors : Distraction Human Factors : Workload Human Factors : Situational Awareness

### **Events**

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 100 Miss Distance.Vertical : 5 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Environment - Non Weather Related Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

I was acting as a CFI on a training flight with a student returning to our home base PAO when we flew past a drone in the traffic pattern. My student was flying. We were entering the left downwind for runway 31 at PAO from a standard 45 degree entry when I spotted an unmanned drone 2-3 feet in size at our altitude, which was the standard left pattern altitude for 31 at PAO. We passed within approximately 100 feet of the drone and took no evasive action. It appeared to be hovering with no discernible motion. My student indicated that he did not see it. There were no prior traffic advisories from PAO tower or PAO ATIS regarding the drone or drone activity in the area. I reported the drone to PAO tower and tower made a broadcast to all aircraft of our drone report.

By the time I saw the drone and recognized it as such, we had nearly flown past it. Such a small vehicle is difficult to spot until very close in. I usually focus on traffic scanning at distances that are further away. I had recently attended a meeting at PAO for CFIs where reports of nearby drone activity was mentioned and I think this helped me recognize it as a drone more quickly. Some pilot awareness of local drone activity may help facilitate close-in visual scanning and faster recognition of these small vehicles.

Legislation requiring firmware in these commercially manufactured drones that prevents operation outside of the FAA limits would improve safety. The distribution of information to drone purchasers regarding local flight restrictions, airport locations, etc. may also help prevent this incident from occurring.

To put this event into some context, bird activity also creates hazards at PAO and I have had several near collisions with birds there and elsewhere flying over many years. However, birds usually dive out of the way while the drone did not. This drone also likely weighed significantly more than a bird.

# Synopsis

An instructor with his flying student was entering a 45 degree left downwind for PAO Runway 31 at 1,000 FT when he detected a UAV about 2-3 FT wide, approximately 100 FT beneath his aircraft.

# ACN: 1283984 (7 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

#### Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : S56.TRACON State Reference : UT Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 5500

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 30 Light : Daylight

#### Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.TRACON : S56 Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Light Sport Aircraft Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : None Airspace.Class E : S56

#### Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : UAV - Unpiloted Aerial Vehicle Flight Plan : None Route In Use : None Airspace.Class E : S56

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 2500 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 100 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 800 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1283984 Human Factors : Workload Human Factors : Time Pressure Human Factors : Situational Awareness

### Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 300 Miss Distance.Vertical : 0 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action Result.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Environment - Non Weather Related Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

The student was forced to maneuver our aircraft in order to avoid a radio controlled (RC) airplane being operated near the RC Park on the northwest end of Utah Lake. We were performing ground reference maneuvers over the Lehi/Saratoga Springs area at 5,500 FT MSL putting us about 1,000 FT AGL. While in a left hand turn the student saw the RC plane and reacted immediately by turning the aircraft to the right in order to avoid the hazard. As the student turned our airplane to the right I was able to see the RC plane approximately 200 feet above us performing maneuvers and dives to include a dive through our original flight path and altitude. The student wisely decided to move to a different area to perform his ground reference maneuvers. As I watched the RC plane maneuver I felt that it was intentional and that he was attempting to "mess with us" or show off. Based on the size of the RC plane and the skill at which it was being operated I feel like the operator would have been somebody familiar with RC plane operations and regulations.

# Synopsis

An Instructor reported his student took evasive action at 1,000 FT from a radio controlled (RC) aircraft, which was apparently being flown with intent toward and around their maneuvering aircraft. They were near an RC park northwest of Utah Lake.

# ACN: 1283969 (8 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : P03.Airport State Reference : AZ Relative Position.Angle.Radial : 360 Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 8 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 8500

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 13000

#### Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : P03 Aircraft Operator : Government Make Model Name : Small Aircraft, High Wing, 1 Eng, Retractable Gear Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : Direct Airspace.Class E : ZAB

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y Aircraft Operator : Military Make Model Name : UAV - Unpiloted Aerial Vehicle Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Airspace.Class E : ZAB

#### Aircraft : 3

Reference : Z Make Model Name : Cessna Single Piston Undifferentiated or Other Model Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Phase : Cruise Airspace.Class E : ZAB

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : Government** Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 283 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 6 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 6 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1283969 Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Workload Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

# **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Object Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 200 Miss Distance.Vertical : 250 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

# Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

# Narrative: 1

While flying westbound approximately 8 miles north of P03 at 8500 feet MSL we encountered a small grey UAV (possibly a Hunter) followed by Aircraft Z acting as chase. UAV was slightly below us and crossed in front of us from left to right. Aircraft Z crossed underneath us. Collision avoidance was taken by climbing and turning to the Southwest. Approximately 8 minutes prior to the event I called on CTAF 122.8 of our location over P03 and received no response. After seeing the UAV and Aircraft Z I called once again on 122.8 and no answer was received. The UAV and Aircraft Z continued to the North and no change in altitude or direction was seen.

# Synopsis

Pilot took evasive action to avoid a UAV and the chase airplane behind it at 8,500 FT near a local airport.

# ACN: 1283361 (9 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

#### Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Air Taxi Make Model Name : HS 125 Series Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Route In Use : None

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Air Taxi Function.Flight Crew : First Officer Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 8553 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 101 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 1175 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1283361 Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Training / Qualification

# **Events**

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe Anomaly.Deviation - Speed : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Ground Excursion : Runway Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Unstabilized Approach Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

I was receiving a 135.299 check ride with another company pilot as the check airman. We were conducting our last approach with our first landing. The approach was the ILS with a circle to land on the intersecting runway. This runway is 6,700 feet long and our landing weight was 14,678 pounds. Our tab data factored landing distance was 3,930 feet with a reference speed of 113 knots. We had been using 119 knots as a reference speed during the check ride approaches. I did not reset the airspeed bug to 113 knots. A later weight and balance analysis showed that our actual landing distance for our weight would have been 2,200 feet.

Outside the outer marker the check airman pulled the left engine to idle to simulate an engine failure. The remainder of the approach and circle were conducted without incident. On the base leg the gear was extended and aircraft was configured to flaps 25 degrees. On final I noticed that I was approximately 300 feet higher than normal and my airspeed was approximately 20 knots above the 119 knot reference speed. I considered these parameters to be acceptable for a single engine approach with a right crosswind of 280 at 13 gusting to 20 knots. The flaps were extended to 45 degrees and I continued my descent to the runway.

Crossing the threshold I was slightly high (I didn't look and do not know what the altimeter was displaying) and I believe the airspeed was in the range of reference speed plus 10 to 15 knots. The extra speed was to compensate for the single engine and the wind gust factor. I didn't actually look at the airspeed indicator but the speed "felt" right.

After I flared we floated for some distance but both the check airman and I thought we had touched down near the intersection of the two runways. Later I spoke with the tower supervisor who stated the tower controller who had been handling our flight also believed we touched down within that area. According to the tower controller the distance from the intersection to the end of the runway is 3,200 feet. A later examination of tire marks on the runway by company personnel revealed that we touched down approximately 2,500 feet from the runway end. On touchdown we immediately got a severe nose wheel shimmy which shook the entire airplane. The touchdown was firm and while I thought the mains landed first then the nose wheel, it is possible that all three touched down at the same time which would explain the nose wheel shimmy. I deployed the lift dump and applied brakes but the aircraft did not feel as though it was slowing. I had maximum pressure on the brake pedals but I didn't notice any travel. It was as though the brake pedals were not responding to the pressure applied. The aircraft still did not seem to be slowing and as it began to appear that we were not going to be able to stop before the end of the runway the check airman applied the emergency brakes. We continued to travel down the runway and just before departing the end I turned the aircraft to the left to avoid striking the row of threshold lights at the end. We traveled approximately 300 feet off the end of the runway before coming to a stop. After the aircraft stopped the check airman instinctively raised the lift dump and flaps and we then secured the engines.

# Synopsis

HS125 pilot, preforming a simulated engine out circle to land approach, reported landing long and fast and being unable to stop before departing the end of the runway. The aircraft may have touched down nose wheel first with 2500 feet of runway remaining.

# Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 20000

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Fractional Make Model Name : PC-12 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Route In Use : Vectors Maintenance Status.Maintenance Deferred : N Maintenance Status.Maintenance Type : Unscheduled Maintenance

# Component: 1

Aircraft Component : Brake System Manufacturer : Pilatus Aircraft Reference : X Problem : Malfunctioning

# Component: 2

Aircraft Component : Parking Brake Manufacturer : Pilatus Aircraft Reference : X

# Component: 3

Aircraft Component : Main Gear Manufacturer : Pilatus Aircraft Reference : X

#### Person: 1

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Fractional Function.Flight Crew : Check Pilot Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Function.Flight Crew : Captain Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 6500 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 50 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 800 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1283027 Analyst Callback : Attempted

### Person: 2

Reference : 2 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Fractional Function.Flight Crew : First Officer Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 6198 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 180 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 4691 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1283342 Analyst Callback : Completed

# **Events**

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Critical Detector.Person : Flight Crew Were Passengers Involved In Event : N When Detected.Other Result.Aircraft : Aircraft Damaged

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Aircraft

#### Narrative: 1

Upon landing, aircraft skidded straight ahead. Brakes were unresponsive. Tower reported smoke from tires. Aircraft began vibrating and making noise from rear. Aircraft then slowed and stopped on runway. Upon exit, both main tires were flat spotted and blown out.

Parking brake lever was in the off position. It seemed that the parking brake was on in spite of the position of the lever.

#### Narrative: 2

[Report narrative contained no additional information].

# Callback: 2

Reporter stated he was the FO on a training flight. The initial landing was OK, but as he started to apply the brakes he noticed the pedals felt hard, as if the brakes were already applied. That's when he realized the brakes were unresponsive and apparently locked as the Pilatus PC-12 began skidding down the runway. Reporter stated Maintenance arrived and changed both Main tires due to being flat-spotted and blown. While jacking the aircraft, Maintenance noted that both main tires spun freely. Pilatus aircraft do Not have an Anti-Skid System; just basic application of brake pedals and hydraulic fluid. The incident aircraft was one of their newer PC-12s. He has heard of other pilots experiencing brake lock-ups on the newer aircraft. His company does change the brakes to a different type when they receive a new aircraft. He does not know if the removed brake or the replacement brakes are steel or composite type brakes.

Reporter stated the Parking Brake is a T-type handle that is pulled out and turned clockwise as brakes pedals are applied to lock brakes. A valve is involved in the process. Unlocking only requires turning the T-handle counterclockwise to release the brakes.

# Synopsis

Two pilots report their Pilatus PC-12 was unresponsive to braking upon landing as the aircraft vibrated and skidded straight ahead. Upon exiting the aircraft both main tires were found flat spotted and blown out.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

## Place

Locale Reference.Airport : IYK.Airport State Reference : CA Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 10

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Weather Elements / Visibility.Other Light : Dusk

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : IYK Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : VFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Takeoff Route In Use : Direct

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y ATC / Advisory.CTAF : IYK Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Small Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Mission.Other Flight Phase : Takeoff Route In Use.Other

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 6200 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 80 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 40 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1283002 Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

# Events

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 20 Miss Distance.Vertical : 50 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Environment - Non Weather Related Contributing Factors / Situations : Airport Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

Cessna 172 made CTAF 122.8 VHF radio call to enter Runway 33 for takeoff. Cessna 172 paused on runway as student prepared to add takeoff power. A helicopter operating on the east ramp made a direct west takeoff call. Cessna 172 immediately queried helicopter who then answered that he would hold position for Cessna. Cessna 172 added power for takeoff roll, at approximately 1,000-1,250 feet on takeoff roll instructor glanced down for instrument check and verify maximum power was set and flying speed attained. Student pilot began to rotate with instructor in backup position. Instructor noticed jet aircraft rapidly approaching in the opposite direction (Runway 15) on its takeoff roll at just past rotation in a moderate Angle of Attack (AOA) takeoff. Cessna 172 instructor immediately pushed nose over for evasive action and added slight left Angle of Bank (AOB) for lateral clearance. Estimated about 50 feet vertical as aircraft passed above and just right of the Cessna. Cessna 172 called on CTAF 122.8 to aircraft to identify with negative response. Cessna 172 queried helicopter if the jet was working with his photo group and for call sign but was not successful in communicating with departing jet. Communications were never established with the jet on Inyokern CTAF or on Joshua Approach. The jet was not on proper CTAF frequency, or was on frequency and did not make any radio calls. Runway end is not clearly visible during dusk conditions from the approach end.

