

ASRS Database Report Set

Controller Reports

Report Set Description.....A sampling of reports from Air Traffic Controllers.

Update Number.....30.0

Date of UpdateApril 28, 2018

Number of Records in Report Set.....50

Number of New Records in Report Set50

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.

Linda 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: 1521080 *(1 of 50)*

Synopsis

ORD Tower Controller reported receiving a report from a departing B757 flight crew that they encountered wake turbulence after takeoff five miles in trail of an A330.

ACN: 1519181 *(2 of 50)*

Synopsis

BJC Controller in Charge (CIC) was also working Local Control did not notice that an arriving aircraft was aligned to land on the wrong runway.

ACN: 1518920 *(3 of 50)*

Synopsis

A Tower Controller reported they issued a departure clearance to the wrong aircraft due to similar sounding call signs from the same company.

ACN: 1515707 *(4 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZKC Controller reported a departure on the CHIEF7 SID navigating to KATTS instead of the published SID fix of CATTs. Both fixes are phonetically identical and very similar spelling.

ACN: 1515187 *(5 of 50)*

Synopsis

TPA Tower Controller reported two aircraft taxied on a closed portion of a taxiway that ground personnel did not mark with cones.

ACN: 1515186 *(6 of 50)*

Synopsis

LCH TRACON Developmental Controller reported vectoring an aircraft below the MVA.

ACN: 1515183 *(7 of 50)*

Synopsis

MIA TRACON Controller reported FLL Tower has a constantly practiced procedure of allowing aircraft to line up and wait while traffic is on a short enough final to require a go-around. They then have issued a takeoff clearance which creates a conflict on climbout.

ACN: 1514990 *(8 of 50)*

Synopsis

HUF Tower Controllers reported while training on Local, traffic did not comply with reporting instructions, which caused a conflict on final.

ACN: 1514691 *(9 of 50)*

Synopsis

ANC Tower Controller and three pilots reported that two aircraft were cleared to land on different runways with intersecting approach courses.

ACN: 1514683 *(10 of 50)*

Synopsis

ASE TRACON Controller reported that during training a Developmental descended an aircraft below the MVA.

ACN: 1514674 *(11 of 50)*

Synopsis

Two PBI TRACON Controllers reported receiving aircraft handoffs from another sector that were already in conflict.

ACN: 1514114 *(12 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZOA ARTCC Controller reported that while conducting training during a high volume, and complex period, a VFR pop-up was issued an IFR clearance below the MVA.

ACN: 1514112 *(13 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZDC ARTCC Controller reported being unable to provide separation to aircraft in conflict and subsequent approach clearance, due to limited radar and radio coverage in the area.

ACN: 1514103 *(14 of 50)*

Synopsis

LAX Tower Controller reported instructing an aircraft to lineup and wait, while another aircraft was on final approach. After a query from the flight crew, the Tower Controller promptly issued go-around instructions.

ACN: 1514099 *(15 of 50)*

Synopsis

BHM TRACON controllers reported an aircraft entered adjacent airspace without coordination after it's tag was dropped when splitting off combined positions.

ACN: 1514096 *(16 of 50)*

Synopsis

EUG TRACON Controller reported not issuing prompt corrective vectors, after an aircraft flew through the localizer and below the MVA.

ACN: 1513831 *(17 of 50)*

Synopsis

SAT TRACON Controller reported unsafe operations between aircraft landing Runway 13R and the nearby non-towered field 5C1.

ACN: 1513606 *(18 of 50)*

Synopsis

MWH Tower Cab Radar Controller In Charge reported a loss of separation after inadvertently descending an aircraft into another aircraft.

ACN: 1513344 *(19 of 50)*

Synopsis

SCT TRACON Controller reported observing a false radar target on a conflicting heading with traffic they were vectoring for an approach.

ACN: 1513018 *(20 of 50)*

Synopsis

PDX Tower Controller and an A320 Captain reported a traffic conflict on the Localizer due to VFR traffic at VOU.

ACN: 1512452 *(21 of 50)*

Synopsis

MCO Tracon Controller reported a pilot receiving VFR flight following refused to comply with ATC issued vectors for traffic.

ACN: 1512443 *(22 of 50)*

Synopsis

PDX Local Controller reported an air carrier on short final reporting close proximity to aircraft at an adjacent airport.

ACN: 1512437 *(23 of 50)*

Synopsis

ATC Controller in Charge reported observing the Local Controller not notice an aircraft in sequence fly underneath and overtake landing traffic.

ACN: 1512436 *(24 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZAN Center Controller reported being overwhelmed with traffic and coordination while working combined sectors even after having making multiple requests for assistance.

ACN: 1512415 *(25 of 50)*

Synopsis

SRQ Tower Controller reported observing an aircraft land on a taxiway parallel to the assigned runway.

ACN: 1512167 *(26 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZOA Center Controller reported that an aircraft on the SUUTR TWO arrival missed a crossing restriction, creating a direct conflict with another aircraft on the DYAMD THREE arrival.

ACN: 1512163 *(27 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZSE controllers reported issuing a pilot the lowest MIA available, at pilot's request. The pilot later questioned assigned altitude while descending below the MIA, causing a lower altitude alert.

ACN: 1510842 *(28 of 50)*

Synopsis

Center Controller reported the Radar Controller issue a direct clearance to an aircraft below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude.

ACN: 1510828 *(29 of 50)*

Synopsis

GSP TRACON Controller reported a loss of separation after a nearby Tower allowed a VFR aircraft to fly towards the FAF for GSP approaches.

ACN: 1510818 *(30 of 50)*

Synopsis

EUG TRACON Controller reported issuing vectors that resulted with an aircraft flying below the Minimum Vector Altitude.

ACN: 1510799 *(31 of 50)*

Synopsis

HPN Tower Controller and Gulfstream flight crew reported an altitude overshoot and airborne conflict when the flight crew responded to a windshear warning.

ACN: 1510565 *(32 of 50)*

Synopsis

TRACON Controller reported vectoring an aircraft below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude due to distraction.

ACN: 1510560 *(33 of 50)*

Synopsis

A Tower Local Controller and Supervisor reported an aircraft took off from a taxiway instead of a runway.

ACN: 1510031 *(34 of 50)*

Synopsis

BOI TRACON Controller reported vectoring an aircraft into a higher MVA after the aircraft was unable to climb fast enough.

ACN: 1510024 *(35 of 50)*

Synopsis

Tracon Controllers reported the Developmental commanded an aircraft to descended below the MVA.

ACN: 1510022 *(36 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZOA Controller and air carrier First Officer reported the aircraft was issued a descent clearance too late to comply with a crossing restriction which caused a conflict with other traffic.

ACN: 1509716 *(37 of 50)*

Synopsis

ALB TRACON Controller reported an aircraft that checked in climbed to the wrong altitude and received a terrain alert.

ACN: 1509150 *(38 of 50)*

Synopsis

ASE Tower Controller reported than an aircraft landed in the grass parallel to the runway.

ACN: 1509149 *(39 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZNY Controller reported receiving a wake turbulence report from an A320 flight crew. Wake may have come from a B777 that was 15 miles ahead of the A320.

ACN: 1509121 *(40 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZAB Center Controller reported vectoring an aircraft without knowing the aircraft's altitude, which may have been below the Minimum IFR altitude.

ACN: 1508881 *(41 of 50)*

Synopsis

Tower Controller reported poor quality connection on the crash phone, and no one taking responsibility to repairing it. Controller also cited a need for training on coordination procedures to the downtown Sioux City response, or eliminated from tower line.

ACN: 1508871 *(42 of 50)*

Synopsis

ATL Tower Controller reported working combined positions during a busy period while the unqualified Operations Manager performed some of the Clearance Delivery duties.

ACN: 1508868 *(43 of 50)*

Synopsis

A TRACON Controller reported assigning an aircraft an altitude below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude.

ACN: 1508637 *(44 of 50)*

Synopsis

SPI TRACON Controller reported an aircraft on final approach slowed unexpectedly causing them to have insufficient spacing on final.

ACN: 1507558 *(45 of 50)*

Synopsis

NCT TRACON Controller reported accepting a point out on an MRY departure, which conflicted with an SJC arrival. The reporter attributed this incident to an expectation bias, fellow Controller's inexperience, and a heavy workload of a combined sector.

ACN: 1507557 *(46 of 50)*

Synopsis

MLI Approach Controller reported ATC denied the request of an arriving Heavy jet for the longest runway to reduce a possible departure delay for Wake Turbulence requirements.

ACN: 1507556 *(47 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZTL ARTCC Controller reported that the combination of control positions during complex phases, and the need to compensate for inadequate staffing, were the primary factors that led to an airspace violation.

ACN: 1507548 *(48 of 50)*

Synopsis

ZOB ARTCC Controller reported that management allowed under staffing against facility operations requirements, consequently compromising safety.

ACN: 1507547 *(49 of 50)*

Synopsis

SCT TRACON Controller reported an aircraft restricted to 6,000 feet received a TCAS/RA and climbed for a VFR aircraft above it at 6,500 feet.

ACN: 1507535 *(50 of 50)*

Synopsis

D10 Developmental Approach Controller reported receiving a handoff of an aircraft that was on a conflicting path with the adjacent sector's traffic.

Report Narratives

Time / Day

Date : 201802
Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ORD.Airport
State Reference : IL
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1300

Environment

Light : Night

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.Tower : ORD
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : A330
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 129
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Climb
Airspace.Class B : ORD

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower : ORD
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : B757 Undifferentiated or Other Model
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Initial Climb
Airspace.Class B : ORD

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : ORD.Tower
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Local
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1521080

Events

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Wake Vortex Encounter
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.General : None Reported / Taken

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

[A330] heavy departed 28R full length followed by [B757] departing 28R full length. [B757] reported a wake turbulence event off the departure end with no issues. [A330] was more than 5 miles for proper wake turbulence separation. Event was reported to on duty supervisor with no further incident.

Synopsis

ORD Tower Controller reported receiving a report from a departing B757 flight crew that they encountered wake turbulence after takeoff five miles in trail of an A330.

Time / Day

Date : 201802

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : BJC.Tower

State Reference : CO

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : BJC

Aircraft Operator : Personal

Make Model Name : Small Aircraft

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : VFR

Mission : Training

Flight Phase : Landing

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Route In Use : VFR Route

Airspace.Class D : BJC

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : BJC.Tower

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Supervisor / CIC

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1519181

Human Factors : Confusion

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Training / Qualification

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Distraction

Analyst Callback : Attempted

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Track / Heading : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Company Policy
Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors
Contributing Factors / Situations : Staffing
Primary Problem : Staffing

Narrative: 1

I reached out to Aircraft X who was switched to my new tower frequency. The student pilot acknowledged he was on frequency and I gave him instructions to make a right turn after landing, and to "change to Runway 30L cleared to land." The reason for the right turn was to protect for helicopter traffic operating on the taxiway to the left of Runway 30L. I believe the pilot read back my instructions correctly.

I turned my scan to check the position of the helicopter and the other fixed wing aircraft in my pattern and began to sequence the fixed wing aircraft to follow Aircraft X. As I issued the position of Aircraft X as being "1/2 mile final," I realized something was wrong because Aircraft X did not appear in the right position. I suddenly realized he was touching down on Runway 30R and alerted the other controller.

The Local 1 controller immediately sent around jet traffic on final for Runway 30R and the pilot made the go around prior to the runway threshold. The instructor in Aircraft X began asking if he was cleared for a touch-and-go, to which I responded that it appeared he landed on Runway 30R, to cancel his takeoff, and to exit at Taxiway B and advise Ground Control of his intentions. The instructor acknowledged.

Aircraft X called once again to request taxi clearance, and I coordinated with Ground Control to taxi him, issuing him the Brasher warning. The instructor acknowledged, said he'd switch to Ground Control. I continued to scramble on Local 2 to receive additional aircraft that were shipped to me for arrival to Runway 30L, along with doing my best to provide watch supervision as the CIC (Controller in Charge). The controller in training at Ground control helped me with some of the watch supervision tasks, such as handling internal and outside calls to the tower cab. Later on, the pilot called the facility promptly and was transferred to personnel downstairs to discuss the event. He was reportedly very apologetic and seemed well aware of the wrong runway landing. The other controller that took his call advised they had a positive and productive conversation.

This event took place during a busy rush with high volume and complexity and was a "squeeze play" to get Aircraft X across the Local 1 final. Controller expectation bias played a role here, as I watched the aircraft appear to cross the Runway 30R final before I turned my attention to the other aircraft in my pattern. In my scan, I did not see in time that the aircraft instead lined up for the wrong runway. Local 1's awareness and swift action was commendable in response to the event. I believe the lesson here is continue to stay vigilant and keep scanning and watching for things that may be out of place.

Pilot expectation bias may have also occurred here, as the aircraft was originally sequenced to Runway 30R and then changed over to Runway 30L. Being issued a new tower frequency on the base leg can definitely increase the pilot's workload at a critical time and it might be more desirable to have the aircraft remain on downwind while making that frequency change in the future, if feasible. In fact, there is a work group reviewing these kinds of issues right now. The work group is expected to develop some best practices for the use of Local 2 and more standardized procedures to issue frequency changes and split the two Local positions. I have provided some input to date and eagerly await their findings. In the long run, their work will help provide a more standardized and less chaotic approach to splitting our Locals, which should ultimately enhance safety of the

operation.

Additional staffing that afternoon, even one more controller, would have allowed the CIC/Supervisor position to be worked stand alone in the cab, split from Local 2. During good weather our traffic numbers should reflect that on this day, afternoon rush is fairly common. Having an additional set of eyes in the cab might have spotted Aircraft X line up for the wrong runway sooner, allowing faster corrective action to be taken. Traffic is up significantly in recent months, yet we are continuing to work many shifts with limited staffing or where the Supervisor and/or controllers in training are used for coverage. Better staffing and/or watch supervision in the future would help ensure improved oversight of the operation during peak traffic periods and should also help ensure we have the resources to effectively train our newer controllers.