# Synopsis

C172 instructor pilot departing Runway 33 at IYK reports a NMAC with a departing jet on Runway 33. Evasive action is taken by the C172 instructor, at low altitude near midfield. CTAF procedures were in use and the reporter had communicated with a helicopter planning a departure but the jet pilot was apparently never on the CTAF.

# ACN: 1282668 (12 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : BTV.Airport State Reference : VT Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling : CLR

#### Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Ground : BTV Aircraft Operator.Other Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Taxi

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 1336 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 65 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 816 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1282668 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

#### **Events**

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Taxiway Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control When Detected : Taxi Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Airport Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

We landed on Runway 15 and taxied onto Taxiway C eastbound via Runway 19 as advised by Burlington Tower. We called Burlington Ground, who advised us to taxi to parking to GA parking at the end of Kilo via Charlie and Kilo. A regional jet landed on Runway 15 after we landed and exited the runway onto Charlie westbound; the two planes were a safe distance apart but pointed at each other.

Typically at BTV, when two aircraft are on Charlie in opposite directions, ground control advises one aircraft to sidestep onto the GA ramp adjacent to Charlie while the other aircraft passes. The ground controller advised the regional jet to taxi to the terminal via Charlie and Alpha and then advised us to sidestep onto the GA ramp adjacent to Charlie. There was a work area on the GA ramp. We no longer had space to sidestep ahead of the work area due to the incoming regional jet. The jet was getting too close for comfort for me, so we sidestepped through the work area between two empty trucks, ensuring that we were far clear of any personnel in the area. After the jet taxied past us, we returned to Charlie, not crossing the work area a second time.

When we returned to our GA ramp, a Burlington Airport Operations representative was waiting for us. He advised us that we had taxied through a NOTAMed work area. He told us that ATC shouldn't have put two planes in opposite directions on the same taxiway. I told him that we had to move out of the way of the jet heading toward us. He replied that I should have told the controller that I was unable to sidestep. I would have violated my personal margins for operational safety if I had not reacted as the regional jet taxied closer to us.

# Synopsis

A C172 pilot reported he taxied into a work area to avoid a conflict with opposite direction air carrier aircraft.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

# Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : A90.TRACON State Reference : NH Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4400

# Environment

Flight Conditions : Marginal Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 2500

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.TRACON : A90 Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Small Aircraft Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Approach Route In Use : Direct Airspace.Class E : A90

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : Personal** Function.Flight Crew : Captain Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 5103 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 30 Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 2500 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number : 1281996 Human Factors : Confusion Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

# **Events**

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Excursion From Assigned Altitude Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Returned To Clearance Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Chart Or Publication Primary Problem : Ambiguous

### Narrative: 1

I was flying an instrument proficiency flight. The flight was to fly practice approaches under IFR at CON (Concord, NH), MHT (Manchester, NH) and terminate with a practice approach and some VFR takeoffs and landings at ASH. The [flight] was flown under IFR because marginal VFR conditions existed over the route, with ceilings ranging from 2,200 feet to 3,500 feet AGL, depending on location. Good visibility existed beneath the cloud deck. A safety pilot was on board and a view limiting device was used, because conditions were not solid IMC.

Departing out of ASH, I contacted Boston Approach and was cleared to climb to my assigned altitude of 4,000 feet MSL. After some vectoring for traffic, I was cleared to proceed direct to KERSY, which is an IAF for the RNAV Runway 17 Approach at CON. Since the aircraft was equipped with the G1000 System, much of the leg to KERSY was flown on autopilot, while I tended to other tasks such as obtaining ASOS at CON, briefing the approach, etc.

Approximately 5 miles from KERSY, I took over manual control and received the following clearance from Boston Approach: "Cross KERSY at 4,000, cleared RNAV Runway 17 Approach at Concord." Looking at my chart, the minimum altitude for the published segment from KERSY to INKOW (the next fix) was 4,400 feet MSL. It struck me odd that the controller would issue a crossing restriction that was LOWER than the minimum altitude for the segment I was about to enter. I was also aware that there was hilly terrain in that area and that there was likely good reason for the published altitude for that segment. I decided that AFTER crossing KERSY at 4,000 feet, I would then climb to 4,400 feet MSL, because I was cleared for the approach, and should be cleared to fly the procedure as published after making the requested crossing restriction.

I climbed to 4,400 feet MSL and about 4 miles into the segment, the controller called me and advised: "I see you have climbed to the published altitude of 4,400 feet. Just for future reference, when I assign a crossing altitude, I'm expecting you to fly that altitude for the segment." He didn't sound upset, nor did he ask me to contact him on the ground after the flight. Based on the controller's tone, it did not appear as if any conflict was created by my action. He just made it clear that I did something he was not expecting. Needless to say, I immediately descended to 4,000 feet and proceeded with the approach to CON. The rest of the flight was uneventful, and nothing further was said about the altitude situation at KERSY.

Needless to say, I was a bit rattled by the incident. I pride myself on flying precisely and

interacting as professionally as possible with ATC. I realize that it is not just my reputation that is on the line, but also that of the organization. In my previous experience, the only time I had ever been given an altitude assignment that was BELOW published safe altitudes was while being vectored...never on a published approach segment. In addition, it has always been my understanding that once cleared for the approach, I was cleared to fly the procedure as published. Whenever a controller needed me higher than published on an approach segment, the controller would typically say: "Intercept and fly the route, maintain X thousand, expect approach clearance in X miles", meaning once cleared, I could then fly the procedure at the published altitudes. Clearly, I need to get back with the AIM and reread the material on approaches. At any rate, the deviation wasn't done maliciously, it was done for safety and because I believed at the time that it was the correct thing to do.

# Synopsis

While on a practice instrument approach, there was a disagreement between the pilot and the Controller about the assigned altitude being below the published approach segment altitude.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : OKV.Airport State Reference : VA Relative Position.Angle.Radial : 144 Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 1 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1200

# Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : OKV Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Small Aircraft, High Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : Runway 32 Flight Phase : Final Approach Route In Use : None Airspace.Class E : ZDC

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y ATC / Advisory.CTAF : OKV Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Small Aircraft Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Flight Phase : Final Approach Flight Phase : Initial Approach Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class E : ZDC

# Aircraft : 3

Reference : Z Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Small Aircraft Flight Plan : None Flight Phase : Taxi

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : FBO** Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 4771 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 80 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 1006 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1281993 Human Factors : Confusion Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Time Pressure Human Factors : Workload Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

#### Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 3000 Miss Distance.Vertical : 200 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action Result.Flight Crew : Executed Go Around / Missed Approach

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

An instrument student was at the controls of our aircraft flying the ILS RWY 32 approach at OKV. As there were other aircraft in the pattern, I was making position reports every mile from the FAF. When approximately 2 miles from Runway 32, another aircraft was observed on downwind. With the other aircraft still on downwind we continued our approach and I made a one mile final RWY 32 call. I then observed the other aircraft turning onto base. I advise of our position relative to their aircraft and the instructor advised they did not have us in sight. The aircraft continued to turn onto base leg. I took the controls of our aircraft and executed a missed approach to the right. I took this action since we did not know what actions the other aircraft was going to take. A collision was not imminent, but I felt it was the safe thing to do. We proceeded back to attempt a second ILS approach. The other aircraft was doing closed traffic practicing takeoff and landings. They were not keeping up with traffic location. When an aircraft is on short final, an aircraft on downwind should have that traffic in sight prior to turning onto base leg. This would have prevented our incident.

On the second approach, as we were near decision altitude, another aircraft, not making radio calls, entered the runway at Taxiway D. The aircraft made a couple of 360 degree turns and returned to Taxiway D, but only clear of the runway edge marking (still on the runway side of the hold short line). I advised the student to execute a go-around. The aircraft was then observed taking off on Runway 32 and proceeded to make right traffic (OKV is left traffic on both runways). We continued closed traffic and landed on Runway 32. As we cleared the runway and began our taxi to the ramp, the no radio aircraft was observed on short final. The aircraft had turned final in front of another aircraft, causing them to go around also. This incident could have been prevented if the no radio aircraft would have ensured that no other aircraft was on final prior to entering the runway and when exiting, clear the runway past the hold short line.

Both incidents are just the latest of similar incidences experienced flying out of OKV. When discussing traffic pattern procedures with other pilots, many advise the AIM is only advisory and that they can do whatever they wish since OKV is "uncontrolled". OKV is non-towered, but not uncontrolled, when all aircraft use standard procedures when departing and arriving at airports. I feel the lack of standards and attitudes indicate a failure in the training process. CFIs are not teaching or impressing the importance of SOPs in conducting safe flights. I fear the attitude that some pilots have toward airport traffic operations at non-towered airports is going to result in a collision at OKV. I place emphasis on proper procedures and traffic avoidance on each and every flight with my students.

# Synopsis

An instructor with a student at OKV observed nonstandard pilot behavior at this airport, while flying the ILS RWY 32 Approach. In discussion with other pilots, the instructor discovered an attitude that the AIM is just advisory and that their flight and ground pilotage did not require adherence.

# ACN: 1281888 (15 of 50)

#### Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : T85.Airport State Reference : TX

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

#### Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Center : ZHU Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Approach Route In Use : Direct Airspace.Class E : ZHU

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1281888 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

#### **Events**

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : ATC Equipment / Nav Facility / Buildings Primary Problem : Procedure

### Narrative: 1

IFR flight plan to T85 to conduct an instrument proficiency check for a pilot who owns his own aircraft.

The plan was to use the NDB at T85 (Yaokum, TX - radio aid identifier OKT). Houston ARTCC cleared us for the NDB Runway 31 approach.

During initiation of approach in VMC I noted the NDB was not transmitting a Morse Code identifier nor were we receiving any course guidance. Houston ARTCC was advised that we suspected that NDB OKT at T85 was out of operation and that we were continuing a simulated NDB approach using GPS under VMC conditions. If this had been in IMC conditions we would have declared a missed and requested radar vectors.

After landing I contacted Ft. Worth FSS to see if they had any outage of NDB OKT as we were told it was in operation when we filed our IFR flight plan.

FSS said that because it is in an unmonitored status we should only be able to use that NDB if we have radar coverage from Houston ARTCC. This is in conflict with what the Airport Facility Directory says about a radio aid that is unmonitored. Also, if this were true then I believe the approach plate would require radar. It doesn't.

I was left with the impression that the Ft. Worth FSS didn't want to take the trouble to report this outage and was blowing smoke up my tail pipe. I am also concerned that Houston ARTCC has taken no action to report the T85 NDB out of service.

#### **Synopsis**

C172 pilot reported finding the NDB at T85 out of service and advised ATC who still showed it in service.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

## Place

Locale Reference.Airport : SQL.Airport State Reference : CA Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1500

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 12000

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : SQL ATC / Advisory.TRACON : NCT Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Small Aircraft, High Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Climb Airspace.Class B : NCT Airspace.Class D : SQL

# Person

Reference: 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : FBO** Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Private Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 220 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1281346 Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Time Pressure Human Factors : Training / Qualification Human Factors : Workload Human Factors : Distraction Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

## **Events**

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Overshoot Anomaly.Deviation - Track / Heading : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

Time building for Commercial Pilot Certificate. Issue happened on the way back trip from SQL. Early morning departure engine is running, ready for IFR clearance. Calling Clearance Deliver for clearance multiple times, but no answer is received. My phone was off and I have tried to call other approach frequencies, but no one answers. Calling CTAF in the SQL to ask guys if they know another frequency for clearance delivery. One guy replied that the tower will open at 7am. But my decision was to pick up airborne-clearance. On an initial climb runway 30 departure leg and when I passed patten altitude, I switched radio from CTAF to Oakland Approach and tried to call them again to "check in". ATC replied: "[Aircraft X] Stand By! remain outside of class B airspace". I was still climbing and did not know where specifically to go. I knew that SQL is located within class B airspace, even though airport itself was class D. That is why I was in rush to pick a clearance or request and receive assistance to guide me through airspace without touching class B. I was trying to find a gap on frequency to speak with him and tell him that I need assistance to stay away of B. And the reason why I was not able to manage it myself is because of the increased workload to a single pilot being very low and flying in very busy congested airspace. I looked at my chart and try to figure out where am I in relation to class B airspace and then what altitude to remain on and which heading to fly, but still it was hard for me to look down on chart because I felt unprotected in airspace, that is why I decided to fly the airplane in first place and wait for ATC to call me or find a gap and talk to him. At approximately 1,500feet-1,900 feet I found a short gap and call him again for assistance. ATC replied: "[Aircraft X] Stand By! remain outside of class B airspace". I remember that the frequency start to be busy again and I could not talk to him back. I started to circle and still figuring out where to go and having hope that ATC gonna get back to me and help me. I remember that I was approximately at 2,300 feet when I made my [third] call and ATC replied: "I told you to remain outside of class B airspace! Now turn to the East immediately". Upon my compliance he said to me to copy a phone number and call it upon arrival. He said that I entered class B airspace without clearance. Rest of my flight was very normal and I made it safely. Upon my arrival I charged my phone and called that number. I spoke with person representing San Fransisco TRACON. The person said that a report needed to be filed and asked my personal information, where I respectfully declined it and I said that I need a legal advice from attorney and then that I`ll call them back. Today after conversation with my attorney I called them and gave them all of my information in case they gonna file letter of investigation.

#### SUMMARY:

1. Calling for clearance on the ground, but we did not established communication 2. Calling airborne without yet busting any airspace, ATC constantly replies Stand By. 3. I could have wait until the tower will open in 30 minutes, I could look for someone on an "empty field" and ask them to call an approach or FSS for me to get clearance. But I did not do it. Because I was not comfortable doing it. I looked positive to pick up an airborne clearance in this case. I did not expect of neglect ATC assistance. He saw me in a radar on initial call and further, but did not take care of me. He knew that I had filed the IFR flight plan and I need a clearance. But yet they give me their stand by's, not providing any vectors any suggestions, without giving any room to talk on a dynamic environment and then fearing me to file a report for pilot deviation. Like a punishment machine. You can`t talk to them, you cant tell them to stand by, because they got very angry when you do so, especially if you fly small airplanes.

When people say that ATC there to provide assistance for us, pilots. In this case dose not seem like that at all. I am disagree that it is only my fault.

#### **Synopsis**

A pilot departed CTAF SQL before the Tower opened and attempted to get an IFR clearance while airborne from NorCal. The Controller was busy and before clearance could be given, the pilot entered SFO Class B.

# ACN: 1281001 (17 of 50)

## Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : GUC.Airport State Reference : CO Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : GUC Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Light Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turboprop Eng Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing

# Component

Aircraft Component : VHF Aircraft Reference : X Problem : Failed

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Captain Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1281001 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

# **Events**

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight When Detected : Aircraft In Service At Gate Result.General : Maintenance Action

# Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Weather Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Aircraft

#### Narrative: 1

While training a third party student I was making radio calls on CTAF at GUC. I had previously verified that the radio I was using (Comm 1) was operative. After several approaches (both to missed and to landings), during which I continued to make calls on CTAF, we ended up head to head on the runway with another airplane. Both aircraft were fully stopped while still a great distance from one another (probably more than 1000 feet). I made another call on CTAF and we taxied back to the FBO to find out what happened.

We were informed that no one had heard our calls, so I went back out to the airplane in order to check the radios. I could not discern why Comm 1 was inoperative, so I wrote it up first and then called Maintenance. Maintenance Control asked the usual questions, including checking the volume and making sure the radio was on (both these things I had already checked), and then suggested I check the circuit breaker. The breaker was popped so I reset it as per Maintenance Control's directive and I cleared the write up according to the instruction of the Maintenance person I was talking to.

Asking for frequent radio checks from the FBO are the only way I can think of to avoid this happening again. It was very hot (over 100 degrees F) in the cabin, despite having the temp control set to full cold. This might have had something to do with the circuit breaker popping.

I am certain that for most of that training flight, we were hearing (and were heard on) CTAF. It was just right at the end when something happened.

#### Synopsis

Instructor pilot, practicing landings with a student and using CTAF procedures, finds himself nose to nose with another aircraft on the takeoff roll. After stopping with room to spare it is discovered that Comm1 had failed due to a tripped circuit breaker.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

## Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 50 Weather Elements / Visibility.Other Light : Night

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : ZZZ Make Model Name : King Air C90 E90 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Takeoff Route In Use : Direct

# Aircraft : 2

ATC / Advisory.CTAF : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier Make Model Name : Regional Jet CL65, Undifferentiated or Other Model Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Passenger Flight Phase : Taxi

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Air Carrier Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 8800 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 100 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 3000 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1280428 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

## **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected.Other Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

At an uncontrolled field after making calls I taxied to Runway 3 for a northeast departure. I cleared the runway made a call and then commenced takeoff roll with all available lighting illuminated. Somewhere around V1 I noticed an aircraft starting to enter the left side of the runway at the opposite end in which I was departing. I briefly thought about aborting but thought the safer alternative would be to rotate, establish a climb, and veer to the right side of the runway. The aircraft was exiting the runway by the time we crossed the departure end of the runway, [I noticed] the aircraft was a Canadair regional jet. I was about to make a call and noticed I must had inadvertently switched the frequency to the ground frequency at some point.

# Synopsis

BE9L pilot reported a CRJ taxied onto his runway as he was on his takeoff roll. After takeoff the pilot noticed his radio was tuned to Ground frequency.

# ACN: 1280396 (19 of 50)

# Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

## Place

Locale Reference.Airport : P08.Airport State Reference : AZ

### Environment

Light : Daylight

### Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : P08 Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Bonanza 33 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Approach Airspace.Class E : P08

### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Trainee Qualification.Flight Crew : Student ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1280396 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

# **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

# Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

# Narrative: 1

First, when entering on the 45 for the left downwind runway 05 at Coolidge another Cessna came close to our right side with the same intention of entering the pattern. Prior to that we already made our calls, and the Cessna claimed it would be no factor since he was behind us. Unfortunately this was not the case. The Cessna called he was going to initiate a 360 for spacing to the left, this was not the safe direction to do that, and while saying 'left' he turned right. Since then, I kept an extra eye on the Cessna since he did the opposite of what he was saying on the frequency.

Second, when the student flying turned final and made his call, the Cessna turned an early base and was on collision course with us again by cutting us off by turning a short final at a lower speed. I called out that the Cessna initiated this maneuver and soon the student flying and the instructor had him in sight and initiated a go around.

Third, after completing the go around we turned left crosswind in order to give it another try. The Cessna did not respond to our go around call and kept continuing his patterns without taking other aircraft into account. Soon after we turned crosswind, the Cessna cut us off again by turning an early crosswind instead of following us in the pattern.

From this moment we angled out and flew a wide downwind in order to leave the pattern since it was not working out with this other airplane in the pattern. The student flying made all calls properly.

# Synopsis

F-33A student pilot reported an airborne conflict with another aircraft in the pattern at P08.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

# Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Weather Elements / Visibility.Other Light : Daylight

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Route In Use : Visual Approach

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Private Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 264 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 9 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 264 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1280077 Human Factors : Training / Qualification

# **Events**

Anomaly.Ground Excursion : Runway Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Ground Strike - Aircraft Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Loss Of Aircraft Control Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Aircraft : Aircraft Damaged

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

While practicing landings I had an event. It happened on my second landing right after touchdown. The aircraft veered to the right leaving the runway, traveling through the grass and coming to a stop on the taxiway. I was told by the tower to taxi to a nearby tie down area. After parking the aircraft I got out and inspected the aircraft for damage, found that the left main wheel pant, and right main wheel pant fairing were damaged.

I was the only person onboard and was not injured. I contacted the flying club after securing the aircraft in the hangar. Tagged the aircraft grounded until the club's maintenance personnel inspected and returned it to service.

#### **Synopsis**

C172 pilot reported losing directional control after landing resulting in a runway excursion that did minor damage to the aircraft.

# ACN: 1280072 (21 of 50)

## Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : N90.TRACON State Reference : NY Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1100

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 15

#### Aircraft

Reference : X Aircraft Operator : Government Make Model Name : Skylane 182/RG Turbo Skylane/RG Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Nav In Use.VOR / VORTAC : CCC Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : None Airspace.Class E : N90

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Government Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 10000 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 25 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 500 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1280072 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

#### **Events**

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

Prior to departure, a standard briefing was obtained from FSS. The Briefer was specifically asked if there are any parachute jump activities in the vicinity of the CCC VORTAC. The reply was that there were no parachuting activities in this area.

Upon arrival at the VOR while conducting a visual practice search, it was discovered that there were jumpers in the air. It would be helpful if the operator would notify FSS about such activities so close to a NAVAID.

#### **Synopsis**

C182 pilot reported jumpers in the air in the vicinity of CCC VORTAC even though there was no notice of the activity.

## ACN: 1279980 (22 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201507

#### Place

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

## Aircraft

Reference : X Aircraft Operator : Government Make Model Name : Helicopter Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Flight Phase : Takeoff Airspace.Class C : TLH

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Government Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Rotorcraft Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 4300 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1279980 Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Distraction

#### **Events**

Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Other / Unknown Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Other / Unknown Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : Taxi When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airport Primary Problem : Airport

#### Narrative: 1

At the Tallahassee Regional Airport There is a large sod field on the north end of the airport east of Taxiway A adjacent to the windsock. This area is outside of the movement area but within the airport boundary fence. The area is routinely used by helicopters for training both day and night, as a staging area for firefighting helicopters, and as a mooring area for transient blimps. On the north end of the area are four unlit communications towers which are approximately fifty feet tall which are fed by power lines that extend from the towers Easterly toward the airport fence. Several utility poles support the wires. Until recent these towers, wires, and poles were not a hazard as they were positioned along the edge of a stand of pine trees which served as a very visible barrier. Several months ago the stand of trees was removed leaving the obstructions exposed without markings in the middle of what is now a very large field. While the towers and poles are visible during the day the wires are not always visible based on the scene background. During night time hours the towers and poles are sometimes invisible as well at some approach angles. The unlit structures as well as the exposed aboveground power lines present a hazard to aircraft operations especially at night. I submit that all four towers need marker lights and the power lines need to be placed underground to prevent an accident.