Synopsis

BJC Controller in Charge (CIC) was also working Local Control did not notice that an arriving aircraft was aligned to land on the wrong runway.

Time / Day

Date : 201802

Local Time Of Day : 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : BUR.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : BUR

Make Model Name : Commercial Fixed Wing

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Takeoff

Flight Phase : Taxi

Route In Use : None

Airspace.Class C : BUR

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : BUR.TOWER

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1518920

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Human Factors : Confusion

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Person : 2

Reference : 2

Location Of Person.Facility : BUR.TOWER

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1518914

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Human Factors : Confusion

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Air Carrier XYZ called for taxi instructions. I taxied the aircraft to the runway. When I passed the strip to Local Control, I passed Air Carrier AYZ. Air Carrier AYZ got released by TRACON. The Local Controller using the callsign Air Carrier AYZ put Air Carrier XYZ into position on the runway and then subsequently cleared Air Carrier XYZ for takeoff using the callsign Air Carrier AYZ. The Pilot of Air Carrier XYZ responded to Air Carrier AYZ each time and began using that callsign as well. After the aircraft got airborne he tagged up as Air Carrier XYZ and then we realized what had happened.

Narrative: 2

[Report narrative contained no additional information.]

Synopsis

A Tower Controller reported they issued a departure clearance to the wrong aircraft due to similar sounding call signs from the same company.

Time / Day

Date : 201802

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZKC.ARTCC

State Reference : KS

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 36000

Environment

Light : Daylight

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZKC

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Medium Large Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Flight Phase : Climb

Route In Use.SID : CHIEF7

Airspace.Class A : ZKC

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZKC.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1515707

Human Factors : Confusion

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure

Primary Problem : Airspace Structure

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was a MCI departure enroute [westbound] and the aircraft was slightly off route. I asked the pilot what fix they were navigating towards and they told me they were issued direct CATTs. There was a pause and the pilot spelled the fix and said KATTs. The flight plan had both fixes, CATTs which is on the standard departure out of MCI and used daily and the other fix KATTs which was much further down in the flight plan. The issue was resolved quickly and without incident.

Recommend maybe a little more clarification from the pilot when two identical sounding fixes are in the flight plan to ensure that everyone is on the same page. Or a slight change in the spelling of fixes that are sounding identical.

Synopsis

ZKC Controller reported a departure on the CHIEF7 SID navigating to KATTs instead of the published SID fix of CATTs. Both fixes are phonetically identical and very similar spelling.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : TPA.Tower
State Reference : FL
Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.Tower : TPA
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : Commercial Fixed Wing
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Taxi

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower : TPA
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : Commercial Fixed Wing
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.Facility : TPA.Tower
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Ground
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 0.5
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1515187
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Human Factors : Confusion
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Taxiway
Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Other / Unknown
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : Taxi
Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working ground control when an airport vehicle called me on ground control frequency that the earlier construction on a taxiway was not completed sufficiently. [Airport Operations vehicle] informed me they needed to close a portion of the taxiway for approximately 2 hours. [Airport Operations vehicle] did not set up cones to show the closure. I informed clearance delivery to show the closure on the ATIS. Aircraft X was taxiing into the gate via the and I amended the taxi instructions. I turned my attention to several other taxiing aircraft when [Airport Operations vehicle] called on frequency to tell me Aircraft X taxied through the closed portion of the taxiway. I asked [Airport Operations vehicle] if they were going to set up cones at the closure. [Airport Operations vehicle] told me they would make a call. The next aircraft given taxi instructions near the closure was Aircraft Y aircraft. I informed Aircraft Y where to taxi and enter the ramp. I verified with Aircraft Y to where enter the ramp due to a portion of their taxiway closed. I saw Aircraft Y taxi a bit fast and let him know he needed to make the right turn in. Aircraft Y taxied through the closed portion of the taxiway. I called [Airport Operations vehicle] on ground frequency again to inform him we needed cones for the taxiway closure.

Over the past few months, the airport has closed multiple taxi ways, as well as one runway. We have not had both of our main runways for months. The facility management and the airport authorities are not communicating well and it is causing some very serious unsafe situations. I recommend a better working relationship and suggest a more sufficient process in closing portions of the airport. The closures are inconsistent and random. It is unsafe. The closures should be done at a time when traffic volume has decreased, or during the night when operations are fewer.

Synopsis

TPA Tower Controller reported two aircraft taxied on a closed portion of a taxiway that ground personnel did not mark with cones.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : LCH.TRACON

State Reference : LA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2000

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : LCH

Aircraft Operator : Government

Make Model Name : Fighter

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Training

Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : Runway 15

Flight Phase : Initial Approach

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class D : LCH

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : LCH.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Developmental

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1515186

Human Factors : Training / Qualification

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure

Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1

I was working approach control, vectoring Aircraft X on extended vectors for an opposite direction practice ILS approach, awaiting a departure to get airborne. When I saw that Aircraft X who was going extremely fast on his vector was getting close to an obstruction I turned him to avoid the obstruction clearance ring and he barely clipped the ring itself due to his wide turning. The minimum vectoring altitude over the obstruction is 2,300 ft and Aircraft X was at 2,000 ft and he was still 3 miles from the obstruction itself and higher than the obstruction. I should be quicker with turning a fast mover considering they make horribly wide turns.

Synopsis

LCH TRACON Developmental Controller reported vectoring an aircraft below the MVA.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : MIA.TRACON

State Reference : FL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1500

Environment

Light : Night

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : FLL

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Large Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Landing

Airspace.Class C : FLL

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Tower : FLL

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Large Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Landing

Airspace.Class C : FLL

Aircraft : 3

Reference : Z

ATC / Advisory.Tower : FLL

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Commercial Fixed Wing

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Airspace.Class C : FLL

Aircraft : 4

Reference : A
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : MIA
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : Commercial Fixed Wing
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Initial Approach
Airspace.Class C : FLL

Aircraft : 5

Reference : B
ATC / Advisory.Tower : FLL
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : Commercial Fixed Wing
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Takeoff

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : MIA.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 2.2
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1515183
Human Factors : Workload
Human Factors : Training / Qualification

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Executed Go Around / Missed Approach

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

To start off I just want to say it involves an unsafe situation/event with the aircraft but also a safety issue with the constant actions and mentality of the controllers at the facility.

Starting with the event, Aircraft Z was one of four aircraft on final to Runway 28R at FLL. The aircraft order on final is as follows: Aircraft X, Aircraft Y, Aircraft Z and Aircraft A (Aircraft A is the last aircraft for a good 20 miles). All aircraft are instructed to maintain 170 knots until a 5 mile final. When Aircraft X drops off my scope there is 4.5 miles between him and Aircraft Y who is slowing because they are just inside a 5 mile final. We have a display (PASSUR) at the left of the positions that show the ground radar at FLL so we can see taxiing traffic and give gaps when necessary (I will note not all controllers do this). When I glanced at the display I noticed one aircraft taxiing and one waiting out there as Aircraft X is short final, but that would be the gap to hit. When Aircraft Y drops off the scope there are 3.5 miles between him and Aircraft Z with a slightly faster speed so it is still compressing. When Aircraft Z is on about a mile to half mile final I notice he is at 300 feet and starting a climb. At this point Aircraft A is 3.6 miles behind Aircraft Z and no one is behind Aircraft A. I look at the PASSUR screen to see if Aircraft Y was stuck on the runway or didn't clear, but what I saw was a departure rolling down the runway. Not only am I baffled as to why, but now I'm worried because Aircraft Z is straight out climbing and here pops up Aircraft B a half mile in front of him climbing same heading and about 600 feet apart and closing. I know the Tower can provide visual separation, but they did nothing [to] turn Aircraft Z or Aircraft B until the departure end when the collision alert is going off because Aircraft Z is speeding up and Aircraft B climbs into them. This is completely unsafe and shouldn't have happened.

The safety issue is with FLL and the mentality they have there that lead to this incident and multiple others that have happened before this. It is a well-known fact that the controllers at FLL have the idea of if I have a departure and no gap I'll just clear them for takeoff or line up and wait and send the next one around. This happens constantly and has become what I believe is the normal thinking for them and they just do it as seen above. They are constantly putting aircraft in gaps that can easily be seen as not big enough for a departure. All it takes is one stuck mike, radio failure or miss applied go-around procedure for a major accident to happen. When they are busy they have asked us to give them 5 miles between arrivals which we do, but how do [you] need 4-5 miles for a departure and yet put an aircraft in a 3.5 mile and closing gap. The mindset of these controllers is negligent and this is a major safety issue. They are going to get someone killed.

We have two runways at FLL and try to balance it as best as we can. We do have a best operating practice, that in times of busy traffic to send certain arrival gates to certain runways, but most of the time it is not a balanced arrival push so one runway gets hit more if you follow it. To not follow it (and balance the traffic to suit our needs) draws attention of certain supervisors who then yell and force you to do it. We also use 5 miles and 170 knots when we can to help them, but it is not always possible when we get so strung out. They are supposed to balance the departures between the two runways which is not always followed as well. We both need to balance the traffic better, in-air and on the ground. But this mentality of lock and load and go around has to stop. This has been going on for months now and it is getting worse, and for safety I cannot in good conscience let this continue without something being said.

Synopsis

MIA TRACON Controller reported FLL Tower has a constantly practiced procedure of allowing aircraft to line up and wait while traffic is on a short enough final to require a go-around. They then have issued a takeoff clearance which creates a conflict on climbout.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : HUF.Tower

State Reference : IN

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : HUF

Make Model Name : Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : VFR

Mission : Personal

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Airspace.Class D : HUF

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Tower : HUF

Make Model Name : Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : VFR

Mission : Personal

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Airspace.Class D : HUF

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : HUF.Tower

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Developmental

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514990

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Human Factors : Training / Qualification

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Person : 2

Reference : 2
Location Of Person.Facility : HUF.Tower
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Local
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 6
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1515190
Human Factors : Training / Qualification
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was told to "make straight in for Runway 14 and report a 3 mile final." There was an aircraft in left closed for 14 turning base when Aircraft X reported a 3 mile final. In reality, they were around a 1.5 mile final. I cleared Aircraft X for stop and go and then gave them a right 360 for spacing after realizing how close they were to the traffic on left base. Upon coming out of the right 360 they said "verify that Aircraft X is cleared to land." I went back and said "Aircraft X Runway 14, cleared to land." Once they were on the ground I gave them taxi instructions and they proceeded to say "Aircraft X is a stop and go." I then gave them a pattern entry. The pilot did not comply with the instruction that was given. Not sure what you can do to change that.

Narrative: 2

I was providing OJT on the Local position during TRACAB Operations. We had 4-6 aircraft on frequency and were working ground control and flight data. Aircraft X was joining the traffic pattern straight in. We observed Aircraft X and Aircraft Y were going to be a conflict due to compression on final, and my Developmental issued a right 360 to establish proper spacing. His sequence and plan should have worked. During the debrief we watched the falcon replay and saw that Aircraft X and Aircraft Y had an [approximately] 40 knot speed difference. We could not see this when it happened due to working TRACAB Operations. During discussion my Developmental knew how to handle this had we seen the speed difference. If the speeds were matched we would have had plenty of room and the sequence would have worked as planned. During TRACAB Operations we do not have access to the Center Radar. Approach Control is using it to work the airspace on a 60 mile range.

Open the TRACON before someone gets killed! It is less safe to work TRACAB Operations due to "staffing" than it is to have the TRACON open. It is not fair to expect our Developmentals to learn how to do this job with only half of their tools available. Our facility is sick. We have something worse than just a lack of safety culture. We willingly and knowingly schedule staffing so low that we cannot open the TRACON. We have Developmentals who have been in the building for over a year and have never seen the TRACON open. This is messed up.

Synopsis

HUF Tower Controllers reported while training on Local, traffic did not comply with reporting instructions, which caused a conflict on final.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ANC.Tower

State Reference : AK

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : ANC

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Commercial Fixed Wing

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Landing

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Airspace.Class C : ANC

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Tower : ANC

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Commercial Fixed Wing

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Airspace.Class C : ANC

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ANC.Tower

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 6

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514691

Human Factors : Distraction

Person : 2

Reference : 2
Location Of Person.Aircraft : X
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
Reporter Organization : Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew : First Officer
Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 2700
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 200
Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 680
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1515281
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Person : 3

Reference : 3
Location Of Person.Aircraft : X
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
Reporter Organization : Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew : Captain
Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1515282
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Person : 4

Reference : 4
Location Of Person.Aircraft : Y
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
Reporter Organization : Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew : First Officer
Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1515528
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure

Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1

I was working LC and in the process of giving a relief briefing to the next controller. The wind was strong out of the north and we had aircraft landing runway 7L, 7R and 33. Aircraft X was on a mile final for RY 7L and Aircraft Y was on 1.5 mile final RY33 doing a visual approach. I asked Aircraft Y if he would be able to pass behind Aircraft X and the pilot said he wasn't sure if he could. I knew it was going to be very close but I decided to watch the situation closely and allow Aircraft Y to continue his approach to RY33. I observed Aircraft Y pass directly behind the now landed Aircraft X on RY7L.

The position relief was a distraction from this close sequence and there was extra noise from people starting their shift. If I had realized the development of the situation sooner I could have asked the Aircraft Y to do an S turn through final to ensure more separation.

Narrative: 2

I was the First Officer and Pilot Flying. We were cleared for a visual approach to runway 7L. After issuing our clearance, ATC then cleared Aircraft Y for a visual approach to runway 33. ATC did not specifically indicate which aircraft was number one to the field. However it was, in my opinion, implied that we were number one as our clearance was issued first and we were lined up for a final to 7L. Aircraft Y maneuvered behind us to enter a downwind/base for runway 33. Once we switched to tower we were cleared to land 7L. Aircraft Y then checked in and was cleared to land 33. On short final to 7L tower advised Aircraft Y to reduce speed so as to not overtake us landing on 7L. They replied that they may be unable. At this point it became apparent of how close they were to landing on 33, and we were then committed to land on 7L for any attempt to make a go around would've placed us in an even more hazardous situation. Our mains touched down as Aircraft Y passed several hundred feet over us. Both aircraft landed without further incident. At the end of our duty day our Dispatch asked the Captain of my flight to contact the ANC Tower. They had a brief discussion of the event, and Tower indicated that they had reviewed their tapes and discovered that they had not instructed either aircraft as to which should be first. They felt that they could have sequenced us both better and would review the event to prevent it from occurring in the future. In conclusion I do not feel that my aircraft violated any regulations nor did we violate an ATC instruction. I am submitting this report in order to communicate the event to hopefully prevent this from occurring in the future.

Narrative: 3

Cleared for a visual approach to 7L and received, "cleared to land", from ANC tower with a caution about Aircraft Y who was going to 33. I found the caution odd because I was able to locate Aircraft Y high in our 8 o'clock passing above and behind us. I reported the traffic in sight above and behind us. We proceeded configured and stabilized to the runway. My expectation was that the tower would sequence Aircraft Y behind us since we were cleared to land and straight in to 7L versus above and behind on a downwind to intersecting runway 33. On very short final I again noticed Aircraft Y, now on short final for 33. I was surprised, and said as much to the first officer who was doing the landing. After we were on the runway Aircraft Y passed over or slightly behind us. In my opinion there was a decided lack of direction from the tower as to the sequence, however, I was not aware of the pending conflict until a go around was no longer an option. It's hard for me to imagine how an aircraft flying a downwind base and final to an intersecting runway could become a

conflict for another aircraft on a straight in approach to the intersecting runway considering our positions relative to each other when the tower was issuing our landing clearances. I'm not an ATC specialist, but I've spent a lot of my professional life communicating with ATC, and this situation could have easily been mitigated if the tower had simply told Aircraft Y to fly downwind and await tower's ok to turn onto the base leg of their visual approach to 33.

Typically, we only file reports when we know we have made an error and are sharing our experience in order to enhance safety through the reporting system as well as protecting ourselves against certificate action. I want to be clear that I believe I was not operating in error or in any way contrary to safety. I am filing this report at the direction of my supervisors in order to help all involved understand what happened and how a similar event can be avoided in the future.

Narrative: 4

We were cleared for a visual approach to runway 33 and were told to maintain visual separation with Aircraft X that was on a visual approach to runway 7L. When Aircraft X was about to flare to land on 7L the tower controller told us to pass above and behind Aircraft X. Then the controller said disregard they are landing now. The other aircraft was on the runway by the time we flew over them, and they were off to our right side so we did pass behind them as well. I can't recall exactly how high we were when we flew over them but I do remember that we were above the PAPI visual glideslope. I don't believe we violated any regulations.

Synopsis

ANC Tower Controller and three pilots reported that two aircraft were cleared to land on different runways with intersecting approach courses.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ASE.TRACON

State Reference : CO

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 13100

Environment

Light : Daylight

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : ASE

Make Model Name : Citation X (C750)

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Flight Plan : IFR

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class E : ASE

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ASE.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Instructor

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514683

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Training / Qualification

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was [training a developmental] on a Radar session. The developmental is around 70 hours training on position and our level of traffic this session was below his ability level so I was allowing him to work the session with as little input from me as possible. We had a slow stream of arrivals with very few departures, at the time of the event we had, I believe, 1 aircraft on final already switched to tower and 2 other aircraft being vectored for the approach. There may have possibly been a departure as well, but no aircraft were a factor with one another.

Aircraft X was a HAREI arrival and was on a 330 vector for the downwind initially descended to 16000 ft. I heard the developmental descend the aircraft to 13000 ft and the pilot readback the clearance more as a question than a statement. The developmental confirmed the 13000 ft altitude and the pilot readback the altitude with certainty. At this point Aircraft X was over a 13700 ft MVA. I noticed Aircraft X at 13700 ft and pointed this out to my developmental asking if he saw anything very wrong happening. He saw Aircraft X descending below 13700 ft and issued a low altitude alert and a climb to 14000 ft. Aircraft X ticked down to 13100 ft before showing a quick climb and level at 14000 ft.

Even though I heard the 13000 ft altitude issued I never visually correlated the control instruction with Aircraft X at the time the instruction was given. As this was a slow easy session I wasn't expecting the developmental to do anything, that easy, wrong. We normally descend aircraft in that position to 14000 ft and once on the base to 13000 ft, but since I didn't visually correlate the instruction with Aircraft X verbally hearing 13000 ft didn't raise a mental flag to me as 13000 ft is a commonly used altitude. When I saw Aircraft X at 13700 ft I assumed he had been assigned 14000 ft and was blowing through his assigned altitude. That's the point at which I realized that he was the aircraft that had been assigned 13000 ft.

Due to the low level of traffic and ability of the developmental I was complacent in how much attention I was giving the session. I also had an expectation bias that the developmental could easily handle the traffic with no problems and at this particular point of the session, with all traffic conflicts resolved, was not expecting this type of mistake.

Synopsis

ASE TRACON Controller reported that during training a Developmental descended an aircraft below the MVA.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : PBI.TRACON

State Reference : FL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : PBI

Make Model Name : PA-44 Seminole/Turbo Seminole

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Flight Plan : IFR

Flight Phase : Cruise

Route In Use : Direct

Airspace.Class C : PBI

Airspace.Class E : PBI

Aircraft : 2

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : PBI

Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Flight Phase : Cruise

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class C : PBI

Airspace.Class E : PBI

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : PBI.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 24

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514674

Human Factors : Workload

Person : 2

Reference : 2

Location Of Person.Facility : PBI.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 24

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514679

Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface
Human Factors : Workload

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working a sector which should have been split off. It is an extremely busy and transmission-laden position that works three busy satellite airports with many student pilots with multiple requests and language difficulties as well. During the last minutes of my position time, Orlando Approach handed me two aircraft in a direct line at the same altitude with a 1.5 times overtake. The front aircraft, Aircraft Y was doing 100kts and the back aircraft, Aircraft X a twin was doing 150kts. Before Aircraft X reached my boundary, the separation was already down to under 5 miles. Right at that time is when the relieving control got in and the briefing started. There was much other activity and coordination to accomplish before, during, and directly after the completion of the briefing. By the time the relieving controller had been in position for 1 minute the separation between the two aircraft had reduced to under three miles. There was way too much going on to identify and respond to this overtake situation that was handed to our position to respond adequately.

The position needs to be split sooner and more often. When not split, one controller is looking at airspace from south of SUA to north of X26 and 40 miles across, with practice approaches going on at almost all airports. Otherwise, simply not being handed an aircraft going 1.5 times faster than the one in front of it, with less than a two-mile cushion to do something with the planes would have fixed the problem.

Narrative: 2

The preceding controller was given the two involved aircraft. Aircraft Y followed by Aircraft X from the adjacent facility with the same destination, same routing, same altitude with a 50kt overtake and little more than minimum separation. No coordination regarding this situation was accomplished to alert or correct the impending conflict. It was not until after I had assumed the position that I realized the conflict and took corrective action, both lateral and vertical to resolve the conflict. The sector was very busy, North and South combined, conflicting runway configurations between VRB and FPR, busy traffic volume and numerous conflict alerts.

There are multiple factors involved that could have prevented this event.

1- Staffing - the sector was busy enough that services were being curtailed, [another sector] should have been opened. Establish criteria for monitoring the volume via the TSD

(Traffic Situation Display) or other means. Do not wait until the sector is already saturated to make the split.

2- LOA/coordination - longitudinal feed from cape palm needs to be required constant or increasing unless otherwise coordinated.

3- RWY configuration - VRB and FPR are routinely on conflicting runway configurations which adds dramatically to the complexity of this sector. Educate VRB & FPR as to how their runway configurations affect the overall flow of the sector.

4- Conflict alert - the conflict alert system at PBI does not work properly. It is routinely giving alerts that are not warranted. This leads to it becoming as much of a distraction as it is useful. At other times when it should be giving an alert, it either alerts too late or sometimes not at all. In this event, the conflict alert did not give a timely alert, in fact I do not recall that it gave an alert at all.

Synopsis

Two PBI TRACON Controllers reported receiving aircraft handoffs from another sector that were already in conflict.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : TRK.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 12000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZOA

Aircraft Operator : Air Taxi

Make Model Name : PC-12

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 135

Flight Plan : VFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : GPS

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Flight Phase : Climb

Airspace.Class E : ZOA

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZOA.ATRCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Function.Air Traffic Control : Instructor

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 6

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514114

Human Factors : Training / Qualification

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

This sector, 44, had been saturated with IFR arrivals to TRK, along with IFR departures, VFR to IFR pop ups and VFR flight following requests all associated with TRK airport. The entire training session was far more complex than what the sector can handle. I was an On the Job Training Instructor (OJTI) at the time, training a Developmental Controller on the position. After an hour on position and numerous stressors along with complex traffic volume/saturation, the situation in question occurred. Aircraft X, VFR popped up 15 EAST of HNW VOR requesting IFR. At the time, my Trainee was just recovering from over 8 IFR arrivals into a temporary towered airport. Aircraft X was given an IFR clearance below the Minimum IFR Altitude (MIA)/MVA. Although later confirmed that the pilot/aircraft had terrain in sight, we still failed to notice that the slow climbing PC-12 was below the MIA/MVA. Most of the aircraft into and out of TRK during this session had been CL30 or GLF high performing jets. WE SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN TRAINING DURING THIS PERIOD, no matter how great the training experience could have been, safety was compromised.

I advise this event be reviewed in its entirety. The volume, complexity, and convoluted nature of a temporary tower at TRK and the inability of Northern California TRACON (NCT) to space or sequence for an arrival push is not only dangerous but [also] unacceptable. Although we do not have this consistent amount of volume on any given day, I still do believe that we should be trained better, or be more prepared for such a situation. Throughout my time here at ZOA, Sector 44 has been a nightmare of a sector, ever-changing procedures, and patterns, temporary towers and airspace changes and lack of proper training in regards to TRK TEMPORARY TOWER. WE SHOULD HAVE NO BEEN TRAINING DURING THIS PERIOD.

I suggest that we give NCT the airspace between SILVER NUGGET and PARADISE BUTTES regardless of the issues this may cause without facility rating or level. SAFETY is our main concern.

Synopsis

ZOA ARTCC Controller reported that while conducting training during a high volume, and complex period, a VFR pop-up was issued an IFR clearance below the MVA.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : IXA.Airport

State Reference : NC

Relative Position.Angle.Radial : 220

Relative Position.Distance.Nautical Miles : 15

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 3000

Environment

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZDC

Aircraft Operator : Corporate

Make Model Name : Citationjet (C525/C526) - CJ I / II / III / IV

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission.Other

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Airspace.Class E : ZDC

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZDC

Aircraft Operator : Personal

Make Model Name : PA-28R Cherokee Arrow All Series

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Mission : Personal

Flight Phase : Climb

Airspace.Class E : ZDC

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZDC.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 8

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514112

Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was descending to 3,000 about 15miles southwest of IXA airport for the visual approach. Aircraft Y came up on my frequency looking for flight following southbound. I gave him a code, told him to ident, and told him about the inbound traffic landing at IXA. The second I saw Aircraft Y's code I transmitted for the citation to stop decent and informed him about the traffic. Then I told Aircraft Y about the traffic, which at that time was already past. Not knowing that Aircraft X was out of frequency range and could not hear anything I said about the traffic. I never did get contact with Aircraft X and he landed without any approach clearance.

The only thing would be better radar and radio coverage for that area. I never saw the departing aircraft until he was at 2,800 feet. Aircraft X never heard my traffic calls because he was out of radio coverage.

Synopsis

ZDC ARTCC Controller reported being unable to provide separation to aircraft in conflict and subsequent approach clearance, due to limited radar and radio coverage in the area.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : LAX.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : LAX

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : A320

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Airspace.Class B : LAX

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Tower : LAX

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : EMB ERJ 170/175 ER/LR

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Taxi

Route In Use : None

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : LAX.TOWER

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 4

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514103

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Confusion
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Person : 2

Reference : 2
Location Of Person.Aircraft : Y
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
Reporter Organization : Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew : Captain
Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514196
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.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : Taxi
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 : Human Factors
Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure
Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1

I was working local. On the other side of the airport, runway 25r was closed and they were using their one runway for both arrivals and departures. Multiple cross-overs had been happening, and I had most of the departures and arrivals on my side of the airport due to their runway closure.

Many aircraft were catching [up to] the ones in front on final and I was really keeping an eye on this. Aircraft X was number 2 on final for 24r when he checked in, and they were very fast and catching the aircraft in front of them. I knew based on experience that they would have to be sent around, so I offered for Aircraft X runway 24I instead. There was one aircraft in position on 24I, and Aircraft X was approaching 4-mile final when I offered them 24I. I told Aircraft X about the aircraft holding in position, and I told the aircraft in position about Aircraft X on final, then I cleared them for takeoff. I saw that the spacing was good between the departure and Aircraft X on 24I, so my focus went back to making a good departure sequence reference my traffic and traffic off the south complex.

I set the sequence for Aircraft Y to depart first from the full length, and I told the next aircraft to hold short of 24I at V (they would be number two for departure). Then I told Aircraft Y to line up and wait on 24I. Aircraft X was still on final, and was tagged up for 24r still, so my scan saw 24r and I my brain processed 24r while scanning Aircraft X on final.

Out the window, Aircraft X appeared to be in final for 24r. All of the visual signals and cues I was receiving confirmed that Aircraft X was landing on 24r. Aircraft Y had not lined up on 24l, and they asked me to verify that they were cleared to line up and wait. I scanned again told him yes, lineup and wait on 24l. Aircraft Y's pilot asked what the aircraft on final was doing. Then I realized that I had switched Aircraft X to his runway, and I immediately sent Aircraft X around. Aircraft X went around, and then the ASDE-X (Airport Surface Detection Equipment) alarmed.

SOCAL had been running aircraft tight the entire time I was sitting on local controller (which they do very frequently). When the pilots are told to maintain visual separation from preceding traffic on final, there are a lot of squeeze plays and a lot of close calls with aircraft barely exiting the runway before the next arrival crosses the threshold. Something can be done about this, perhaps, SOCAL could take some of the responsibility for their final and make sure they are not consistently handing us close calls.