# Synopsis

Power lines and towers within the airport boundary at TLH to the north and east of Taxiway A are unlit and unmarked.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 250

# Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 25000

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Government Make Model Name : Jet/Long Ranger/206 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Takeoff Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class D : ZZZ

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer Flight Phase : Takeoff Airspace.Class D : ZZZ

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Government Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Rotorcraft Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 1000 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 60 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 800 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number : 1278777 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

# **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Detector.Person : Flight Crew Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control Miss Distance.Horizontal : 150 Miss Distance.Vertical : 0 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

I was sitting in the left seat of a Bell 206 Jet Ranger helicopter, instructing another pilot, no others were on board. We had a near miss with a fixed wing aircraft. Both aircraft were taking off, the Bell 206 was at the North Pad, and the airplane was taking off from Runway 26 (the North Pad helicopter training area is just north of Runway 26, sits just short of mid-runway, and the upwind leg of the North Pad is parallel to the upwind leg of Runway 26). Prior to the near miss, the Bell 206 reported "On the go" to the tower, and received clearance to perform a right closed traffic pattern. Immediately following the Bell 206's clearance, the airplane was cleared for takeoff on Runway 26 with a right turn out, and the airplane pilot was alerted by the tower of a helicopter operating at the North Pad. The airplane pilot reported "helicopter in sight, maintain visual." The Bell 206 was climbing upwind at 60 knots, the airplane was traveling upwind at a faster takeoff speed (aircraft traveling parallel to each other), as the airplane began to overtake the Bell 206, the airplane began drifting right of Runway 26, towards the Bell 206, and then the airplane initiated their right turn (prior to the end of the runway). The tower alerted the plane "Do not make your right turn prior to the end of the runway." Simultaneously, the copilot of the Bell 206 spotted the plane out of the left window at the 8 to 9 o'clock position, overtaking and turning towards the Bell 206. Upon seeing the airplane, the Bell 206 copilot immediately began to make a 90 degree right turn, beginning the crosswind leg of their pattern earlier than expected (over farmland, no danger resulted in this turn). The plane stopped their right turn at the tower's direction, and continued to the end of the runway before turning right. No further communication was made by the airplane, the Bell 206, or the tower. It is estimated that the airplane came within 150 feet of the Bell 206. Both aircraft were at approximately 250 feet AGL when the Bell 206 spotted the airplane.

# Synopsis

Helicopter instructor pilot reports a NMAC with a fixed wing aircraft after both craft had been cleared for takeoff by the Tower. The fixed wing pilot had reported the helicopter in sight but begin a right crosswind turn before he was well past the helicopter.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

## Place

Locale Reference.Airport : FFZ.Airport State Reference : AZ Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 4 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2700

# Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 40 Light : Daylight

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : FFZ Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : PA-44 Seminole/Turbo Seminole Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class D : FFZ

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : UAV - Unpiloted Aerial Vehicle Flight Plan : None Route In Use : None Airspace.Class D : FFZ

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1278763

# **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

# Narrative: 1

Flying the PA44 north of CHD, about 4 miles south of FFZ, the drone appeared to the left of the left wing tip, at close proximity. Drone was red with black and approximately half a foot in diameter. Tower was immediately notified.

### **Synopsis**

PA-44 instructor pilot reports an airborne conflict with a drone at 2,700 feet 4 NM south of FFZ. Evasive action is taken.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : TTA.Airport State Reference : NC Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 600

# Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 25000

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : TTA Make Model Name : PA-28R Cherokee Arrow All Series Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : VFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Final Approach Route In Use : Visual Approach Route In Use : Direct Airspace.Class G : TTA

# Aircraft : 2

ATC / Advisory.CTAF : TTA Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer Flight Phase : Final Approach Airspace.Class G : TTA

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Private Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 250 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 35 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 10 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1277369 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

# **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 1000 Miss Distance.Vertical : 50 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

While conducting a commercial maneuvers' training flight with my instructor, we encountered a near midair collision. We had been remaining in the pattern at TTA for some time, completing about five landings before the incident occurred. We were monitoring the CTAF frequency for the airport and making calls for crosswind, down wind, base and final as you would in any non-towered environment. To confirm we were on the correct frequency, at the time we the incident occurred, there was a helicopter circling the field about 1,500 feet higher than we were who was responding to our calls and giving us his position. For the details of the specific incident, we were conducting a power off 180 degree landing (commercial training maneuver). While on base and turning to a short final, I caught a glimpse of an aircraft just to the right of that nose of the aircraft and at close to our altitude, who appeared to have the same descent rate we had. Essentially, the aircraft incorrectly entered the pattern (made a straight in for runway 21) without making any radio calls and completely ignoring ours. I took immediate evasive action and conducted a climbing right turn to the right with full power, and flew away from the field, where I conducted a 360 degree right turn to ensure the aircraft was on the ground and off the runway. We completed that final touch and go and returned to [base]. It is my strong belief that this individual displayed a total disregard for aeronautical decision making, proper planning, and was complacent enough to fly right into our path of flight and show no sign of realizing he/she had done so.

# Synopsis

PA28R student pilot reported an airborne conflict with another aircraft at TTA, a non-Tower airport.

# ACN: 1277101 (26 of 50)

## Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : DAB.Airport State Reference : FL Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 500

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Night

### Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : DAB Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Final Approach Route In Use : Vectors Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class C : DAB

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y ATC / Advisory.Tower : DAB Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer Flight Phase : Final Approach Airspace.Class C : DAB

### Person: 1

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 1000 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 215 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 600 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1277101 Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Human Factors : Situational Awareness Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

### Person: 2

Reference : 2 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : Personal** Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 770 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 150 Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 500 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number : 1277103 Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

## **Events**

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Detector.Automation : Aircraft TA Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 100 Miss Distance.Vertical : 0 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

## Narrative: 1

I was doing my CFII training with another instructor this evening when an issue occurred. I was positioned right seat, as he was left acting as safety pilot and PIC. We were cleared for ILS 7L by Daytona Approach. Daytona Approach tells us to slow from 100 KTS to 90 KTS for sequence. We complied and slowed the aircraft to 90 KTS. We were instructed to switch to Daytona Beach Tower. We established contact with tower and were cleared low approach for RWY 7L. Localizer and Glideslope were centered throughout the approach. TCAS warning system went off inside the aircraft to warn us of a nearby airplane. We could not see the airplane because he was in our blind spot (high wing airplane). My safety pilot tried calling Tower to ask what our instructions were and where the traffic was. At that time, tower frequency was blocked by multiple aircraft calling at once. At roughly 500 feet MSL, I was instructed to look outside by my safety pilot to find a low wing airplane to our 9 to 10 o'clock position at same altitude, converging at a very scary close distance. My safety pilot took evasive action and dove towards the ground initially to avoid an immediate collision. We both thought we heard orders "side step to the right" by tower as multiple aircraft were still stepping on each other. We both agreed to turn right 20 degrees and level off momentarily. After turning right 20 degrees and started an initial climb, we find another aircraft on final for 7R approach at the same altitude not far from our current position. We both decided to split the difference of the two runways and headed 070 between Runway 7L and Runway 7R, climbing at Vx airspeed to get as much altitude as possible. At a safe altitude (1200 feet MSL), we switched back to Daytona Approach because tower frequency was still clogged up with radio calls. We exited Class C airspace to the south and headed to home base.

### Narrative: 2

Just unnerving that if we had done exactly as we were instructed and had not had traffic collision avoidance in our aircraft there is a good chance my student and I would not be here right now.

### **Synopsis**

Two instructors working together reported an NMAC on approach to DAB. Reporters were critical of ATC handling.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ESN.Airport State Reference : MD Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 13500

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 12000

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.TRACON : PCT Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Albatros (L39) Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : VFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : Direct Airspace.Class E : ZDC

## Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 4700 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 193 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 40 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1276810 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

## **Events**

Anomaly.No Specific Anomaly Occurred : All Types Detector.Person : Flight Crew Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

While at VFR cruise altitude at 13,500 on a VFR training flight to ESN we entered the area of within 60 NM of the DCA VOR. Specific training required by the DC SFRA rules requires a mandatory speed of no greater than 230 indicated airspeed which we did abide by while enroute within the defined area requiring the speed restriction. Once we landed at ESN we were informed to call the Potomac TRACON. On that phone call, we were advised that we were doing 310kts ground speed which was going too fast according the DC SFRA procedures. However, ground speed is not the same as indicated airspeed when citing a violation.

I actually agree with his statement that we were going that fast in Ground Speed. As 230kt indicated at 13,500 results in approximately 290kts true airspeed and with 15-25kts of tailwind as reported on my weather preflight I obtained via FLTplan.com to satisfy weather and NOTAM requirements of FARs. This would equate to an approximate value of 310Kts Ground Speed while still adhering to DC SFRA procedures of 230kt indicated while under VFR. Under this scenario there should be no need to document my actions as no procedures or FARs were broken regarding a speed violation.

In order to mitigate further confusion in the future, the rules can be rewritten in ground speed instead of indicated airspeed so both pilot in the air and radar controller supervising VFR flights within the area are on the same page when it comes to speed control. Another possibility could be a refresher to both pilots and controllers alike about the change in true airspeed vs indicated airspeed with the change in altitude, especially high VFR altitudes where 230kts indicated can look like close to 300kts under certain circumstances. Another option could be any VFR aircraft wishing to operate between 200-230kt indicated must be on Flight following inside the DCA 60NM ring in order to afford Potomac TRACON the ability to manage high speed aircraft not under IFR control so near the DC SFRA but not actually inside the DC SFRA boundary.

#### Synopsis

L39 pilot reported ATC questioned his speed in the DC SFRA and appeared confused about the difference between IAS and ground speed.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : BDN.Airport State Reference : OR Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 1 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

## Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : BDN Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Robinson R22 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Approach Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class G : BDN

## Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Sail Plane Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Mission : Personal Flight Phase : Initial Climb Airspace.Class G : BDN

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Rotorcraft Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 430 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 200 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 300 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1276781 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

# Events

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 60 Miss Distance.Vertical : 30 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action Result.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented

## Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

On Initial Approach to Bend Airport our Helicopter was making radio calls on CTAF (123.00) that we would be crossing mid field for a right downwind 34 (this is an established procedure that has not yet been put into the AFD) at one mile my student and I saw the glider under its own power (electric motor deployed) in the left downwind for 34. I instructed my student to turn left and cross behind the traffic. As soon as we started to do this the glider started to turn out to the west. I made a radio call to the glider specifically at this point and received no answer. I had my student turn more to the north to ensure that the glider would pass by our right. The glider continued to turn at our altitude toward us as we started to descend I made another radio call to the glider trying to talk to it. At this point I lost sight of the glider because my aircraft was obscuring it. I asked my student where it was at and he replied "he's right there he's still turning toward us." I allowed my student to continue to descend and was probably 200 FT AGL or less when I saw the glider appear over the top of my aircraft through the window installed on the top. The whole time we had been trying to turn in behind the glider who was obviously circling (obvious now) in the downwind without radios. When I saw the glider through the top window I took control and straightened out putting us in the left downwind. There was no tow plane as the glider was still under its own power. I know this because we passed near enough to hear the engine/prop.

## Synopsis

R22 instructor pilot experiences a NMAC with a powered glider in the BDN traffic pattern. The glider was apparently thermaling with no intent to land and was not using radios.