When I switch someone to the arrival runway, I need to do something that is a visual reminder for myself. Maybe turn over the next departure strip immediately so that this information stays in the forefront of my memory, and so that it will be a reminder that something out of the ordinary is happening on that runway. Or take my pad of paper that I'm using for my arrivals and set it on top of the departure strips. Aircraft on final that are switched to the inboard runway need to be tagged up for the correct runway to allow for this information to be accurately.

Narrative: 2

While taxiing to runway 24L in LAX, we were issued a line up and wait clearance, the First Officer (FO) read back the clearance. Crossing the hold short bars I announce "clear left" and the FO said "clear right" and "runway 24L, heading 251". When he said clear right, it appeared to be right, as the runways are closely spaced and can be very difficult to judge if the plane is actually lined up with the usual runway for landing 24R. As we were passed the hold short bars and close to the centerline, I asked something like "does that airplane (on final) look clear to you?" The FO asked ATC to confirm our line up and wait clearance for 24L, and they confirmed it. Immediately after the confirmation the FO asked about the plane on final. ATC immediately issued a go around to the final traffic. At this point, the final traffic was probably about 2NM from the runway. We briefly held in position and then issued a takeoff clearance and accepted. On the hand off to departure, the tower thanked us for the catch. The flight continued without incident from there. I contacted the on call chief pilot after landing to touch base about the situation.

Synopsis

LAX Tower Controller reported instructing an aircraft to lineup and wait, while another aircraft was on final approach. After a query from the flight crew, the Tower Controller promptly issued go-around instructions.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : BHM.TRACON

State Reference : AL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 6000

Environment

Light : Daylight

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : BHM

Make Model Name : Baron 55/Cochise

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Flight Plan : IFR

Flight Phase : Descent

Airspace.Class E : BHM

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : BHM.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Developmental

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514099

Human Factors : Time Pressure

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

Person : 2

Reference : 2

Location Of Person.Facility : BHM.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 5

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514101

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

Human Factors : Time Pressure

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

At the time of the event, training was in progress with all positions combined to SR (Southern Radar) during a period of moderate traffic. Aircraft X was an over flight transitioning the BHM SR airspace. When attempting a handoff with Aircraft X to (Northern Radar), the tag for Aircraft X was accidentally dropped during the split off of the two radar positions. Aircraft X continued on his flight plan route into the adjacent facilities airspace with no automation or manual handoff being accomplished.

I would recommend the positions be split before the workload becomes moderate/heavy and complexity becomes difficult.

Narrative: 2

[Report narrative contained no additional information.]

Synopsis

BHM TRACON controllers reported an aircraft entered adjacent airspace without coordination after it's tag was dropped when splitting off combined positions.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : EUG.TRACON

State Reference : OR

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2400

Environment

Light : Daylight

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : EUG

Aircraft Operator : Corporate

Make Model Name : Citation Excel (C560XL)

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : Runway 16R

Flight Phase : Initial Approach

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class D : EUG

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : EUG.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1514096

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Track / Heading : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

Were Passengers Involved In Event : N

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure

Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was inbound to EUG from the east. Aircraft X checked in with the current ATIS and altitude. Aircraft X was issued vectors for the ILS Runway 16R approach. Aircraft X was issued a turn to the localizer and clearance for the ILS at 2,800 the read back was correct. Aircraft X flew through the localizer, I issued a 140 heading to join final. Aircraft X started descending through 2,800 in a 2,800 MVA. I advised Aircraft X it appeared they were descending through 2,800 and restated the 2,800 until established. Aircraft X replied, "We're considered established". I pointed out the airport and asked if Aircraft X had the airport in sight. Aircraft X had the airport in sight and was cleared for the visual approach to Runway 16R and switched to the tower. Brasher warning was not given.

I should have turned Aircraft X sooner to final so [that] the fly through didn't happen. In similar situation situations, I will reissue the altitude with the corrective heading to join final.

Synopsis

EUG TRACON Controller reported not issuing prompt corrective vectors, after an aircraft flew through the localizer and below the MVA.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : SAT.TRACON
State Reference : TX
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

Environment

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : SAT
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : EMB ERJ 170/175 ER/LR
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Descent
Route In Use : Vectors
Airspace.Class E : SAT

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory.CTAF : 5C1
Aircraft Operator : Personal
Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer
Mission : Personal
Flight Phase : Climb
Airspace.Class E : SAT

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : SAT.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1513831
Human Factors : Other / Unknown

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

5C1 is a fairly busy, uncontrolled airport right on the localizer about 15 mile final to SAT. They have a wide variety from gliders to [corporate jets] based at 5C1. Today, as pretty much with every day, we are working a final around whatever the uncontrolled airport is doing that day guessing what altitude primary targets are at, guessing which way the gliders are going to go, wondering if the mode C is accurate. Today was no different. There was one aircraft that appeared to be doing acrobatics about 5 miles northwest of the localizer. I had varying reports of altitude between 3000 and 5000, often times Mode C indicated literally right on the localizer to 13R. With the aircraft doing aerobatics on the localizer, I was taking aircraft off of the arrival and vectoring to final. As I'm vectoring Aircraft X towards the final approach fix, another aircraft departed 5C1, turned to the northwest and started climbing right towards the descending Aircraft X. I turned Aircraft X again away from the final and called traffic. This type of operation in general makes sequencing air carriers more complicated than it needs to be and introduces a lot of guessing and hoping on what we think these aircraft are going to do. Often times, with the gliders, we do not even see the targets all of the time due to the size of the aircraft, the type of tight circle maneuvering they're doing on top of the lack of transponders.

5C1 is a well-known problem in our facility. There have been multiple reports and multiple attempts to educate the users of the airport. We have even made requests to expand our class C airspace or upgrade our airspace to class B to give us more control over the final approach course of our primary runway. I recommend to increase our airspace size to force VFR, non-participating aircraft to stay below glideslope altitudes on the ILS on the localizer so that we at least know the airspace that every aircraft landing SAT will be protected while on the approach.

Synopsis

SAT TRACON Controller reported unsafe operations between aircraft landing Runway 13R and the nearby non-towered field 5C1.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : MWH.Tower

State Reference : WA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 6000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : MWH

Aircraft Operator : Military

Make Model Name : Globemaster (C-17)

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 D : MWH

Aircraft : 2

ATC / Advisory.Tower : MWH

Make Model Name : Beechcraft Single Piston Undifferentiated or Other Model

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Flight Phase : Cruise

Route In Use : Direct

Airspace.Class E : MWH

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : MWH.Tower

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Supervisor / CIC

Function.Air Traffic Control : Departure

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 19

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1513606

Human Factors : Confusion

Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Workload
Human Factors : Fatigue
Analyst Callback : Completed

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Company Policy
Contributing Factors / Situations : Environment - Non Weather Related
Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors
Contributing Factors / Situations : Staffing
Primary Problem : Staffing

Narrative: 1

I was working CIC (Controller In Charge) along with Cab Radar, with training going on at Local 2 with Local 1 combined, and Training on Ground Control. The 3 Controllers working that day including me had all taken short breaks to facilitate training. I was working Radar, and we were at one of the higher levels of traffic I had worked in a long time. There was lots of aircraft, lots of approaches, and lots of Flight Following. We get spurts like this often, but they usually do not last as long as this one did. I Had 4 aircraft depart the airport south bound 2 IFR and 2 VFR.

Aircraft Y wanted to go direct to a fix to hold as well, so I put him on a heading and climbed him to 5,000 ft then issued holding instructions. I had Aircraft X exit an IR requesting a Visual Approach so I issued him a heading and climbed him to 6,000 ft. I was trying to keep up with everything, and about this time, the Local 2 Instructor requested to split Local 1 off. The Instructor at Ground Control was the only other controller we had available. He was in the process of getting a new Ground Controller in, and he eventually grabbed another Trainee and split Local 1 off. I believe all this occurred within about 10 minutes of the error.

When Aircraft X was about 6-7 miles South of the airport level at 6,000 ft, Aircraft Y was turning back inbound to level at 5,000 ft. At this time I was talking to at least 9 other aircraft. Aircraft X advised they had the airport in sight and I cleared him for the Visual Approach. I never saw Aircraft Y at 5,000 ft. It never crossed my mind that there was a problem. I cannot explain this. When I climbed Aircraft X to 6,000 ft I knew he was there, but when I issued the clearance I saw no problem with it. I cannot say that Data Block overlap was or was not an issue, I do not have any answer for it.

I was mentally tired at this time, and my flight strips were all over the place however we had no other options. We all powered through, and I think I eventually got off position about 45 minutes later. It was still a very high work load, and very complex when I gave the position away. I stayed on position about 5 minutes to help the new controller, get strips and a handle on the position before I left. We had no Supervisor as one called in sick and one was in a class over at the port fire station, with 3 Controllers. At the time, we were so busy, that these resources were not even an option.

Other than increasing our staffing, which is what we are trying to do. We have just got our 8th Controller within the last week. We are supposed to have 14 controllers, and we have I think 13 Trainee's in our facility. We have been working short staffed for so many years. We all are trying so hard to get people trained as we see that that will be the only way we can get this problem resolved. The lack of supervision in the operational areas during this event was a factor however it is quite the norm. With my performance, or for whatever reason just missing Aircraft Y, it is a result of trying to do too much, with too little, for too long. I apologize for allowing this to happen on my watch, I do not have an answer for why it happened, and all I can say is that I will try to not let it happen again.

Callback: 1

Controller reported they were working the Radar position combined with Controller in Charge from the Tower Cab due to insufficient staffing to open the TRACON.

Synopsis

MWH Tower Cab Radar Controller In Charge reported a loss of separation after inadvertently descending an aircraft into another aircraft.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : SCT.TRACON

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 3500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory. TRACON : SCT

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : EMB ERJ 170/175 ER/LR

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Flight Phase : Initial Approach

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class B : LAX

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : SCT.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 5

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1513344

Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Troubleshooting

Human Factors : Confusion

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Other / Unknown

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : ATC Equipment / Nav Facility / Buildings

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure

Primary Problem : ATC Equipment / Nav Facility / Buildings

Narrative: 1

I was working a busy simultaneous approach session. I had a full downwind of airplanes all slowed to 170 knots to maintain spacing and keep them inside my airspace boundary. During my scan, I notice a handoff from the eastern side of my airspace. At first, I panicked thinking the aircraft was heading right into my downwind and called traffic to the EMB 175 multiple times. The pilot said he saw nothing and was looking. The target then took a sharp turn towards the EMB 175 and fell off the scope. I don't recall what I said to the EMB 175, other than it was believed to be a false target. I continued working the final until my break and went to see a replay to determine it was in fact a false target.

The false targets showing up on the radar display is a dangerous operation. I keep thinking one of these days a believed false target will be a real one. I'm not sure the solution other than moving radar sites or turning off the Fusion radar.

Synopsis

SCT TRACON Controller reported observing a false radar target on a conflicting heading with traffic they were vectoring for an approach.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : PDX.Tower

State Reference : OR

Environment

Flight Conditions : Mixed

Weather Elements / Visibility : Cloudy

Weather Elements / Visibility : Rain

Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 10

Light : Daylight

Ceiling.Single Value : 2900

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : PDX

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : A320

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : ILS RWY 10L

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Airspace.Class C : PDX

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.CTAF : VUO

Make Model Name : Cessna Aircraft Undifferentiated or Other Model

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Airspace.Class E : PDX

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : PDX.Tower

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 1

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1513018

Human Factors : Time Pressure

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Distraction

Person : 2

Reference : 2
Location Of Person.Aircraft : X
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
Reporter Organization : Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew : Captain
Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 2128
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1513366
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Automation : Aircraft TA
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working Local combined with VUO advisory frequency. Aircraft Y was reported in the left pattern to runway 8 at VUO doing touch and go's. Aircraft X was descending on the ILS to runway 10L at PDX. As Aircraft X was descending down final I observed Aircraft Y in his upwind and issued the traffic to Aircraft X. Aircraft X responded with what sounded like "looking". [Another aircraft arriving] ahead of Aircraft X crossed the 10L threshold and I put a departure [aircraft] in position on the full length of runway 10L with Aircraft X crossing a 5 mile final. The arrival [ahead of Aircraft X] missed exit A3 so I gave instructions to expedite down to the A2 exit for the traffic in position [on the runway] and Aircraft X on final. The arrival exited the runway and I gave a "no delay" takeoff clearance to the traffic in position with Aircraft X on about a 2 1/2 mile final. Aircraft X landed on runway 10L and was instructed to exit the runway at A3 exit and contact ground control. Upon reading back his exit instructions he made a statement indicating that he had questions about the traffic on final and that it got "close". Aircraft X was given the tower phone number and called shortly after arriving at the gate. This happened because of the very close proximity of traffic operating at VUO to PDX traffic. I believe this also happened due to workload and distractions. VUO traffic is a distraction from PDX traffic and vice versa and the amount of traffic calls needed for this operation takes way more time than a Local controller has some times.

VUO airport is an airport that is very active and lies 2.5 miles west of PDX underneath the runway 10L final. Aircraft operating at VUO create the biggest safety hazard that I have

seen in the FAA especially when PDX is on runways 10L/R. When PDX is on 10's there are typically multiple TCAS RA's a week due to PDX traffic descending on final with traffic operating at VUO. This operation is a disaster waiting to happen and it will be seen on the nightly news when it does. To maintain safety and protect the flying public it is strongly my recommendation to, at a minimum, prohibit touch and go's at VUO and change the way they depart VUO airport. For example, instead of them turning the downwind into the face of Portland traffic to head toward Vancouver lake, they could fly north toward battleground. Ideally, I recommend closing VUO to all fixed wing aircraft. Again, this is a disaster waiting to happen.