# ACN: 1276421 (29 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

### Aircraft

Reference : X Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 3 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Mission : Training Flight Phase : Parked

## Component

Aircraft Component : Propeller Blade Aircraft Reference : X

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1276421 Human Factors : Distraction Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Time Pressure

## **Events**

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Object Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : Taxi Result.General : Maintenance Action Result.Aircraft : Aircraft Damaged

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

I was flying with two students. We experienced an incident where the tow bar that is used to move the airplane on the ground was left on the nose gear, which made contact with the propeller during taxi to the parking area. We started the mission [early morning] for a dual cross country. After landing at Airport ZZZ1, we departed and flew to Airport ZZZ to finish the mission, refuel, and switch pilots. After landing at ZZZ we taxied to the ramp. I started thinking about the fueling procedure that had been demonstrated during standardization. I took over the controls as we neared the fueling station. I taxied past the station and had my student complete the shutdown checklist. After the shutdown and post flight inspection, I removed the tow bar from the baggage compartment and closed the baggage door. I positioned the tow bar pins into the nose gear and told my students that they were now allowed to walk to the restroom facility. I pushed the airplane back toward the fuel dispenser. Once the airplane was in position, I realized that there was a downward slope toward the fuel pump that was causing the airplane to slowly roll backward on its own when I released pressure from the tow bar. I decided to wait for my students to return to help me, but I became impatient and made the decision to continue by myself. I pulled the airplane about 10 to 15 feet away from the pump, and I decided I would release the tow bar and walk around to enter the cockpit to engage the parking brake before the airplane started to move backward on its own. After determining that I could walk around the wing and engage the parking brake without the airplane moving, I did this. I think this is the main decision that lead to the incident, because I did not remove the tow bar and place it into the baggage compartment like I have in the routine of my previous flights. I left the tow bar in place so that I could be sure to have enough time to engage the parking break before a gust of wind moved the airplane. I engaged the parking brake and exited the airplane. I started thinking about the fueling process at ZZZ because this was the first time I would refuel at ZZZ by myself. I completely forgot that I had not removed the tow bar after engaging the parking break. I then focused on the fueling process, attached the ground wire and paid for the fuel. My students returned and watched as I was pulling the fuel hose out for fueling. I fueled the left tank and as I was dragging the hose around the front of the airplane to fuel the right tank, I noticed the tow bar was still in the nose gear. But I decided to continue the fueling process and would remove the tow bar after fueling. After fueling the right tank, I dragged the hose around to the left side and asked my students to remove the grounding wire and tow bar. I then focused on retracting the hose and spent several minutes trying to figure out how to retract the grounding wire. I failed to check if the tow bar had been removed. During this time I asked my students to start getting ready for the flight. This is because I decided to re-position the airplane, shutdown, and push into a parking spot for the pre-flight checklist so that someone else could use the pump, although no one was waiting for us to move. I asked my students to enter the airplane and put their headsets and seatbelts on. I entered the airplane and as my Student X was completing the briefing, I put my seatbelt and headset on. After the engine was started, I took the controls to make sure we would safely taxi away from the fueling area, and I planned to turn right toward the parking spots and shutdown, and have Student Y practice pushing the airplane back. I taxied the airplane and turned right. We taxied about 30 feet and when I started heavy braking, I heard several knocking noises. I stopped and pulled the mixture knob to idle and shut the engine down, and electrical switches off. When I exited the airplane, I discovered that the tow bar caused the noise as the propeller made contact with the tow bar. I called dispatch for instructions and they told me to park the airplane in a spot and tie it down. After parking the airplane I

inspected the damage, and discovered a portion of the propeller and tow bar were missing. I began looking around the area for damage to the facilities, other airplanes, and the ramp surface, but did not discover any damage. I started thinking about the regulation of NTSB reporting of a separation of propeller blade. I believe the incident was caused by several small decisions and one major one, such as allowing the students to go to the restroom when I actually needed their help in the unfamiliar situation. Also deciding to continue to complete the process after realizing I needed help. The major decision that lead to the incident was not completing the preflight at the fueling station, and deciding to taxi away without completing at least a walk around. I am going to avoid a recurrence of this event by making sure the tow bar has been removed and placed in the baggage compartment when the tow bar is no longer required. I will complete the entire pre-flight checklist personally before any operations. I will utilize the help from my students whenever possible if it will increase the safety of operations rather than detract from it. I will attempt to identify lack of alertness during all operations, and maintain 100% focus during operations. If I believe that I am not performing at 100% at any time, I will discontinue the mission regardless of the impact on my flight schools operations. I will take measures to constantly be asking myself what I should be doing to maintain safety, asking what else I need to be doing other than specified by checklist, and determining if I have completed all of the required tasks for safe operations. Especially during unfamiliar situations. I plan to restudy risk management methods and remain current.

## Synopsis

A flight instructor with 2 students became distracted and started the engine with the tow bar still attached to the nose landing gear of a Piper Cherokee, causing damage to the propeller.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : FXE.Airport State Reference : FL Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

## Environment

Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility: 10 Light : Daylight

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : FXE Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : VFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Route In Use : Direct

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Private Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 151 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 39 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 53 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1276092 Human Factors : Training / Qualification

# **Events**

Anomaly.Ground Excursion : Runway Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Loss Of Aircraft Control Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Object Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected.Other Result.General : None Reported / Taken

# Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

## Narrative: 1

In FXE I was cleared to land Runway 9, ATIS information reported wind from 110 degrees at 13 knots but during the approach the wind was pushing the airplane to the left of the runway centerline. A wind check was asked and tower reported that the wind was now coming from 140 degree, then a side slip was done to correct from the wind. The approach speed was faster than the established and the landing flare was made too soon which result in hard landing and high- speed taxiing. With the wind hitting the airplane from the right, I apply right rudder to remain in the centerline while waiting to slowdown the airplane and exit in the nearest taxiway. Clearly I used excessive rudder considering that the airplane was rolling faster than normal and that resulted in skidding to the right of the runway. There was an attempt of mine and my safety pilot to stop it but failed and the aircraft end up hitting a runway taxiway sign. This incident could have been avoided if I, as pilot in command, had decided to go around in the proper time.

## Synopsis

Cessna 172 pilot reported losing directional control after landing and hitting a taxiway sign.

## ACN: 1276051 (31 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

#### Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZZZ.ARTCC State Reference : US Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 7500

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 12000

## Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Center : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Corporate Make Model Name : Skylane 182/RG Turbo Skylane/RG Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : VFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : Direct Airspace.Class E : ZZZ

## Component

Aircraft Component : Air/Ground Communication Aircraft Reference : X Problem : Improperly Operated

## Person

Reference : 1 Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Corporate Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 795 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 21 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 795 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1276051 Human Factors : Time Pressure Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

# **Events**

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Other / Unknown Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Returned To Clearance Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

## Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Weather Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

While on VFR flight plan and using flight following with the Center controller, I requested an IFR clearance from an upcoming intersection to my destination airport as it was forecast to be mountain obscuration in clouds along a future segment of the flight. Center asked if I had an IFR flight plan on file and I confirmed I did not. He stated he could not help, but I could wait until I got to the next Center sector. I confirmed that I would do that as it was VFR. He then contacted me and said to "CONTACT Radio to file an IFR Flight Plan." I was surprised at that, but changed frequencies and contacted as instructed. FSS was also surprised when I asked for an IFR flight plan while in the air and suggested I ask ATC. I told him that ATC declined my request and told me to call FSS to file it. Given the fact that there is a delay in transmitting the IFR Flight Plan request to ATC, I had to file for a point farther along the route than preferred, but it appeared to be VFR for a good distance along the route. While finishing with FSS, I heard calls on the guard radio "My call sign" "Contact Center." I immediately changed frequency to Center and reported in. He seemed upset and instructed me to contact Center which I did immediately.

Since I have only one VHF radio on this aircraft, I was unable to contact FSS without going off frequency and should have clarified that with the Center controller, "did I have permission to leave the frequency and for how long?" Or I could have cancelled flight following, but I wanted the advisories to prevent conflict with other air traffic in the area. Apparently I was crossing into another Center sector and he needed to hand me off.

My confusion came from the "order" to CONTACT Radio. When I got an instruction to CONTACT another frequency from ATC, it felt like an "order." Obvious communication confusion with use of the terminology "CONTACT [frequency]"

Another point is that I could have filed an IFR flight plan for the later segment before the flight, but it was a training mission and I could not predict the time I would need it to start until after completing the training segment. Next time I'll do that with an estimated time and ask to pick it up while in flight. Lesson learned.

## Synopsis

Intending to file an enroute IFR flight plan, the pilot of a Cessna 182 misunderstood instructions from ATC to do so with Flight Service Station as an order to change frequencies. With only a single radio, this caused a loss of communication with ATC Center.

# ACN: 1276045 (32 of 50)

## Time / Day

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : BRD.Airport State Reference : MN

#### Environment

Weather Elements / Visibility : Haze / Smoke Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 2.5 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 2500

### Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : BRD Aircraft Operator : Government Make Model Name : Small Aircraft, High Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Climb Flight Phase : Takeoff Route In Use : None Airspace.Class E : ZMP

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Government Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 6000 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 65 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 3000 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1276045 Human Factors : Training / Qualification Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

#### **Events**

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Weather Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Ambiguous

#### Narrative: 1

The [G-1000] equipped [aircraft], with two pilots, arrived VFR at BRD after cancelling IFR during an instrument training flight. The aircraft was refueled while the crew ate. After paying for gas, the crew consulted foreflight via [the tablet] and found the field to be marginal VFR according to the flight condition indicators and the METAR. The crew then visited the restroom and headed out to the aircraft. During the pre-taxi check, the ASOS was tuned, but there was no audio and the XM weather was not yet downloaded to the G-1000 from the satellite. Another aircraft was observed flying to the northwest several miles away, so visibility and ceiling were not a problem. Taxi and pre-takeoff checks and procedures were normal. The aircraft departed via Taxiway C intersection on Runway 23. On climb-out, the non-flying pilot (NFP) zoomed out the [G-1000] MFD map from close-in taxiway depiction to 5 miles. At that point, the NFP noticed that the METAR flag on the BRD symbol was indicating IFR. The foreflight on the [tablet] was consulted again, and still showed MVFR; [foreflight uses a different indicator than the G-1000 avionics to indicate MVFR conditions]. Both pilots looked outside in several directions and determined the flight visibility to be 4 plus miles. Boats and cabins on Long Lake, over 3 miles to the northwest, could plainly be seen. Re-tuning the ASOS found audio giving 2-1/2 miles and 2,500 BKN to be the broadcast weather. Zooming out the G-1000 found all surrounding airports to be either MVFR or VFR. No other aircraft were in the area. One aircraft was on the ground in the arming/run-up area for Runway 16 but had not broadcast departure intentions.

The crew made sure there was sufficient visibility and ceiling to continue VFR and flew south into improving conditions. All airports along the route were reporting VFR.

This incident illustrates the differences that can occur among the numerous weather data sources. The difference may have been caused by delays in relaying, processing, and uploading/downloading weather through the various systems. While the ASOS should have been the primary reference, it was not producing audio at start-up. The frequency was confirmed to be correct.

This also demonstrates the conflict that often occurs between actual and reported weather. The aircraft spotted several miles northwest before takeoff showed the flight visibility and ceiling to be above minimums.

If we had either received the ASOS or had a rapid download from XM weather, we would have investigated the weather further and probably filed IFR out of BRD to cancel immediately south. This also highlights the age-old question of...does the pilot have the authority to over-rule conditions reported on ASOS (or other weather sources) at uncontrolled fields based on his personal observations. Everyone, including DE's, FAA FSDO personnel, instructors, pilots, etc...all interpret FAR 91.155 differently. Would we have over-ruled the ASOS or XM based on what we saw? I don't know...it wasn't an option this time, anyway.

# Synopsis

An instructor pilot reports departing BRD VFR and discovering airborne that the field is IFR. The tablet software showed VFR while the weather in the avionics (G-1000) showed IFR when zoomed out. The ASOS was not transmitting at departure time but later reported 2.5 miles visibility.

Date : 201507 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

## Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 10000

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Taxi

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : FBO** Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 300 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 100 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 100 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1276043 Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Fatigue

# **Events**

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Object Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : Taxi Result.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented Result.Aircraft : Aircraft Damaged

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

I was flying with two students. We started the mission for a dual cross country with [Student X] initially and we flew to Airport ZZZ1. After landing at ZZZ1, we departed and flew north to Airport ZZZ to finish the mission, re fuel, and switch pilots. After landing at ZZZ we taxied to the ramp. I started thinking about the fueling procedure that had been demonstrated during standardization.

I took over the controls as we neared the fueling station. I taxied past the station and had my student complete the shutdown checklist. After the shutdown and post flight inspection, I removed the tow bar from the baggage compartment and closed the baggage door. I positioned the tow bar pins into the nose gear and told my students that they were now allowed to walk to the restroom facility, after remembering [Student Y] indicated that he needed the restroom in flight. I pushed the airplane back toward the fuel dispenser. Once the airplane was in position, I realized that there was a downward slope toward the fuel pump that was causing the airplane to slowly roll backward on its own when I released pressure from the tow bar. I decided to wait for my students to return to help me, but I became impatient and made the decision to continue by myself. I pulled the airplane about 10 to 15 feet away from the pump, and I decided I would drop the tow bar and walk around to enter the cockpit to engage the parking break before the airplane started to move backward on its own. After determining that I could walk around the wing and engage the parking brake without the airplane moving, I did this. I think this is the main decision that lead to the incident, because I did not remove the tow bar and place it into the baggage compartment like I have in the routine of my previous flights. I left the tow bar in place so that I could be sure to have enough time to engage the parking break before a gust of wind moved the airplane.