Narrative: 2

I was PM (Pilot Monitoring) and my FO (First Officer) was PF (Pilot Flying). We were on ILS 10L approach at PDX. Last ATC assigned speed was 210 knots. Once established on the localizer, ATC instructed us to slow to approach speed for traffic on the parallel approach to 10R. That parallel traffic was displayed on our TCAS, and we decided to set TCAS from TFC (Traffic) to TA to avoid a possible nuisance alert. After switching to the PDX tower frequency, we received a landing clearance and VFR traffic information at 10 o'clock over VUO. ATIS was reporting 100@10KT 10SM -RA OVC029, but there were multiple layers of clouds below the ceiling and 40 knots of southerly wind (resulting in a large crab angle to stay on the localizer) with rain reducing our in-flight visibility. As I am an airplane owner who is actively engaged in General Aviation I was thinking "flying VFR in this condition?" while looking for this VFR traffic. The VFR traffic was not displayed on our TCAS when ATC gave us the traffic information. It was not that easy, but both the FO and I had a visual with VUO runway but no VFR traffic. Near the JALAG intersection, the amber traffic target suddenly appeared at the 10 o'clock 4 mile position on TCAS. We both searched hard for the traffic but could not see it. The amber target quickly got very close to the left wing tip on our own airplane symbol on TCAS, and though we were on the glide slope descent, the amber target displayed (0) at our altitude. Both the FO and I thought the traffic was going to hit us. I thought about going around, but not knowing the exact position of the VFR target, with the 10L runway in sight with no traffic directly ahead of us, and other airplanes on the parallel approach to 10R, I determined that continuing the approach was the safest course of action. The target stayed on the left side and moved behind us on TCAS. This event maybe lasted 30 seconds but it felt like forever. Normal landing and gate arrival completed the flight. Upon arrival, I asked for the PDX tower telephone number. On the way to the layover hotel, I called the PDX tower manager and told him what had happened on the approach. [He] told me that traffic conflicts with VUO are an ongoing problem at PDX that VUO has special flying procedures, and many airlines have filed [reports] and complained numerous times in the past. The PDX tower knows about the problem, but since VUO is one of the oldest airports with some kind of political/special interest group influence, safer procedures or rules have never been implemented. [He] thanked me for contacting him, and promised to file a report and address the issue with the appropriate agencies again.

I have experienced my fair share of inflight difficulties and emergencies in the past, but I have never experienced a heart racing event like this. Though it is approved by FOM, I will probably not set TCAS in TA only mode again in the future. I strongly recommend that new safety procedures be implemented when PDX is conducting instrument approaches.

Synopsis

PDX Tower Controller and an A320 Captain reported a traffic conflict on the Localizer due to VFR traffic at VOU.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : F11.TRACON

State Reference : FL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 11000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : MCO

Aircraft Operator : Personal

Make Model Name : Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 1 Eng, Retractable Gear

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : VFR

Mission : Personal

Flight Phase : Cruise

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class C : SFB

Aircraft : 2

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : MCO

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Large Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Airspace.Class C : SFB

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : F11.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1512452

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Analyst Callback : Completed

Events

Anomaly.Deviation - Track / Heading : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.General : Work Refused
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X called me 4 miles south of the final requesting a VFR Class C airspace transition to an airport. I radar identified the aircraft, and told the pilot to fly westbound to avoid traffic on the SFB final. He failed to comply. I issued traffic to Aircraft X, and another turn with a heading of 270 to avoid. He did not see the traffic, and still failed to turn. I instructed a 3rd time to please turn to avoid. I then issued traffic for an aircraft on final that he was in close proximity to Aircraft Y, who was already on a visual approach clearance to a nearby airport. Aircraft X reported the traffic in sight eventually, and said he would maintain visual separation. I still issued a turn of 270 to avoid an RA/TCAS situation, and explained it to Aircraft X the reason why I was still turning the aircraft due to the targets so close to each other. He never turned to a 270 heading, so I had to stop Aircraft Y from descending.

They crossed out over each other with Aircraft Y at 1600 and Aircraft X at 1100. Once the conflict was resolved I allowed Aircraft Y to continue the visual approach, and apologized to him for the Aircraft X getting in the way. Aircraft Y landed without incident. I then asked Aircraft X why he bothered to request flight following if he was not going to obey instructions. His response was that since he was outside the Class Bravo airspace he did not need to obey anything I said, and just wanted to transition the Class Charlie airspace. I then reiterated the fact that he was going to cause a TCAS/RA situation with someone, even if he had the traffic in sight in the future. I also stated that if he had not called me for flight following, I would have worked around the aircraft I was not in communication with, but since he had called me, I was expecting him to follow instructions. He proceeded to turn his transponder to code 1200.

The pilot may be correct in the fact that he was not in the Class B airspace, but he was knowingly creating an unsafe situation. Upon further research/questioning, another controller had an incident similar to the one I just had today on a previous occasion with the same aircraft.

Callback: 1

Reporter states this is a known recurring issue with this particular pilot.

Synopsis

MCO Tracon Controller reported a pilot receiving VFR flight following refused to comply with ATC issued vectors for traffic.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : PDX.Tower

State Reference : OR

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 900

Environment

Flight Conditions : Marginal

Weather Elements / Visibility : Windshear

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : PDX

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Medium Large Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : PDX 10R

Flight Phase : Landing

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Airspace.Class C : PDX

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.CTAF : VUO

Aircraft Operator : Personal

Make Model Name : Cessna Aircraft Undifferentiated or Other Model

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : VFR

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use.Other

Airspace.Class E : VUO

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : PDX.TOWER

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 1.1

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1512443

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was at landing PDX. Aircraft Y was in left closed pattern Runway 8 at VUO. Traffic was exchanged multiple times, but Aircraft X still reported the incident as too close. No TCAS/RA was reported. Both aircraft landed safely. Aircraft Y seemed unaware or unconcerned about proximity to PDX traffic. Weather was marginal VFR with LLWS advisories in affect. I recommend eliminating pattern work from VUO. This would reduce the number of potential conflicts between PDX arrivals at VUO aircraft.

Synopsis

PDX Local Controller reported an air carrier on short final reporting close proximity to aircraft at an adjacent airport.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : FPR.Tower

State Reference : FL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1800

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : FPR

Aircraft Operator : Personal

Make Model Name : PA-32 Cherokee Six/Lance/Saratoga/6X

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : VFR

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Route In Use : VFR Route

Airspace.Class D : FPR

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Tower : FPR

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 : VFR

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Route In Use.Other

Airspace.Class D : FPR

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : FPR.TOWER

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Function.Air Traffic Control : Supervisor / CIC

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 1.5

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1512437

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
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.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working Controller in Charge (CIC) plugged into the Local Control position to relieve a controller. Aircraft X called up initially 15 miles southeast of the field. Local Control asked the pilot to continue inbound and report 10 miles from the field. After this call Local Control continued to work the traffic closer to the field. As Local Control was working traffic Aircraft Y reported inbound on an 8 mile VFR/RNAV Approach. Aircraft X was still behind and south of Aircraft Y. Aircraft X reported 10 miles from the field. Local Control responded to Aircraft X and told him to continue inbound and follow the Aircraft Y traffic that was about 1-2 miles ahead of him (Aircraft Y). Local Control did not notice that Aircraft X was overtaking Aircraft Y, after Local Control gave Aircraft X new instructions to turn and follow the Aircraft Y he already advised Local Control he had the traffic insight and was underneath him. I told the pilot of Aircraft X to make a 360 to follow but he advised Local Control he was already ahead of the traffic. Local Control asked the pilot to keep his speed up and pointed out the traffic for Aircraft Y to follow. Aircraft Y just reported the traffic in sight.

The controller was fatigued and I was trying to relieve him because he did look and sound exhausted from training. The Local Controller at the time also had a little bit of tunnel vision and needed to step back and take a breather.

Synopsis

ATC Controller in Charge reported observing the Local Controller not notice an aircraft in sequence fly underneath and overtake landing traffic.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZAN.ARTCC

State Reference : AK

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZAN

Aircraft Operator.Other

Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer

Operating Under FAR Part.Other

Flight Plan : IFR

Airspace.Class A : ZAN

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZAN.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 7

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1512436

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Other / Unknown

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : Routine Inspection

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Company Policy

Contributing Factors / Situations : Staffing

Primary Problem : Staffing

Narrative: 1

There was an extremely unsafe situation where traffic complexity and workload were too high. We just started new coordination procedures with Russia and it was my first time utilizing these procedures on the ATOP(Advanced Technologies and Oceanic Procedures) platform. There was moderate traffic in the sector that most of our Russian traffic goes

through. The new procedures for coordination are much different than the other platform that we work. There were a lot of phone calls and confusion between myself and Russia. The other 2 sectors were getting moderate over flight traffic as well as several airport departures and arrivals.

I knew right when I took the sector that I was going to need it split soon. I immediately informed the CIC (Controller in Charge) that they were going to need to split the sector. He said that we didn't really have anyone at the moment to split it but that he would be able to soon. After about 10 more minutes I informed the CIC again that I needed it split. ATOP was showing multiple conflicts and Russian coordination was almost overdue. I was falling behind and needed help. I told him that he needed to get a supervisor out to take the desk (I knew there was at least one supervisor for my area present) so he can split it or get someone else to do it. He said ok and walked away. Another 15 minutes or so went by and its still not split. The CIC is then sitting at the console next to me for about 5-10 minutes not saying anything to me. At this point it is getting dangerous and I was losing the picture. I had 3 different facilities calling me at the same time for coordination and multiple aircraft calling. I could not keep up with the traffic. I had to raise my voice and state that I needed a sector split NOW! It was then split and another controller came to relieve me. The sectors were a mess and I was told it took at least an hour to get it back under control. Thankfully there was no loss of separation or accidents but it was a very risky and unsafe situation.

CICs need to be trained on what to do when a controller says that the workload is getting too high. In the event that no supervisor is available to take the desk, we need a procedure in place to allow that controller to pass that responsibility to some one else.

Synopsis

ZAN Center Controller reported being overwhelmed with traffic and coordination while working combined sectors even after having making multiple requests for assistance.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : SRQ.Tower

State Reference : FL

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 800

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : SRQ

Aircraft Operator : Personal

Make Model Name : Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 1 Eng, Retractable Gear

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Personal

Flight Phase : Landing

Flight Phase : Final Approach

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Airspace.Class C : SRQ

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Tower : SRQ

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Medium Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Flight Phase : Taxi

Route In Use : None

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : SRQ.Tower

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 2

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1512415

Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Human Factors : Distraction

Events

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

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was on final approach. When he first checked on, I told him to continue traffic would be holding in position. He responded with "okay I will be looking for traffic". I then told him, [to] slow to his slowest practical approach speed, and to continue; that traffic would be holding in position. He then said he could "take [intersecting runway] if it helps", I then told him okay enter a left downwind then corrected myself and said right downwind. "He then asked what runway am I landing." I then realized he was confused and decided not to put an aircraft in position prior to his arrival. I told him runway 32 you are cleared to land. Aircraft X read back cleared to land runway 32. This was when he was on a 2 mile final. He crossed the threshold of the runway at approximately 500-800 feet AGL. That is when I put Aircraft Y in position on the runway. Aircraft X was high over the runway and didn't touch down until around midfield prior to the intersecting runway. Once he touched down, I realized he wasn't on the actual runway, but on a parallel taxiway. From where the tower is situated, it was difficult at first to tell he wasn't on the runway. Aircraft Y then keyed up and asked if the arrival just flew over his head. Aircraft Y had been holding short of the runway on a taxiway at the approach end of the runway. I then told Aircraft X to taxi across the runway, traffic was holding in position, and to stay on my frequency. I then told him I believed he landed on a taxiway and issued the brasher statement.

I don't know what could have prevented this from happening. The two crossing runways are both paralleled by a taxiway on either side. It looks like a lot of concrete in one area of the field. There is [a] new tower being built across the field to alleviate the problems we have in the old tower.

Synopsis

SRQ Tower Controller reported observing an aircraft land on a taxiway parallel to the assigned runway.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZOA.ARTCC

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 33000

Environment

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZOA

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : B737 Undifferentiated or Other Model

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use.STAR : SUUTR TWO

Airspace.Class A : ZOA

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZOA

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : A320

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use.STAR : DYAMD THREE

Airspace.Class A : ZOA

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZOA.ATRCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 6

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1512167

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Undershoot
Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Crossing Restriction Not Met
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was a SMF arrival descending on a STAR and a facility automated coordination with an adjacent sector (15), and entering my sector (34). Aircraft Y was a SFO arrival descending on the STAR as well. The two STARs are procedurally separated (SMF arrivals descend below SFO arrivals) which allows for the automated information transfer from sector to sector of the SMF arrivals coming from S15. Aircraft Y was at FL300 descending on the DYAMD arrival at the time and Aircraft X was out of FL330 descending on the SUUTR arrival, was supposed to be below FL210 when the two arrivals cross path. The S15 controller called and mentioned Aircraft X had missed his altitude crossing restrictions and was being stopped above Aircraft Y. Aircraft X was stopped at FL320, Aircraft Y was advised to increase the rate of descent to allow Aircraft X to keep descending, as well as vectored away from Aircraft Y's arrival path. Aircraft X was handed off and switched to NCT descending to FL200 and on assigned heading instead of the arrival routing to avoid other potential traffic climbing out of approach control. The situation was alleviated because the S15 controller caught the Aircraft X's late descent profile, but had he switched the flight to NCT approach, Aircraft X would have caused a potential disaster especially since the automated transfer procedure has them transferring frequencies to a different approach control sector from the SFO arrivals.

Advise the pilots of better understanding the importance of meeting altitude/speed restrictions on STARs, and what happens when they do not comply with these restrictions. Maybe a better descent altitude profile on the STAR instead of a "dive" because the altitude restrictions on the SUUTR arrival from this direction display aircraft staying high and then doing a quick descent to meet the altitude restrictions (example: staying at FL360 until the last minute and then diving down to meet a restriction to cross a fix below FL210).