I engaged the parking brake and exited the airplane. I started thinking about the fueling process at ZZZ because this was the first time I would refuel at ZZZ by myself. I completely forgot that I had not removed the tow bar after moving the airplane and walked past it. I then focused on the fueling process, attached the ground wire and paid for the fuel. My students returned and watched as I was pulling the fuel hose out for fueling. After fueling both tanks I retracted the hose and ground wire, and retrieved the receipt.

I decided to reposition the airplane, shutdown, and push into a parking spot for the preflight checklists so that someone else could use the pump, although no one was waiting for us to move. I asked my students to enter the airplane and put their headsets and seatbelts on. I entered the airplane and as [Student Y] was completing the briefing, I put my seatbelt and headset on. After the engine was started, I took the controls to make sure we would safely taxi away from the fueling area, and I planned to turn right toward the parking spots and shutdown, and have [Student X] practice pushing the airplane back. I taxied the airplane and turned right. We taxied about 30 feet and were next to the first parking spot when I heard several knocking noises, I stopped and pulled the mixture knob to idle and shut the engine down. I was thinking I forgot to remove the grounding wire as I turned everything off. When I exited the airplane, I discovered that the tow bar caused

the noise as the propeller made contact with the tow bar. I called dispatch for instructions and they told me to park the airplane in a spot and tie it down.

I believe the incident was caused by several small decisions and one major one, such as deciding to fly the mission while feeling slightly tired and fatigued. A normal amount at the end of a work week. And allowing the students to go to the restroom when I actually needed their help in the unfamiliar situation. Also deciding to continue to complete the process after realizing I needed help. The major decision that lead to the incident was not completing the preflight at the fueling station, and deciding to taxi away without completing at least a walk around.

### Synopsis

PA28 Instructor reports using the tow bar to position his aircraft at the fuel pump then forgetting to remove it before attempting to taxi. The propeller strikes the tow bar during taxi and the aircraft is shut down.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : OPF.Airport State Reference : FL Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1000

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility : Haze / Smoke Light : Daylight

## Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : OPF Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Airspace.Class D : OPF

## Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew. Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew. Commercial Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 700 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 250 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 700 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1274952 Human Factors : Situational Awareness

# **Events**

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 400 Miss Distance.Vertical : 400 When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Ambiguous

### Narrative: 1

Requested clearance for NW departure. Controller cleared us [for] takeoff. After receiving clearance, prior to departure, I asked if they wanted us to make left or right traffic. It is usually left traffic, but I wanted to be sure because they didn't say anything. They gave us a left downwind departure. So I made left traffic and once clear of the pattern (approach end), I turned NW. The controllers don't usually give us a frequency change, they just let us go to the practice area, and don't want to hear from us to request one. I usually monitor tower until way beyond the airspace so that I can hear who is coming in. I was almost clear of D airspace. I was explaining holding procedures to my student when I hear tower make a call for another airplane that belonged to the school I work for. I knew that plane was not up at that time so I was listening again in case they misidentified my call sign (completely different from the other plane they called) as often happens at this airport. They had in fact misidentified my callsign, and had not realized it. They were calling to point out traffic. I looked at my TCAS and it showed several airplanes in my area, so I started looking for the traffic. The TCAS is often unreliable, so I try to avoid using it as my primary traffic avoidance, particularly in busy airspace. This time it identified the traffic as 400 FT above me. I did not see it until it passed right over us, as it was a hazy day. Tower then yelled at me for flying along the final approach course for one of the other runways. I was merely following the departure procedure set by our school, while also trying to fly the clearance given to me. The incoming plane was very close and there was no time to avoid. Fortunately, there were a few hundred feet of separation. Had the controller correctly identified my callsign, I could have picked out the traffic sooner. They were also speaking to that incoming plane, and could have given them a vector to avoid us when we didn't respond--because they used the incorrect callsign for us.

# Synopsis

Cessna 172 instructor pilot reported an NMAC departing OPF airport.

# ACN: 1274931 (35 of 50)

## Time / Day

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 200

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

### Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : Cessna 170 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Final Approach Route In Use : None Airspace.Class G : ZZZ

## Component

Aircraft Component : Reciprocating Engine Assembly Aircraft Reference : X Problem : Failed

## Person

Reference: 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : Personal** Function Flight Crew : Instructor Function Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification. Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Air Traffic Control.Radar: 23 Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 10655 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 110 Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 19.7 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1274931 Human Factors : Training / Qualification Human Factors : Situational Awareness

## **Events**

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Critical Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Object Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Object Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action Result.Flight Crew : Landed in Emergency Condition Result.Aircraft : Aircraft Damaged

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Ambiguous

## Narrative: 1

Student's first lesson with second student in backseat. After 20 minutes of taxiing instruction, we departed the airport and flew for 20 minutes, remaining within 3 miles of the departure point. Returning to land, while on final, advanced power because aircraft was low and discovered the engine had lost all power. Aircraft was beyond gliding distance to the runway so made a 20 degree right turn and landed on a paved road located just to the right of extended runway center line. Had to cross a 7 foot high fence to make the road. Cleared the fence and subsequently stalled the aircraft between 10 & 15 feet. Made hard landing on center line of road. Road had a gentle curve to the right and I was unable to keep the aircraft on the road. Aircraft went off the road on the left side, struck a 6" pine log lying on the shoulder which pulled the aircraft further left. Aircraft left wing made contact with the 7 foot fence that paralleled the road. Wing tip then made contact about 12 inches inboard of wing tip with a large wooden fence post that caused the aircraft to ground loop to the left.

FAA investigation revealed a large quantity of water in the right tank & the gascolator was full of water. Subsequently discovered the right wing tank cap seal was bad. That and combination of recessed fuel caps and sitting outside for several days of rain showers explained the source of water. Extensive pre-flight of aircraft while giving 2 students instruction and drained all sumps. Did not notice that the "fluid" drained from the right wing was all water. (Over 16 ounces of water was drained).

This was my first flight in this aircraft for new owners and preflight was during a light drizzle from a rain shower that had just passed. I did not remove or examine the fuel caps as I did not want to allow the water trapped in the cap recess to get into the tank. I noticed that the "Fluid" from the right wing wasn't proper color but attributed this to auto fuel that had been used previously. Smelled the "fluid" and it had the odor of Auto fuel. Obviously, when I drained the fuel sampler, I didn't notice any water droplets remaining in the sampler. I did notice on the gascolator that the fuel was blue but still had an auto fuel odor. Oddly enough, when I drained the left tank, I intentionally caught water dripping off the flap to show the students what water looked like in a fuel sampler.

Lesson learned: If it ain't BLUE, don't fly. I never liked auto fuel in aircraft anyway. Although the engine stoppage was not due to auto fuel, I don't think I would have dismissed the fuel color had I not thought auto fuel was still in the tanks.

## Synopsis

Cessna 170 Instructor experiences engine stoppage beyond gliding distance from the airport and lands on a narrow road. A hard landing ensues and the aircraft cannot be kept on the road as it curves to the right and a fence post is struck with left wingtip.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : 3TE.Airport State Reference : MI Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 4000

## Aircraft

Reference : X Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Cessna 152 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing

## Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew. Commercial Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 640 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 81 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1274929 Human Factors : Other / Unknown Analyst Callback : Attempted

# **Events**

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Other / Unknown Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : Routine Inspection Result.General : None Reported / Taken

## Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Airport Primary Problem : Human Factors

# Narrative: 1

My student and I decided to fly to a local grass runway (7N4) for soft field takeoff and landing practice. Since the field looked a little wet, I decided to divert to an airport nearby (3TE, Tecumseh, MI, hard surfaced) to do a landing or two before heading back to the home airport. The possibility of a runway closure had not crossed my mind, and so we landed on RWY 18. On final approach for the runway, it was noted that the runway looked to be in rough shape. There were, however, no apparent markings denoting the runway closure, so we proceeded to land. Upon returning to Ann Arbor, I decided to look up the NOTAMS for 3TE (since the airport looked fairly run down), and discovered that RWY 18/36 had been closed as of June 2, 2015 until further notice. In order to avoid this type of situation in the future, it is my intention to more thoroughly acquaint myself with the airports of intended use, and all other airports in the vicinity, and include a NOTAM search for each of them.

# Synopsis

C152 Instructor with student reports landing on Runway 18 at 3TE and noting that the runway looked rough. Upon returning to home base the Notams are checked and it is discovered that Runway 18 at 3TE has been closed since early June.

# ACN: 1274927 (37 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

### Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Route In Use : Visual Approach

#### Person: 1

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Trainee Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 208 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 75 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1274927 Human Factors : Other / Unknown

#### Person: 2

Reference : 2 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 1210 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 110 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1274930 Human Factors : Other / Unknown

### Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe Anomaly.Ground Excursion : Runway Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Object Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Aircraft : Aircraft Damaged

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Ambiguous

### Narrative: 1

After cleared for the touch and go for Runway XX, I continued the approach. I requested a wind check and had a stabilized, normal landing. After touchdown, I had right rudder input to maintain directional control, however, the aircraft veered to the left, instructor also acted with right rudder input to confirm the input but the aircraft did not react and continued to veer off to the left. It resulted in us running over runway hold short sign for the intersecting runway. The aircraft came to a stop in the grass. As per procedure, we shutdown the aircraft and waited for fire and rescue.

#### Narrative: 2

We were coming in to do pattern work. When we were on final I contacted tower to confirm we were clear for the touch and go on runway XX. The student had the plane under control the whole way down then once we touched down the aircraft was going to the left. To correct the student was doing the right thing by putting in right rudder to bring it back to the right and center it up. Unfortunately the rudder inputs were not responding, so the aircraft keep going to the left and we went heading into the grass on the left side of runway. We ended up hitting the intersecting runway hold short sign and stopping a little after that. We shut down the aircraft and waited for fire and rescue to come over to us.

#### Synopsis

PA28 pilot under training experiences a normal landing with the aircraft drifting towards the left despite right rudder input by both the reporter and the instructor. A runway excursion occurs with the aircraft contacting an airport sign.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : LAF.Airport State Reference : IN Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight

## Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : LAF Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Cessna 152 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : VFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Taxi Route In Use : None

## Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Student Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 34 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 34 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 34 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1274926 Human Factors : Confusion

# **Events**

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway Detector.Person : Flight Crew Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control When Detected : Taxi Result.General : None Reported / Taken

## Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Airport Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

Cleared to land RWY 28 and exit via [Taxiway] B but the pilot incorrectly recognized the intersecting runway as [Taxiway] B and exited there.

# **Synopsis**

Cessna 152 student pilot reports being instructed by the Tower to exit on Taxiway B after landing, but mistakes the intersecting runway for Taxiway B.

## ACN: 1274923 (39 of 50)

#### Time / Day

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

### Aircraft

Reference : X Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Taxi Airspace.Class D : ZZZ

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Private Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 700 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 368 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1274923 Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Human Factors : Distraction Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Confusion Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

#### **Events**

Anomaly.Flight Deck / Cabin / Aircraft Event : Other / Unknown Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Taxiway Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 10 When Detected : Taxi Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

On an actual Instrument Airplane checkride with a DPE (Designated Pilot Examiner) in the passenger seat, I was PIC (Pilot in Command), the checkride had concluded and we landed back at ZZZ runway XY. The Tower issued the following clearance to me "Piper [callsign] left on Golf, hold short of taxiway Alpha, contact Ground point 7". I turned left on Golf and observed a high wing airplane fast approaching on taxiway Alpha, approaching me from my right, obviously the reason for the "hold short of taxiway Alpha" instruction. I brought the aircraft to a stop prior to taxiway alpha as instructed and switched to Ground frequency. In the position I stopped to give adequate clearance to the approaching aircraft, my aircraft was not completely clear of the runway entrance bars. The DPE shouted to me to clear the runway, apparently wanting me to nudge closer to the approaching aircraft. I believed he did not see the approaching aircraft since he had been looking down at his phone and I responded by saying that we were told to hold short of taxiway Alpha for the approaching aircraft. He said I have to clear the runway and took control of my aircraft from the right seat, which has no toe brakes, and jammed the throttle forward, sending us lurching towards the oncoming aircraft, which was now directly in front of us. He grabbed the parking hand brake to stop the airplane and gave control back to me. I contacted Ground and was told to taxi to transient parking, which I did and shut down the plane. I reviewed the aerial image of ZZZ intersection of Golf and Taxiway Alpha and reconfirmed to myself that the space for an airplane to be completely clear of the runway bars but short of Taxiway Alpha (no additional bars or markings to hold short at) and to be safely clear of a fast approaching high wing aircraft is inadequate. In the greatest interest of safety, the Tower should have told me to proceed to the next intersection to exit the runway, or advised me to remain on the runway until the aircraft passed, or coordinated with Ground Control to have the approaching aircraft on Taxiway Alpha stop for me to exit, given that the maneuver of clearing the runway but holding short of the taxiway is too tight there. Additionally, there are no bars or other markings at the edge of taxiway Alpha to properly indicate where an aircraft should stop, so it is impossible to know whether adequate clearance will be provided when an aircraft is holding short of taxiway Alpha at an imaginary hold short bar for an approaching aircraft on that taxiway. The airport should paint hold short lines or taxiway edge lines if they plan to continue squeezing aircraft in the area between the Runway XY clearance bars and the taxiway. Measurements should be taken to ensure an aircraft holding short of taxiway Alpha at Golf will not make contact with the overhanging wing of an approaching aircraft on taxiway Alpha. The actions of the DPE dramatically increased the probability of my aircraft crashing into the taxing aircraft and were dangerous and inappropriate. In my position as PIC, I determined it to be safer to have a portion of my aircraft still overhanging the Runway XY clearance bars rather than to approach another aircraft too closely. In this case, it would be appropriate for the Tower to have a departing aircraft wait for their takeoff clearance until I was able to completely clear, or an arriving aircraft to go-around, in the best interest of safety. The intersection of Golf and Taxiway Alpha should be studied and measured and consideration should be given to whether additional lines or markings or runway exit procedures should be implemented.

## Synopsis

Pilot did not adequately clear runway when given hold short of parallel taxiway instructions. Designated Pilot Examiner took control and taxied the aircraft forward which nearly created a conflict with an aircraft on the parallel taxiway.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

## Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : DA40 Diamond Star Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing

## Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Student Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 75 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 75 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 75 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1274913 Human Factors : Confusion Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

# **Events**

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Landing Without Clearance Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

Student cleared to land RWY 22R. Student read back "cleared to land 22R." Student expected to land on the RWY 22L. Student landed 22L. Student was given phone number to call tower. This's student solo mission.

## Synopsis

Student pilot reports being cleared to land Runway 22R after expecting to land Runway 22L. The clearance for 22R is read back but the student lands Runway 22L.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : DPA.Airport State Reference : IL Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

## Environment

Flight Conditions : Marginal Weather Elements / Visibility : Rain Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 2000

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Ground : DPA Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Taxi

# Person

Reference: 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : FBO** Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 580 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 100 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 200 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number : 1274183 Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Human Factors : Confusion Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew Analyst Callback : Completed

# **Events**
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : Taxi Result.General : None Reported / Taken

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Airport Primary Problem : Ambiguous

#### Narrative: 1

Aircraft taxiing eastbound to Runway 28 sometimes get issued taxi instructions as simply "taxi via Echo" instead of the full and seemingly proper "via Echo, Hotel", which is the complete taxi route. Failure to miss the turn at Hotel will immediately result in an aircraft entering Runway 33.

Because of this potential, I think the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) should issue such taxi instructions as "Via Echo, Hotel". It would be a very easy mistake for a solo student or non-local pilot to make. Additionally, the area in the vicinity of Runways 33, 28, and Taxiway Echo should be a hot spot because of the possibility of a runway incursion.

### Callback: 1

The reporter indicated that a clearance to cross or hold short of Runway 20R on Echo is being provided, and is not the area of potential confusion.

### **Synopsis**

A local pilot is concerned that ATC instructions that are incomplete or unclear may lead to a less experienced or unfamiliar pilot into a runway incursion.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : APC.Airport State Reference : CA Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2000

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 25 Light : Daylight

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Center : ZOA ATC / Advisory.Tower : APC Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : DA40 Diamond Star Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Approach Route In Use : Direct Airspace.Class D : APC Airspace.Class E : ZOA

# Person

Reference: 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : Personal** Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 8350 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 156 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 528 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1274179 Human Factors : Confusion Human Factors : Workload Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

### **Events**

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

#### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Ambiguous

#### Narrative: 1

Training an instrument student, we departed on an IFR clearance to APC. Due to a TFR to the west of APC, we requested the ILS 36L in order to remain clear of the TFR. The ATIS indicated runways 18L and 18R were in use. ZOA gave us direct FESAV and asked us to report established. Before reaching FESAV, ZOA informed us APC tower would not allow an opposite direction approach. I asked if we could track inbound on the localizer to the FAF (1.5 NM from the APC class D boundary) and break off the approach there. ZOA approved.

As we approached CIKPI, the FAF, I was about to tell my student to turn west when ZOA gave us several traffic advisories. I reported at least one aircraft in sight and we were abruptly told to squawk VFR and to contact the tower. I switched to the tower and said we'd been tracking the localizer inbound and requested a full stop landing. The tower told us to continue inbound, circle west for right traffic 18R, and to report circling. A bit stunned, I told my student to continue tracking the localizer. After 30 seconds or so, the tower told us to start our circle to the west and we complied.

We landed 18R, taxied clear and were told to contact ground. The ground controller gave us taxi instructions and asked me to call the tower by telephone. I called and identified myself as the instructor and gave my tail number. The person I spoke with told me I'd entered class D without making radio contact. I politely explained that our G1000 moving map showed us at least 1 mile outside the boundary and tried to explain the circumstances. The person interrupted me and lectured me about how the FAA does not allow opposite direction approaches. I tried to say that I understood that fact and that we'd planned to break off the localizer prior to entering class D, but the tower has instructed us to continue. However, the person kept talking and was clearly not interested in a dialog nor were they interested in hearing how they had contributed to the misunderstanding.

At one point, the line went silent and I asked if they were still there. The person said "Get your GPS checked" and terminated the conversation. My feeling was that the tower controller who instructed us to continue tracking the localizer was in training. I also got the impression that the coordination between ZOA and APC tower for our arrival had been inadequate or non-existent.

The traffic advisories right as the frequency switch was to take place also added to the confusion and increased my already high instructional workload. The last contributing factor is the FAA's poorly communicated policy about when and where opposite direction

operations are allowed.

As a professional instructor, I am appalled at the behavior and attitude of the tower employee with whom I spoke. Their lack of professionalism was truly astonishing. Their lack of interest in how their performance contributed to the issue shows a poor grasp of hazard and risk management.

# **Synopsis**

DA40 instructor is cleared to track the localizer Runway 36L at APC, but advised that the approach must be broken off outside the Class D as opposite direction approaches are not approved. Approaching the boundary, traffic is issued and a change to Tower frequency. The Tower issues instructions to circle west and land on Runway 18R, which is accomplished. The Tower believes the reporter entered the Class D airspace before contacting the Tower.

# ACN: 1273508 (43 of 50)

# Time / Day

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : PA-44 Seminole/Turbo Seminole Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class D : ZZZ

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : FBO** Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 3398 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 67 Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 191 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number : 1273508 Human Factors : Workload Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Confusion Human Factors : Distraction

# **Events**

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Unstabilized Approach Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.General : Maintenance Action Result.Flight Crew : Executed Go Around / Missed Approach Result.Flight Crew : Landed As Precaution Result.Flight Crew : Returned To Departure Airport Result.Aircraft : Aircraft Damaged

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

This morning I was on a routine training flight with a multiengine commercial student. We were working on [a] lesson, which is the last flight before the stage check and is a review of all of the maneuvers from the course. At the end of the flight, we were working through a simulated engine failure after lift-off. This means that we had taken off from 17L, and I had simulated an engine failure for her by retarding the throttle on the left engine at approximately 600 FT AGL. We flew the circuit around the traffic pattern with standard procedures, however the gear down had been delayed due to aircraft performance while flying on one engine. As a note, the gear warning horn sounds the entire time that the throttle is retarded below approximately 14" manifold pressure. So the gear warning horn had been sounding the entire time we were in the traffic pattern. As the student was coming in to land, I was focused on her directional control and runway distance being used during her flare.

As she rounded out and the aircraft started to settle, we began to notice it felt slightly lower than usual, and began to hear metal scraping noises at that time. When we heard the noise, the student released the controls and began screaming, "oh my gosh, oh my gosh!" With the airplane being in a nose-high attitude, we thought it was the tailskid and the bottom comm. antenna that were scraping and did not notice any reduced engine performance. Because the airplane had not settled, I took the controls the moment I heard the metal scraping noise and added power for a go-around. As we lifted off, there was no perceivable degradation in performance, so we continued to climb...assuming we had just scraped the tailskid or maybe a small aft portion of the fuselage. The moment the metal scraping noise stopped, there were no indications in the cockpit that there had been a propeller strike. There was no extra vibration and all instrument indications were otherwise normal.

I flew the airplane around the traffic pattern, ran the checklists as normal, verified all engine indications and landing gear down indications, and landed the airplane. We did not declare an emergency or require assistance since we did not initially suspect substantial damage and there was no perceivable degradation in performance. As I taxied back in I pulled directly up to the maintenance hangar and shutdown the airplane. It was as we reduced the power during shutdown that I noticed a color change in the tips of the propeller arcs and realized we had most likely struck the props. Upon shutdown, we exited the airplane and were met by mechanics to survey the damage.

During the damage survey, maintenance took photos and we discussed the event. I then proceeded to call the Tower to check in and see what we needed to do for them and provide any additional information they needed. From that point, Maintenance took control

of the aircraft and I proceeded, with the student, to our Department Chair's office to debrief the situation and initiate the necessary protocols for the school. While in their office, I double-checked NTSB 830 to verify that we did not require an immediate notification (which we did not), and then the student and I proceeded to Human Resources to accomplish the required drug screening.

# Synopsis

During a training flight with a simulated engine failure, the pilots neglected to extend the landing gear, but were able to go around after minimal contact with the runway. The gear warning horn sounded the entire time prior to the go-around as the throttle was retarded to simulate zero thrust.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : FRG.Airport State Reference : NY Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Ground : FRG Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Robinson R22 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Taxi

# Person

Reference: 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : FBO** Function.Flight Crew : Captain Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Rotorcraft Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 320 Experience Flight Crew Last 90 Days : 65 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 270 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number : 1273496 Human Factors : Situational Awareness Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

# **Events**

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control When Detected : Taxi Result.General : None Reported / Taken

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

The helicopter has one radio with two intercom mods:

 The hot mic, both occupants can freely talk and listen to the controller. However when one person is transmitting, the other can't hear what is transmitted.
The PTT mic, for which the occupants have to press a button in order to talk to each other. However when one person is transmitting a radio call the other can hear the transmission.

My student and I went for a flight with purpose to prepare him for his first solo. He was almost ready, so we agreed that he will do the radio communications today. We switched over to PTT mic for this initial call. On the ramp he called ground for taxi clearance. We were cleared to taxi and to hold short of the active Runway 19 at Bravo 3. The student had the controls and was taxiing to Bravo Taxiway and hold short of Runway 19.