Synopsis

ZOA Center Controller reported that an aircraft on the SUUTR TWO arrival missed a crossing restriction, creating a direct conflict with another aircraft on the DYAMD THREE arrival.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZSE.ARTCC

State Reference : WA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 6300

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZSE

Aircraft Operator : Air Taxi

Make Model Name : PC-12

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 135

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Ambulance

Flight Phase : Descent

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZSE.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1512163

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Person : 2

Reference : 2

Location Of Person.Facility : ZSE.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1512158

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Overshoot

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result.Flight Crew : Returned To Clearance
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

[Aircraft] requesting lowest available altitude. Cleared to MIA of 6600 msl. Aircraft read back 6600. Aircraft then asks if the altitude was 6300 or 6600. Clarified to aircraft that the clearance was to 6600. Aircraft descends below MIA to 6300 mode-c reported before correcting to 6600. The moment the altitude was questioned, a Low altitude alert should have been issued for safety.

Narrative: 2

[Report narrative contained no additional information.]

Synopsis

ZSE controllers reported issuing a pilot the lowest MIA available, at pilot's request. The pilot later questioned assigned altitude while descending below the MIA, causing a lower altitude alert.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZAB.ARTCC

State Reference : NM

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 7400

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZAB

Aircraft Operator : Personal

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 : Personal

Flight Phase : Initial Climb

Route In Use : Direct

Airspace.Class E : ZAB

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZAB.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 1

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510842

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure
Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1

I was assigned to help the Radar Controller who was busy and dealing with some complexity. When I signed on as the Assist, I got straight to work without a briefing because the Radar Controller was clearly dealing with too much. He did give me some key points verbally. One being, that he gave a release to an aircraft climbing to 12000 feet westbound to intercept an airway. He had an aircraft inbound from the south. When the departure came off, he was slow moving and slow climbing. This caused the Radar Controller to make a decision to clear the aircraft direct to a fix, which would mean his westbound turn would be quicker so he could get him out of the way of the arrival. The problem is he didn't ask the aircraft if he could maintain his own terrain and obstruction clearance to through 10000 feet since he was in a 9300 feet terrain block. I don't feel there was much I could do at that point since this was the radar controller's decision. I would recommend the Radar Controller to come up with a better solution to avoid this mistake.

Synopsis

Center Controller reported the Radar Controller issue a direct clearance to an aircraft below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : GSP.TRACON
State Reference : SC
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC
Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : GSP
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : Large Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Descent
Route In Use : Visual Approach
Airspace.Class C : GSP

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower : GMU
Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1
Flight Plan : VFR
Flight Phase : Climb
Route In Use : None
Airspace.Class E : GSP

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : GSP.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 1
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510828
Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was cleared for the Visual Approach to Runway 4 at GSP over MULDE FAF. The aircraft was descending out of 2500 ft. At the same time Aircraft Y appeared to be in right traffic for GMU. Aircraft Y suddenly made a turn out the "authorized" Southeast exit of their Delta Airspace towards the Final Approach Fix. By that time Aircraft X was slowed for landing in a critical stage of flight descending out of 2100 ft. VFR, Aircraft Y was at 1900 ft. Their distance closed to within a mile. I called GMU tower to ask if they called traffic and they said they had terminated the aircraft at their Delta Airspace as Aircraft X (which is visible on their DBRITE) descended into him. Separation reduced to about 200 ft and less than a mile. Aircraft X in a critical stage of flight had to add power and climb while on final to avoid a possible collision.

We are now averaging a daily loss of separation with a daily risk of collision which is NOT a safe operation. We have recommended everything we can think of and gotten no response. The easiest recommendation is for the contract tower to have these aircraft pass behind our traffic but they seem to not be willing to be bothered to prevent collisions and have refused to work with us. So the only other option would be requiring aircraft landing here to remain at or above 2800 ft until the final Approach Fix to provide 500 ft separation from the 2300 ft VFR traffic but that has the arrivals high on the approach in a critical stage of flight. Something has to be done!

Synopsis

GSP TRACON Controller reported a loss of separation after a nearby Tower allowed a VFR aircraft to fly towards the FAF for GSP approaches.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : EUG.TRACON
State Reference : OR
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 3000

Aircraft

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : EUG
Aircraft Operator : Personal
Make Model Name : Small Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turboprop Eng
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Personal
Flight Phase : Final Approach
Route In Use : Vectors
Airspace.Class D : EUG

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : EUG.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 7
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510818
Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Human Factors : Confusion

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X had the wrong frequency dialed in for the localizer and joined the wrong final. Approach Clearance was canceled and pilot was climbed to 3000 feet. Vectors were issued and the correct localizer frequency was given. A turn to a 340 heading was issued. Aircraft X entered the 3900 feet Minimum Vectoring Altitude (MVA) at 3000 feet and was issued a climb to 4000 feet. My supervisor (in training) was sitting beside me. Either he thought I issued the turn in time to avoid the 3900 feet MVA (as I thought I did) or he said nothing and watched the aircraft enter the 3900 feet MVA. He said nothing to me until he informed me I needed to fill out an Occurrence Report.

Synopsis

EUG TRACON Controller reported issuing vectors that resulted with an aircraft flying below the Minimum Vector Altitude.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : HPN.Tower
State Reference : NY
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2800

Environment

Flight Conditions : IMC
Weather Elements / Visibility : Turbulence
Weather Elements / Visibility : Fog
Weather Elements / Visibility : Rain
Weather Elements / Visibility : Thunderstorm
Weather Elements / Visibility : Windshear
Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : .5
Ceiling.Single Value : 100

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.Tower : HPN
Make Model Name : Gulfstream G280
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91
Flight Plan : IFR
Flight Phase : Climb
Route In Use.SID : Westchester 7
Airspace.Class D : HPN

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : N90
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : Regional Jet 900 (CRJ900)
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Initial Climb
Route In Use : Direct
Route In Use.SID : HPN7
Airspace.Class D : Y

Person : 1

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : HPN.TOWER
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510799
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Person : 2

Reference : 2
Location Of Person.Aircraft : X
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
Reporter Organization : Personal
Function.Flight Crew : First Officer
Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine
Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 19789
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 150
Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 1500
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1511466

Person : 3

Reference : 3
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 : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine
Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument
Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor
Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 5940
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 40
Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 400
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1511500

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Overshoot
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Weather / Turbulence
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Returned To Clearance
Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure
Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure

Contributing Factors / Situations : Weather
Primary Problem : Airspace Structure

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X departed HPN on the Westchester 7 departure. Aircraft X was issued 2000 feet on departure because LGA final is supposedly over our airspace at 3000 feet. HPN airspace extends to 2999 feet so that's their claim that the Aircraft for LGA are above our airspace (like we can even measure that 1 foot exactly is absurd). Anyway on departure Aircraft X started climbing past 2000 feet saying he was responding to windshear on a right turn of 320 degrees where he should have been maintaining 2000 feet but was instead climbing to 3000 feet now directly towards a Aircraft Y going to LGA because well they own that 1 extra foot of airspace even though our normal SID at HPN is 3000 feet on departure. I quickly informed Aircraft X that he was climbing directly at the Aircraft Y at 3000 feet. He responded immediately that he was descending and a potential midair collision was averted.

I do not know how many times I have report this particular problem. This is by far the closest to a midair collision that I have ever seen. I have been complaining about this issue for a long time. Honestly Aircraft X should not have been in a position that he can't respond to windshear and Aircraft should have had a safe clear path to LGA. The pilots deserve safety as due the passengers deserve safety! [A nearby airport] gets their departures stopped due to overflights and since they get to ride on the count of those overflights they get to be a big bad level 9 tower despite getting stopped and twiddling their thumbs. HPN doesn't stop, we run traffic with that questionable 1000 foot buffer. We don't get counts for those overflights because we don't own that 1 foot of airspace! Should an arrival to LGA descend out of 3000 feet or our departure climb above 2000 feet there is a huge potential for loss of life. Even our Prop1 departure is a joke for single engine props keeping our departures on Runway 16 from turning into our arrivals because it doesn't address the twin props that turn just as sharp as single engine props. We should be a part of this Bravo airspace of LGA with redesigned airspace to better safely move traffic. I keep hearing nothing can be done... I keep hearing how we are behind on ELMS and that we can barely get a communication for safety class going, but really instead of these semi useless check a box stuff why can't we sit down and figure some important stuff out and not just give us new equipment that tries to get us to walk away from our position.

Narrative: 2

On Departure we received a Windshear Warning between 500 and 1000 ft on MFD. A gain in 50 knots and vertical speed of 2500 was indicated. Aircraft went through assigned altitude but once control was reestablish aircraft returned to assigned altitude. ATC was advised of the wind shear event.

Narrative: 3

During an Instrument departure (Westchester 7 Departure) off of Runway 16 in KHPN we experienced a low level Windshear event at approximately 700 ft right after Flap retraction. The Windshear warning alerted the crew and the Pilot Flying (PF) immediately added full TOGA Power and pitched up. Due to this evasive maneuver we overshot our assigned altitude (2000 ft) by approximately 600ft and got a Traffic Advisory for an airplane above us at 3000 ft. After both pilots agreed that the windshear event was over the PNF immediately advised ATC that we had a windshear event and that we are taking corrective action to return to our assigned altitude of 2000 ft. We returned to 2000 ft without any further problems. ATC gave us further vectors and subsequent climbs. No further action was taken by ATC.

The ATIS warned of windshear and the crew discussed it during their takeoff briefing.

Synopsis

HPN Tower Controller and Gulfstream flight crew reported an altitude overshoot and airborne conflict when the flight crew responded to a windshear warning.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : P50.TRACON
State Reference : AZ
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 5200

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : P50
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : B737 Undifferentiated or Other Model
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Flight Phase : Initial Approach
Flight Phase : Descent
Route In Use : Vectors
Airspace.Class B : PHX

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : P50
Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer
Flight Phase : Initial Approach

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : P50.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 4
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510565
Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Human Factors : Workload
Human Factors : Distraction

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working finals combined and there was a runway closed. We had a flight under medical distress straight in and he was tied up with an arrival from the north, so I crossed the arrival over the airport for the south downwind to get behind the distressed Aircraft. I vectored the downwind in closer to the airport and descended them to 5000 feet. I thought the vector I gave them would keep them clear of the Minimum Vectoring Altitude (MVA) and then got caught up watching the distressed Aircraft. The Aircraft just clipped the corner of the 5700-foot MVA as I turned them on to base leg. I just needed to not be so focused on the emergency because everything was worked out fine there. I just misjudged the vector.

Synopsis

TRACON Controller reported vectoring an aircraft below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude due to distraction.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : PIT.Airport

State Reference : PA

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Light : Night

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : PIT

Aircraft Operator : Corporate

Make Model Name : Diamond Jet, Undifferentiated

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Takeoff

Route In Use : None

Airspace.Class B : PIT

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : PIT.TWR

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 4

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510560

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Confusion

Person : 2

Reference : 2

Location Of Person.Facility : PIT.TWR

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Supervisor / CIC

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 14

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510564

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Events

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Taxiway
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected.Other

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working local 1. I cleared [the aircraft] for takeoff. It was dark out. [The aircraft] took off of a taxiway. I coordinated with ground control and told the tower supervisor that the aircraft was taking off of a taxiway. We all decided the safest thing to do was to allow the aircraft to continue. I think it is was just a pilot deviation. Everyone makes mistakes. It was dark and that affected the pilot and I from noticing it sooner.

Narrative: 2

[Report narrative contained no additional information.]

Synopsis

A Tower Local Controller and Supervisor reported an aircraft took off from a taxiway instead of a runway.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : BOI.TRACON

State Reference : ID

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 11700

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : BOI

Make Model Name : Cessna 340/340A

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Personal

Flight Phase : Climb

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class E : BOI

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : BOI

Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer

Airspace.Class E : BOI

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : BOI.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 20

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510031

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Distraction

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was on a direct route and climbed. I had turned them slightly northeast before I normally would because of depicted/reported weather. The turn on course was given above the MVA the aircraft was in. At this time I was coordinating with adjacent airspace about a weather deviation. Aircraft X was in a 10000 ft MVA approaching a 12000 ft MVA @ 11500 ft approximately 5 miles from the higher MVA. I inquired if the pilot could increase the rate of climb. The pilot responded negative so I turned the aircraft towards a lower MVA. I was also communicating with the second aircraft that was deviating around weather. When I next observed Aircraft X he was exiting the 12000 ft MVA into a 10000 ft MVA at 11700 ft. After the aircraft had reached 12000 ft I resumed his navigation on course.

Synopsis

BOI TRACON Controller reported vectoring an aircraft into a higher MVA after the aircraft was unable to climb fast enough.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : U90.TRACON
State Reference : AZ
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 6000

Aircraft

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : U90
Make Model Name : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 1
Flight Phase : Cruise
Route In Use : Vectors
Airspace.Class E : U90

Person : 1

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : U90.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510024
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Human Factors : Training / Qualification
Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Person : 2

Reference : 2
Location Of Person.Facility : U90.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510029
Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was training a trainee that is having difficulties and has been for a long time in training. I was focused on maintaining our separation on final and trying to get him to slow down air carrier and speed up aircraft ahead of him to ensure that we not lose separation. [The trainee] issued Aircraft X 6000 on initial contact, [the controller] realized as soon as he said that it was wrong and said out loud that's wrong it needs to be 7000. [The controller] went back and told the aircraft to maintain 7000. The aircraft did not read it back.

I should have caught the no read back but I moved back to the aircraft on final to ensure we had our separation. We were about to get relieved so I wanted the position to be clean and ready to give to the new controller. During the overlap, I did a final scan before I unplugged and I saw the aircraft level at 6000 and then realized I did not hear him read back 7000. The aircraft did not read back the 6000 either, but I knew [the controller] was going to give him 7000 so I did not correct the first hear back error.

The trainee is struggling and I was very frustrated at this point in the session and was so focused on the final and speed control that I did not give the attention needed to Aircraft X's read back. This is basic air traffic and I should have caught this mistake.

I don't have any recommendations. The trainee makes bad decisions and I have to continuously correct them and explain over and over and over again why it won't work. I need to correct myself and not let a trainee continue to go when they are performing as poorly as this. If I would have been on position by myself I don't think I would have missed the read back because the session was not busy but the trainee made it busy.