Also we switched intercom mode back to "hot mic". We were holding at Bravo at the approach end of Runway 1 due to traffic at the nearby Bravo runup area and additional traffic on the Bravo taxiway. At this time the airport was very busy and a lot of planes arrived for touch and goes. After holding short at Bravo for a bit, Ground called us to taxi and to hold short at Bravo 3. However my student understood that we were cleared to cross the runway expeditiously - which I did not hear because of the hot mic setup - and he accelerated the helicopter quickly forward. At this time I was focused on the departing traffic on the runway. I was bewildered that he went forward and was also checking with the student about if we really got the clearance to cross. At this time we were already about half way across the runway and ground control told us that we were not cleared to cross the runway. I took the controls immediately and finished crossing to the other side to Golf taxi way to get off the active runway as fast as possible.

The ground controller informed us about a possible pilot deviation and we held short on Golf until we received the clearance to cross the Runway 19 back to the ramp. We decided to discontinue the flight. No further incidents occurred.

# Synopsis

R22 Instructor reported a runway incursion after a miscommunication between the student pilot and the Controller.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

# Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 17 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4500

# Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 7000

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.TRACON : ZZZ Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : PA-23-250 Aztec Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : VFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Climb Route In Use : Direct Route In Use : Vectors Airspace.Class E : ZZZ

# Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer Flight Phase : Climb Airspace.Class E : ZZZ

# Person: 1

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Trainee Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 224 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 32 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 13 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1273488 Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Human Factors : Confusion Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

### Person: 2

Reference : 2 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : Personal Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP) Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1273491 Human Factors : Confusion Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

# **Events**

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Excursion From Assigned Altitude Anomaly.Deviation - Track / Heading : All Types Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

# Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure Primary Problem : Procedure

# Narrative: 1

I went to take a multiengine checkride. After a thorough oral, my Designated Pilot Examiner (DPE) decided we would go fly. Upon contacting ground, we were told to contact clearance delivery. I contacted clearance delivery to get clearance out of the Class C airspace, telling them we wanted to be a north bound departure to do some maneuvers. After talking to ground to get a taxi to the active, we contacted tower to takeoff. We were cleared to climb out at 3,000 to the North. Upon reaching 3,000, we asked to climb to 4,500 where we would proceed to do our maneuvers. Here is where the confusion began. My DPE and I thought we were a VFR aircraft, while apparently, the Tower had filed and put us on an IFR flight plan. Once we were clear of the outer ring, we began a steep turn to the left. About a quarter of the way through, ATC called us and told us to fly a northerly heading. After turning to that heading, ATC asked us why we had deviated from our original heading, then proceeded to give us a possible pilot deviation. Later in the flight, again still thinking we were a VFR aircraft, we descended out of 4,500 to 4,000 to set up for some ILS approaches. Upon landing, we called the number we were given. He asked if I understood what we did wrong, which I said I sort of did. He explained what we did, and upon talking to him, we realized that the Tower had put us on an IFR flight plan, which we hadn't asked for.

For this flight, I was a multiengine student pilot on a checkride. After reaching the outer ring of that airport's Class C, my examiner told me to begin my steep turns. I complied and began doing them as he asked. Also, had we been told we were on an IFR flight plan, we would have never deviated from our heading. This whole incident was a just a big miscommunication as I previously stated. We thought we were a VFR aircraft receiving a clearance out of the Class C, not an IFR aircraft receiving an IFR flight plan out of the Class C.

I was told by approach that when we turned for our steep turn that put us close to another aircraft. We were never given a traffic advisory by ATC for the aircraft passing off to our left. Had we have known that traffic was going to pass us, we would have never initiated the turn. Also, if a small turn put two aircraft in proximity that makes it seem like tower/approach are releasing aircraft awfully close to each other.

Overall, this whole incident was just a big miscommunication between us, tower, and approach. Neither my DPE nor I meant for what happened today to happen.

### Narrative: 2

Departing and requested clearance to the North/Northwest for air work (which was for a Commercial Multiengine Land checkride), followed by 2 ILS approaches. When we were 11 miles from the airport (outside the Class C airspace), we initiated to begin our air work which started with a steep 360 degree turn to the left. Approach asked what we were doing, and then said that was a "pilot deviation", he did not clear us for air work. We were requested to phone ATC after out flight which the applicant did, who was the PIC on the flight. He was asked for his address & phone number and told he would be hearing from the local FAA office.

- 2 Important things:
- 1. We DID NOT request an IFR clearance from Clearance delivery.
- 2. We were outside the Class C airspace according to the Garmin 530 GPS.

### Synopsis

A pilot and his examiner took off with a clearance out of Class C and began Commercial licensing maneuvers. Unknown to the pilots, ATC had filed an IFR flight plan and threatened a track deviation violation.

# ACN: 1273473 (46 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

### Aircraft

Reference : X Make Model Name : Robinson R44 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Climb Route In Use : None Airspace.Class D : ZZZ

# Component

Aircraft Component : Main Rotor Aircraft Reference : X Problem : Malfunctioning

### Person

Reference: 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck **Reporter Organization : FBO** Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 5100 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 37 Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 4350 ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1273473 Human Factors : Troubleshooting Human Factors : Distraction Human Factors : Confusion

# **Events**

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.General : Flight Cancelled / Delayed Result.General : Maintenance Action Result.Flight Crew : Landed As Precaution

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft Primary Problem : Aircraft

### Narrative: 1

On a climb following the takeoff phase, an "unusual" vibration was felt. The pilot decided to land on the nearest safe area offering access to a road in order to determine its cause. Upon landing it was determined that both tip caps of the main rotor blades flew off. The pilot decided to cancel further flying until the caps were replaced and decided to have the passengers picked up by car and driven back to the airport of origin.

# **Synopsis**

Pilot executed a precautionary landing in a Robinson R-44 due to vibration. After landing, he determined that both rotor tip caps had flown off.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport State Reference : US Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling : CLR

# Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ Make Model Name : Cessna 180 Skywagon Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Landing Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class D : ZZZ

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Function.Flight Crew : Instructor Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor Qualification.Flight Crew. Commercial Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 6570 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 72 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 60 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1273241 Human Factors : Training / Qualification

# **Events**

Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Loss Of Aircraft Control Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Ground Strike - Aircraft Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Weather / Turbulence Detector.Person : Flight Crew When Detected : In-flight Result.Aircraft : Aircraft Damaged

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Weather Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

My student and I were conducting flight training in a tailwheel aircraft towards his Private Pilot Certificate. He has 60 hours of dual, including a solo flight, in the same aircraft. The winds at ZZZ were 130 degrees at 6 knots at the time and the runway in use was 18. My student landed and we performed a touch and go. We went around the pattern for our second approach and were cleared to land. After a short landing rollout, the airplane started to weather vane to the left towards the crosswind and he applied the right brake to stop the longitudinal rotation towards the side of the runway. The airplane continued to turn and more brakes were applied, causing it to nose over on the runway. The airplane came to a stop with a bent prop and cowling. We climbed out uninjured and waited for the emergency services to arrive. The airplane was recovered a short time later with no airframe damage.

# Synopsis

Cessna 180 instructor pilot reported his student lost directional control after landing and the aircraft nosed over, causing damage to the prop and cowling.

# ACN: 1272916 (48 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

#### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : FFZ.Airport State Reference : AZ Relative Position.Angle.Radial : 090 Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 8 Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 3700

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Light : Daylight

#### Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.Tower : FFZ Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Airspace.Class E : ZAB

### Aircraft : 2

Aircraft Operator : Personal Make Model Name : UAV - Unpiloted Aerial Vehicle Flight Plan : None Flight Phase : Cruise Route In Use : None Airspace.Class E : ZAB

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Student ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1272916

#### **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 150 Miss Distance.Vertical : 100 When Detected : In-flight

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

Flying the departure, at 3,700 feet over the RC superstition air park, I spotted a drone traveling northbound. I was traveling south east bound. It looked like a basketball, with vertical rotors. Was at approximately at 3,800 feet. Black in color. Reported to FFZ tower.

### Synopsis

PA-28 pilot reports a NMAC with a UAV at 3,800 feet approximately 8 NM east of FFZ.

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.Airport : JYO.Airport State Reference : VA Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1200

### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight

# Aircraft : 1

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.CTAF : JYO Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : IFR Mission : Training Flight Phase : Initial Climb Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class G : JYO

# Aircraft : 2

ATC / Advisory.CTAF : JYO Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer Flight Phase : Final Approach Route In Use : Visual Approach Airspace.Class G : JYO

# Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine Qualification.Flight Crew : Commercial Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 500 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 2 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 200 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1272664 Human Factors : Communication Breakdown Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

# **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Vertical : 500 When Detected : In-flight Result.General : None Reported / Taken

# Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

### Narrative: 1

Heard traffic make "8 mile call" when holding short. Thinking that 8 miles was more than enough time to safely turn cross-wind and allow traffic to enter downwind with spacing behind me. ADSB installed, no traffic warning and negative visual on the traffic. Other aircraft didn't provide any additional position updates after the 8NM call. Also loss of Situational Awareness (SA) on my part. I assumed he was listening, would make visual contact and enter the down-wind behind me. Turned crosswind at 900 MSL (TPH of 1200) and quickly received call asking if I saw incoming traffic. My reply was "negative" Other aircraft reported passing behind and 500 above my altitude. After that the other aircraft (Unknown type) which was mistake number 1 when I was holding short, slowed and entered downwind behind me.

Lack of SA on both pilots part caused near miss. I failed to determine aircraft type (I'm guessing it was a multi) and with that speed to cover the 8 NM. I wrongly assumed I had enough time and depart and turn crosswind. I also wrongly assumed traffic would enter the downwind behind me.

I decided to solo as I needed to regain day landing currency. Having not flown in a while I should have taken an instructor or second pilot as safety observer and second set of eyes and ears.

# Synopsis

C172 pilot hears traffic make an "8 mile call" on CTAF at JYO while they prepare to take the runway. Thinking 8 miles was plenty to takeoff and make a crosswind turn the C172 takes off and on turn to crosswind is told by pilot of the other traffic they were cut off by their crosswind turn. The aircraft entering the pattern slows and maneuvers behind the C172.

# ACN: 1272336 (50 of 50)

### Time / Day

Date : 201506 Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

### Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : P31.TRACON State Reference : FL Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2100

#### Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10 Light : Daylight Ceiling.Single Value : 12000

### Aircraft

Reference : X ATC / Advisory.TRACON : P31 Aircraft Operator : FBO Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172 Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1 Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91 Flight Plan : None Mission : Training Flight Phase : Cruise Airspace.Class E : P31

#### Person

Reference : 1 Location Of Person.Aircraft : X Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck Reporter Organization : FBO Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument Qualification.Flight Crew : Private Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 160 Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 70 Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 160 ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1272336

### **Events**

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC Detector.Person : Flight Crew Miss Distance.Horizontal : 0 Miss Distance.Vertical : 100 When Detected : In-flight Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

### Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors Primary Problem : Human Factors

#### Narrative: 1

Maneuvering at 1700' at the beach practice area SE of PNS / NUN, Pensacola approach controller issued a traffic alert 1nm to the north of my position at 1700'. I replied with 'Negativate contact call sign' and nothing else was mentioned. I climbed from 1700' to 2100', Traffic was spotted at my 11:30 no more than 100' above (Likely at 2200'). Controller was prompted with the near miss and claimed I hadn't reply to her traffic advisory. The other aircraft was a PA-28 and they didn't have us in sight. Classic high wing cessna below and low wing piper above, and a lack of the controller's input regarding both aircraft's decision to climb in order to avoid each other.

### Synopsis

C172 pilot reports a near miss southeast of PNS while talking to TRACON. C172 pilot, while looking for traffic, climbs to 2100 FT to avoid the PA28 traffic Controller advised was at 1700 FT. Aircraft miss each other by an estimated 100 FT.