Narrative: 2

I got the relief briefing for [arrivals], and the trainee advised that Aircraft X was descending to 070. I took the position and immediately made sure that all the aircraft were separated laterally since the trainee has had instances of giving up a position with aircraft on converging courses at the same altitudes. I didn't notice Aircraft X was already level at 060 in a 063 MVA, and the Trainer tapped the scope and pointed at Aircraft X about 1 minute after I took the position and brought it to my attention. I then climbed Aircraft X up to 065 and brought him in for an ILS approach.

Synopsis

Tracon Controllers reported the Developmental commanded an aircraft to descended below the MVA.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZOA.ARTCC

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 26800

Environment

Flight Conditions : IMC

Light : Dusk

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZOA

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Large Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use.STAR : SUUTR2

Airspace.Class A : ZOA

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZOA

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : Large Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use.STAR : DYAMD3

Airspace.Class A : ZOA

Person : 1

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZOA.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 27

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510022

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Distraction

Person : 2

Reference : 2
Location Of Person.Aircraft : X
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
Reporter Organization : Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew : First Officer
Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1510046
Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Human Factors : Time Pressure

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Undershoot
Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Crossing Restriction Not Met
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was descending via SUTTR into SMF via the AIT procedure following another SWA aircraft into SMF. Aircraft Y was descending VIA DYAMD into SFO. I was by myself working a number of aircraft and was not paying close attention to Aircraft X. I was assuming he would make the crossing restrictions on the SUUTR arrival. The important one is FOOLZ at FL210 or below. One minute from losing possible separation, NCT sector SUNOL called me and said Aircraft X was going to be high for all the restrictions. She mentioned he was too high and too fast. Aircraft X was out of FL268 at this point, so I hung up and immediately stopped Aircraft Y at FL270. Aircraft X crossed FOOLZ at 24700 which is 3700 feet too high. Aircraft Y could legally be down at FL220 at that point. This is very dangerous.

I have written a report on this issue before where the SFO arrival was already down at FL220 and I had to turn him hard to ensure separation. There is 5.1 miles and 1000 ft difference in the crossing restrictions on the SUUTR and DYAMD arrivals. This is way too close. What would have happened if my SFO arrival had been down at FL220 and SWA is in max descent rate trying to make the restriction? In the situation yesterday they easily could be at the exact same place at the same altitude and who knows if TCAS could save it.

The chief pilot for [Aircraft X's airline] called and said he would have a discussion about letting ATC know earlier about missing restrictions. He also mentioned this is happening a

lot and blamed it on the winglets on the B737 saying it is much more difficult to descend quickly when the airspeed is pulled back. I believe also that the previous sector may have issued the descent a little late. Again, CHANGE THE CROSSING RESTRICTIONS TO AT LEAST 10 MILES APART ON THESE TWO ARRIVALS. It is only a matter of time until there is an extremely dangerous conflict with these two procedures that results in loss of life.

Narrative: 2

ATC held us up almost 20 miles past top of descent and then slowed us to Mach .76. Later, he instructed us to "descend via" at which point we were 6000 feet above the path. After a frequency change, we told ATC we were unable to comply with the crossing restrictions due to being held up and slowed. On the next frequency we were given a phone number to call because ATC was upset we were unable to descend via. Frankly, this was 100 percent their fault and it was ludicrous that they wanted to talk to us about it.

Synopsis

ZOA Controller and air carrier First Officer reported the aircraft was issued a descent clearance too late to comply with a crossing restriction which caused a conflict with other traffic.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ALB.TRACON

State Reference : NY

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2200

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : ALB

Aircraft Operator : Corporate

Make Model Name : Gulfstream V / G500 / G550

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Initial Climb

Route In Use : Direct

Airspace.Class E : ALB

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ALB.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Departure

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 3

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1509716

Human Factors : Confusion

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airspace Structure

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure
Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X departed on an IFR flight plan. Aircraft X was issued an IFR clearance by approach. The flight strip indicated that Aircraft X was given initial altitude of 5,000 ft. When Aircraft X departed and checked in with approach the pilot was told to ident. The pilot asked if they were still required to go HIDAL which is a common initial fix given to PSF departures. I observed Aircraft X climbing through 2,000 ft direct HIDAL. The pilot was instructed to climb to 10,000 ft and reaching 5,000 ft cleared direct BAF. The pilot acknowledged and also stated that they were getting a terrain awareness warning. I handed off Aircraft X to the ARTCC without further incident.

Pilots need to state their assigned altitude on initial call up when departing. I should have confirmed the assigned altitude when the pilot did not state it. Continuing to focus on hear back/read back when issuing clearances should always be of paramount importance.

Synopsis

ALB TRACON Controller reported an aircraft that checked in climbed to the wrong altitude and received a terrain alert.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ASE.Airport

State Reference : CO

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Work Environment Factor : Glare

Light : Daylight

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : ASE

Aircraft Operator : Corporate

Make Model Name : Medium Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Landing

Route In Use.Other

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ASE.Tower

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Local

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1509150

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Confusion

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Ground Excursion : Runway

Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Ground Strike - Aircraft

Detector.Person : Flight Crew

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Flight Crew : Regained Aircraft Control

Result.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented

Result.Air Traffic Control : Provided Assistance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X landed on the wrong surface, west of runway in the grass, parallel to the runway. The aircraft did not skid off runway, touched down in grass, and slowed to a manageable speed to be able to taxi across the runway and to parking without issue. It appeared no damage to signage or lights during landing rollout. When I saw the aircraft in the grass, I went for the crash phone as my CIC (Controller in Charge) was telling me to pull it and call it an alert 3. I reported the issue to dispatch as an alert 3 emergency, and explained what had happened with the aircraft. While speaking with dispatch, it became clear the pilot was still in control of the aircraft and was able to taxi without issue, my CIC had me downgrade to an alert 2 emergency. Dispatch attempted to get the remaining emergency information, such as souls on board, but I did not have the information yet and told them to standby while I attempted to get the information from the local controller. After a few seconds they told me emergency equipment is on the way and to call back if the situation changes. A few minutes later my CIC spoke with dispatch on the landline and told them emergency vehicles were not required so I did not call back on the crash phone.

It is unknown what caused this issue. The sun may have been a factor with getting lined up directly on the runway. The runway appeared easy to distinguish from the tower but I don't know what the pilot saw to cause the wrong surface landing.

Synopsis

ASE Tower Controller reported than an aircraft landed in the grass parallel to the runway.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZNY.ARTCC

State Reference : NY

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 32000

Environment

Light : Night

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZNY

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : A320

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Cruise

Airspace.Class A : ZNY

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZNY

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : B777-200

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Cruise

Airspace.Class A : ZNY

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZNY.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 5.5

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1509149

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Wake Vortex Encounter
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

While working sector 73, [an A320] reported to me that he hit a wake and got rocked around pretty bad. The aircraft rolled about 15-20 degrees. The pilot stated that he needed to report this, so, I gave him our facility watch desk's phone number and notified the CIC who notified the Operations Manager. The only other aircraft I can think of that caused this issue was B777 who was 15 miles in front of the [A320] at the same altitude.

Synopsis

ZNY Controller reported receiving a wake turbulence report from an A320 flight crew. Wake may have come from a B777 that was 15 miles ahead of the A320.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZAB.ARTCC

State Reference : NM

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 7000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Light : Daylight

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZAB

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : B747 Undifferentiated or Other Model

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Cargo / Freight

Flight Phase : Initial Climb

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class E : U90

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer

Airspace.Class E : U90

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZAB.ARTCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 12

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1509121

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Confusion

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X called on my frequency on the ground looking for an IFR clearance. The airport is only a couple of miles into TRACON's airspace so I called them to see how we wanted to handle the departure. The filed route took the aircraft south out of his way until going northbound. I thought it would be much more efficient to go from the airport direct to their first fix. TRACON was good with that and they blocked 7,000 ft and below for the departure. The Minimum IFR Altitude in the area is 6,000 ft. When the aircraft finally departed, I radar identified Aircraft X and immediately called traffic on an untracked, unknown VFR target, Aircraft Y. Military airspace also became active and I needed to route the aircraft west and north of the airspace. I turned the aircraft left and proceeded to issue a traffic alert about the VFR traffic. Aircraft X was climbing very fast and I was not sure what altitude the aircraft was actually out of when a vector was issued.

As my supervisor suggested, I will talk about this scenario in main briefing breakout so a best practice can be developed and also review rules and procedures for clearing an aircraft off the ground.

Synopsis

ZAB Center Controller reported vectoring an aircraft without knowing the aircraft's altitude, which may have been below the Minimum IFR altitude.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : SUX.Airport
State Reference : IA
Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Aircraft

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.Tower : SUX
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : Regional Jet 900 (CRJ900)
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Flight Plan : IFR
Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC
Flight Phase : Final Approach
Route In Use : Visual Approach
Airspace.Class D : SUX

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : SUX.TOWER
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Ground
Function.Air Traffic Control : Local
Function.Air Traffic Control : Supervisor / CIC
Function.Air Traffic Control : Flight Data / Clearance Delivery
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 3
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1508881
Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Other

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working Controller In Charge when the TRACON called with emergency information on an inbound CRJ9. I picked up the crash phone to alert the SUX ARFF (Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting) of an ALERT 2 and the quality of the connection was poor. This phone rings to the ARFF, the Air National Guard (ANG) Command Post, and for some reason it rings downtown to the Sioux City emergency command center. On the line, there was an awful repeating tone as I tried to pass the information on and I couldn't tell if the ARFF heard it was an alert 2. When I tried to confirm with them they seemed to disappear and the person answering at the command post said they thought the ARFF was gone and would relay the information. This crash phone has caused numerous problems and this isn't the 1st time we've had an issue or that I've reported this it during or after an emergency. Then later in the event, Downtown called the tower to ask if there was a need for emergency medical, and this coordination is supposed to be handled by the ARFF, not the tower.

Often where there is issues with this phone system a blame game is played between the Iowa ANG, and the commercial telephone company who handles the direct line resulting in "repairs" being done that now obviously doesn't fix the problem. We need:

- 1) A new telephone system between the tower and the ANG ARFF and ANG command post.
- 2) Downtown Sioux City needs to be taken off this line -or- Retraining of the ANG and Sioux City response forces that they are to COORDINATE WITH EACH OTHER NOT THE TOWER!

More often than not, they either over react or call in at times where the tower team has their hands full and for trying to get information that is irrelevant to them. In the past, downtown Sioux City scrambled multiple departments from more than one city for a Bonanza that had an electrical failure with an Alert 1 called to the ARFF. This needs to stop. I would really like to see the city no longer on this line.

Synopsis

Tower Controller reported poor quality connection on the crash phone, and no one taking responsibility to repairing it. Controller also cited a need for training on coordination procedures to the downtown Sioux City response, or eliminated from tower line.

Time / Day

Date : 201712

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ATL.Tower

State Reference : GA

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Light : Night

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Tower : ATL

Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Airspace.Class B : ATL

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ATL.TOWER

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Ground

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 3

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1508871

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

Result.General : None Reported / Taken

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Company Policy

Contributing Factors / Situations : Staffing

Primary Problem : Company Policy

Narrative: 1

I was on Ground Control North position, we were working short staffed for the night due to the fact overtime was not called in and arrival pushes for after Christmas holidays caused Local 5 to be staffed for most of the night. I fully understand current budget issues and

trying to save overtime money allotted, but there comes a point in time where safety should be the number one priority, and keeping controllers fresh and focused by having the correct staffing numbers and not allowing time on position at the world's busiest tower to complicate the operation and morale. Our current Operations Manager has been severely complicating the issue at the Tower by refusing to call in overtime, and instructing Supervisors to not call it in, and combine certain positions instead.

On this particular shift, during the busiest push of the night, the Operations Manager just came up to me while I was working the position, and instructed me that I was taking the Clearance Delivery position combined with Ground. I had no say in the matter. This was purely a move to prevent himself on the books from looking bad because the Clearance Delivery Controller was approaching over 2 hours on position. No one was able to take it because of the landing configuration and the able bodies on break were eating lunch. Keep in mind, this is not the first time this Operations manager has undermined the safety of the National Airspace to make himself look innocent.

So while I was issuing taxi instructions, I was also issuing clearances, as well as Ground Delay Program information to pilots, while he was stuffing flight progress strips into strip holders coming out of the printer, not even checking them for accuracy. This is very dangerous, because the Operations Manager is not certified on the Clearance Delivery positions, but was doing half of the duties, while having myself signed on to the position. This is an illegal operation, and something I had no say. The Operations Manager just came over to my position, keyed up the clearance frequency and told me "You are getting clearance for a minute," which ended up being 20 minutes until I was relieved by the next controller, who also received it combined.

I was baffled by the fact that an Operations Manager, who constantly preaches safety in team training, would do this. I worked at the hardest tower in the FAA for 6 years and never experienced something like this, and we were extremely short staffed and got our heads kicked in on position every night. I also forgot to mention that the Operations Manager passed me duplicate strips, which he had no clue about; this could have been an issue. Keep in mind, later that night when clearance was still combined up, I observed the Operations Manager assigned to the OM desk with his back turned to the operation stuffing flight progress strips. He had his available supervisor working Local Control.

Working at the busiest air traffic tower in the world, the correct number of controllers should be staffed, whether it be by overtime, or other means. This Tower may not be the most complex tower in the system, but it is always busy. Talking nonstop on position for an hour can make one lethargic and tiresome, prone to mistakes. We all understand that the Operations Manager is trying to save the facility money but SAFETY is the number one priority of the National Airspace. The Operations Manager should have communicated with myself asking me if it was okay for myself to take the Clearance Delivery position combined during a busy push. He could have worked the break board better to prevent this. But first, he should have called in overtime. It's time he be held more accountable for actions like this. We NEVER had this problem at my previous facility because we all worked as a team and communicated. I also would not want anyone else to touch the flight progress strips if they are my responsibility unless I ask for help specifically. Also, we need to have more money budgeted for Overtime needs if needed for adequate staffing.

Synopsis

ATL Tower Controller reported working combined positions during a busy period while the unqualified Operations Manager performed some of the Clearance Delivery duties.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : NCT.TRACON

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : NCT

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : B737-700

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Flight Phase : Descent

Route In Use : Vectors

Route In Use : Visual Approach

Airspace.Class E : NCT

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : NCT.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 1

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1508868

Human Factors : Training / Qualification

Human Factors : Confusion

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance

Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

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 : Human Factors

Narrative: 1

I was vectoring the Aircraft for a visual approach and he was descending to 3000. The Aircraft was heading for a Minimum Vectoring Altitude (MVA) of 3900. When the Aircraft was at 4200 feet, I initiated a turn away from the MVA. The Aircraft was slower to turn than anticipated. I asked the pilot if he had the terrain in sight. The pilot stated that he did. I instructed him to maintain terrain and obstruction clearance and turned him further away from the MVA before he descended into it. My supervisor told me I could not do that. My supervisor instructed me to file this report. While I was in training, my instructors taught me that instructing the pilot to maintain his own terrain and obstruction clearance before he was below the MVA was correct.

Synopsis

A TRACON Controller reported assigning an aircraft an altitude below the Minimum Vectoring Altitude.

Time / Day

Date : 201801
Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : SPI.Airport
State Reference : IL
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2200

Environment

Flight Conditions : Marginal
Weather Elements / Visibility : Snow
Light : Daylight

Aircraft

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : SPI
Aircraft Operator : Military
Make Model Name : F/A 18 Hornet/Super Hornet
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Training
Flight Phase : Final Approach
Flight Phase : Initial Approach
Route In Use : Visual Approach
Airspace.Class C : SPI

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : SPI.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 20
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1508637
Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Speed : All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Inflight Event / Encounter : Weather / Turbulence
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors
Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure

Contributing Factors / Situations : Weather
Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1

A snow shower had just moved over the airport and was continuing towards the final of the arrival aircraft. Visibility was reduced to about 4 miles. The cloud layer was lowering to a point where the Visual Approach was going to be questionable. I wanted to give the two aircraft an ILS approach. The two aircraft insisted on a Visual Approach. The weather was above visual minimums, so both aircraft were on vectors to initial to the same runway. When the first aircraft was talking to the Tower, he slowed more than an F18 going to initial should. The second F18 unexpectedly increased his speed to 400 knots and caught the lead aircraft on final.

I think what happened was the first aircraft slowed down to land instead of going to initial. Which was 60 knots slower than expected. The second aircraft increased his speed 170 knots more than expected. The pilots need to explain their operation to air traffic better or take our speed restrictions.

Synopsis

SPI TRACON Controller reported an aircraft on final approach slowed unexpectedly causing them to have insufficient spacing on final.

Time / Day

Date : 201712
Local Time Of Day : 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : NCT.TRACON
State Reference : CA
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 17500

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : NCT
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : B737 Undifferentiated or Other Model
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC
Flight Phase : Descent
Airspace.Class E : NCT

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory.TRACON : NCT
Aircraft Operator : Air Taxi
Make Model Name : Super King Air 350
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 135
Flight Plan : IFR
Flight Phase : Climb
Airspace.Class E : NCT

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : NCT.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 7
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1507558
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Human Factors : Training / Qualification
Human Factors : Workload
Human Factors : Distraction
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Detector.Automation : Air Traffic Control
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working Morgan and Turlock combined which is a relatively large amount of airspace with a big area to scan. I took a point out from the SECA Controller on a Beechcraft Super King Air 350. As a Morgan controller, I take numerous point outs from SECA, which originate out of MRY that are typically going south bound and clipping my airspace and are out of the way of my SJC arrivals that come from the south. There are now routes in place, from MRY going south, to protect against the SJC arrivals and I thought that was what the point out indicated.

I was verbally coordinating with ZOA 16/22 about two point outs that were taking place near the SUNOL/TURLOCK/16/22 boundary which is on the opposite side of the radar scope and didn't see the conflict developing. I got further distracted when one of the point outs I took started an automated handoff to me, and my attention was directed far away from the conflict. I was trying to figure out whether to call ZOA 16/22 about the issue, but instead took the handoff and initiated an automated handoff to stop the flashing on my scope. Soon after, I got a call from ZOA saying they were stopping and turning the King Air to avoid a B737 and then the conflict alert was going off. My attention focused on the conflict, but at this point, there was nothing I could do to regain separation.

First off, I took the point out and I am responsible for this event...I'm not trying to place blame but I feel these two things also contributed to the event. I had a huge expectation bias that the SECA controller would not run a departure opposite the SJC arrivals. As a SECA controller myself, when I point out aircraft to Morgan for aircraft going south I always stay out of the way of the SJC arrivals.

First, the SECA controller is recently certified and doesn't have any other sectors so their knowledge of where to be and where not to be with traffic outside of their airspace is limited. When I asked the SECA controller why they short cut the aircraft instead of leaving them on the standard routing which has built in protection for events like this they said that the standard routing was taking him out of the way of his destination. He didn't seem to grasp that by short cutting the aircraft he was putting aircraft in potential conflict. There is a small contingent of AREA A controllers that feel the need to short cut aircraft instead of leaving them on route no matter what impact of conflict is created when done. If the SECA controller had just left the aircraft on route this would have never happened.

Second, Working Morgan and Turlock combined can be a challenge when traffic and

conflicts develop on opposite sides of the scope. It is a huge scan and one can easily be focused on traffic 80 miles away from developing conflicts. To avoid this re-occurrence, I must be vigilant, read and scan the data blocks of automated point outs, and verify that they are flying as the data block indicates.

Synopsis

NCT TRACON Controller reported accepting a point out on an MRY departure, which conflicted with an SJC arrival. The reporter attributed this incident to an expectation bias, fellow Controller's inexperience, and a heavy workload of a combined sector.

Time / Day

Date : 201801

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : C90.TRACON

State Reference : IL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 5000

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : C90

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : A330

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 129

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Flight Phase : Landing

Airspace.Class B : ORD

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : C90.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1507557

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Airport

Contributing Factors / Situations : Chart Or Publication

Contributing Factors / Situations : Company Policy

Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure

Primary Problem : Company Policy

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was assigned a runway approximately 7750 feet long. Twice Aircraft X asked two different controllers [for] the runway approximately 12000 feet long. His request was

denied twice due to "operational reasons". These operational reasons were to accommodate departures that would otherwise incur a 2 minute wake turbulence delay due to flight path issues. We should never be prohibiting an aircraft from landing the longest runway available by almost a mile to prevent a departing aircraft from incurring a 2 minute delay.

Controllers should not be required to play 20 questions with pilots whether they are requesting a runway or require it for landing distance. The problem compounds when we are required to ask foreign pilots if it is a request or a requirement. Individual agendas regarding who can land which runway should not be worked out on the floor with live traffic.

Synopsis

MLI Approach Controller reported ATC denied the request of an arriving Heavy jet for the longest runway to reduce a possible departure delay for Wake Turbulence requirements.

Time / Day

Date : 201712

Local Time Of Day : 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZTL.ARTCC

State Reference : GA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 17000

Environment

Light : Night

Aircraft

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.Center : ZTL

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : A321

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Flight Phase : Initial Climb

Airspace.Class B : ATL

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZTL.ATRCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 22

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1507556

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Human Factors : Workload

Human Factors : Time Pressure

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : All Types

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

When Detected : In-flight

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure
Contributing Factors / Situations : Staffing
Contributing Factors / Situations : Weather
Primary Problem : Staffing

Narrative: 1

Training was taking place at the South Departure sector. Mid-afternoon, the sector was closed and combined with Macon High to allow the training team to debrief before their end of shift. I believe staffing was a factor in the decision to combine sectors. Due to weather south of Atlanta, all departures were deviating towards sector R09 airspace. The R22 controller became extremely busy dealing with the deviations, I was moved from a D-side to reopen South Departure sector. Due to the workload at R22, it took a while before I was able to assume the R21 airspace.

When I finally did assume the airspace and frequencies, there was some confusion about which aircraft were on the Macon High frequency and which ones were on the South Departure frequency. While in the process of trying to sort that out, the departures continued to come from ATL, and [the departures] were deviating southwest on about a 210 heading. Aircraft X needed further to the west, [it] was stopped at 17000 feet, and a handoff to sector 09 was attempted. I called the sector and offered to turn Aircraft X, but they said no, they would take the handoff. Aircraft X did get within the protected airspace of 09 prior to acceptance off the handoff, thus causing an airspace violation.

I believe that [the] opening and closing sectors for short periods can cause an unsafe situation and [it] contributed to this event. South departure should not have been combined with Macon High due to the complexity resulting from deviating traffic. I would like to see limited use of combining sectors as a tool to compensate for lack of staffing.

Synopsis

ZTL ARTCC Controller reported that the combination of control positions during complex phases, and the need to compensate for inadequate staffing, were the primary factors that led to an airspace violation.

Time / Day

Date : 201712

Local Time Of Day : 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : ZOB.ARTCC

State Reference : OH

Aircraft

Reference : X

Make Model Name : No Aircraft

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : ZOB.ATRCC

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Enroute

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified

Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 3

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1507548

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Communication Breakdown

Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC

Communication Breakdown.Party2 : ATC

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy

Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control

Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Company Policy

Contributing Factors / Situations : Staffing

Primary Problem : Staffing

Narrative: 1

The staffing numbers were supposed to be three people staffing until midnight. We only had two people until midnight making staffing a very unsafe situation. I am not sure how only two people got scheduled to work till midnight, but management knew of this at least the day of and did nothing to get another body in to help if needed (hold people over, call people in early). Running with only two people on a shift while two sectors need to be open are unsafe and should not happen. We were one body under for the day, and shift notes were requesting one 4-12 overtime to get called in and it did not happen. Worse case, solicits to have someone stay late or come in early one way or another. Especially when you are aware of the issue and do nothing to fix it.

Synopsis

ZOB ARTCC Controller reported that management allowed under staffing against facility operations requirements, consequently compromising safety.

Time / Day

Date : 201712
Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility : SCT.TRACON
State Reference : CA
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 6500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X
ATC / Advisory. TRACON : SCT
Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier
Make Model Name : EMB ERJ 135 ER/LR
Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121
Flight Plan : IFR
Mission : Passenger
Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC
Flight Phase : Initial Climb
Route In Use : Vectors
Airspace.Class B : LAX

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory. TRACON : SCT
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 : VFR
Mission : Personal
Flight Phase : Cruise

Person

Reference : 1
Location Of Person.Facility : SCT.TRACON
Reporter Organization : Government
Function.Air Traffic Control : Instructor
Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach
Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs) : 11
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1507547
Human Factors : Confusion
Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Training / Qualification
Human Factors : Human-Machine Interface

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Altitude : Excursion From Assigned Altitude
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Detector.Automation : Aircraft TA
Detector.Automation : Aircraft RA
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result.Flight Crew : FLC complied w / Automation / Advisory
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert

Assessments

Contributing Factors / Situations : Aircraft
Contributing Factors / Situations : Company Policy
Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors
Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure
Primary Problem : Aircraft

Narrative: 1

I was the On Job Training Instructor. The Embraer 135 (E135) was on a heading of 340 level at 6000 feet. A PA-28 was enroute westbound at 6500 feet. My trainee issued traffic to both aircraft. The PA-28 reported the E135 in sight, when the E135 was approximately 1 mile south of the PA-28 we observed E135's mode C was reading 200 feet high. The trainee asked the E135 to verify level at 6000 feet. During this transmission, the E135 indicated climbing through 6300 feet. The E135 advised they were responding to an RA and they climbed through 6500 feet. After the aircraft had passed, I asked the E135 to verify they received a climb RA for the PA-28 above them. The E135 responded affirmative. There was no observed traffic below the E135 in their vicinity.

I advised the trainee that in this situation an immediate traffic alert would have been more appropriate than questioning the pilot. In this case, the TCAS did the opposite of what it should have done. This information should be forwarded to whomever is responsible for looking into TCAS errors.

Synopsis

SCT TRACON Controller reported an aircraft restricted to 6,000 feet received a TCAS/RA and climbed for a VFR aircraft above it at 6,500 feet.

Time / Day

Date : 201712

Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : DFW.Airport

State Reference : TX

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

Aircraft : 1

Reference : X

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : D10

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : EMB ERJ 170/175 ER/LR

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : 36L

Flight Phase : Initial Approach

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class B : DFW

Aircraft : 2

Reference : Y

ATC / Advisory.TRACON : D10

Aircraft Operator : Air Carrier

Make Model Name : A321

Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2

Operating Under FAR Part : Part 121

Flight Plan : IFR

Mission : Passenger

Nav In Use : FMS Or FMC

Nav In Use.Localizer/Glideslope/ILS : 35R

Flight Phase : Initial Approach

Route In Use : Vectors

Airspace.Class B : DFW

Person

Reference : 1

Location Of Person.Facility : D10.TRACON

Reporter Organization : Government

Function.Air Traffic Control : Approach

Qualification.Air Traffic Control : Developmental

ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1507535

Human Factors : Situational Awareness

Human Factors : Training / Qualification

Human Factors : Confusion

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was being vectored from the east downwind to Runway 35R for an ILS approach descending 8,000 feet. Aircraft Y was being vectored from the west downwind for an ILS approach to Runway 35R descending to 6,000 feet. Both aircraft are being worked by the same controller at this point. They turned Aircraft X to the west and turned Aircraft Y to the east, both at this point descending to 4,000 feet. They decided to change Aircraft X's runway to Runway 36L at the last minute and flashed the data block to my position. Aircraft X was then switched to my frequency without resolving the conflict with Aircraft Y. Once Aircraft X checked in on my frequency, I immediately issued a turn to 200 to avoid Aircraft Y. Once separation was re-established, Aircraft X was vectored back to Runway 36L for the ILS approach.

The only thing that I think I could have done to help this situation was ensure that the adjacent sector was turning either Aircraft Y or Aircraft X to avoid each other before I took the hand-off. The conflict should have been resolved before the frequency change occurred.

Synopsis

D10 Developmental Approach Controller reported receiving a handoff of an aircraft that was on a conflicting path with the adjacent sector's traffic.