ASRS Database Report Set

Runway Incursions

Report Set Description.................................A sampling of reports from all aviation arenas referring to runway incursions.

Update Number ..............................................34.0

Date of Update ..............................................September 28, 2018

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

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

Type of Records in Report Set............................For each update, new records received at ASRS will displace a like number of the oldest records in the Report Set, with the objective of providing the fifty most recent relevant ASRS Database records. Records within this Report Set have been screened to assure their relevance to the topic.
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.

Becky L. Hooey, 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: 1609973 (1 of 50)

Synopsis
Air taxi First Officer reported inadvertently exiting the runway into a non-movement area rather than a taxiway.

ACN: 1609177 (2 of 50)

Synopsis
Tower controllers reported a runway incursion with a departure and a vehicle.

ACN: 1609051 (3 of 50)

Synopsis
B767 First Officer reported low visibility and communications breakdown between flight crew and ATC resulted in ground conflict.

ACN: 1607368 (4 of 50)

Synopsis
Tower Controller reported a runway incursion due to an aircraft taking the improper taxi route.

ACN: 1606523 (5 of 50)

Synopsis
Portland Tower Controller reported a ground conflict and runway incursion were managed by issuance of go-around instructions.

ACN: 1604127 (6 of 50)

Synopsis
MSP Tower Controller observed a fast taxing aircraft and sent the aircraft on final around.

ACN: 1604111 (7 of 50)

Synopsis
Tower Controller and Controller In Charge reported a runway incursion after attempting to land all aircraft due to workload and splitting Local Control.

ACN: 1603791 (8 of 50)

Synopsis
BTR Tower Controller reported a runway incursion due to weather and pilot not following correct taxi instructions which could have ended in a disaster.
ACN: 1603772 (9 of 50)

Synopsis
PA-28 flight instructor reported a critical ground conflict when an aircraft taxied onto the runway, requiring evasive action.

ACN: 1602681 (10 of 50)

Synopsis
Corporate jet flight crew reported a runway incursion due to Ground Controller's ambiguity and lack of situational awareness.

ACN: 1601998 (11 of 50)

Synopsis
Pilots reported going around due to a vehicle in close proximity to a runway, and then overshooting the assigned altitude by 100 feet.

ACN: 1601070 (12 of 50)

Synopsis
Air carrier First Officer reported communication breakdown with ATC regarding takeoff clearance from MPTO.

ACN: 1600001 (13 of 50)

Synopsis
Two Local Controllers reported a runway incursion between a departing aircraft and a crossing vehicle.

ACN: 1598958 (14 of 50)

Synopsis
Local controller reported failing to issue a frequency change to an aircraft resulting in aircraft entering a higher MVA.

ACN: 1598854 (15 of 50)

Synopsis
C172 flight instructor reported ATC issued taxi instruction that created a ground conflict.

ACN: 1598265 (16 of 50)

Synopsis
Tower Front Line Manager reported incorrect coordination that led to a runway incursion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1598186 (17 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis**  
Air carrier flight crew reported radio transmissions from the Tower Controller were somewhat broken and there was some confusion over taxi instructions after landing. They were on the yellow taxiway center line, but non-standard terminology used by ATC caused them confusion. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1597971 (18 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis**  
Local Controller reported three aircraft to landed with a snowplow was stuck off the runway in the RSA area. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1595243 (19 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis**  
PA28 pilot reported an aircraft taxied onto the active runway down field, which required an evasive maneuver resulting in a runway excursion. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1594673 (20 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis**  
Ground Controller reported a runway incursion due to developmental on Local not scanning runway to ensure arrival was clear of runway. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1594330 (21 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis**  
TUS Tower controller reported not noticing a rejected takeoff, due to heavy workload from combined sectors and lack of staffing, and landing traffic causing runway conflict with the RTO aircraft. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1592650 (22 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis**  
Portland Tower Ground Controller reported crossing an aircraft, while the Local Controller had an aircraft on final. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1592051 (23 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis**  
B737 First Officer reported a ground conflict during landing rollout when ATC cleared an aircraft to took off from an intersecting runway at MYNN. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1591856 (24 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis**  
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th><strong>ACN:</strong> 1591438 <em>(25 of 50)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B737 flight crew reported observing an aircraft crossing downfield during takeoff roll from LAX.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th><strong>ACN:</strong> 1590954 <em>(26 of 50)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C402 Captain reported hearing an aircraft on final approach during back-taxi at non-towered airport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th><strong>ACN:</strong> 1590495 <em>(27 of 50)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two pilots reported lack of communication between them resulted in a conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th><strong>ACN:</strong> 1589382 <em>(28 of 50)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate pilot reported crossing runway hold short line due to confusing instructions and unclear signage at SAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th><strong>ACN:</strong> 1588175 <em>(29 of 50)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A student pilot reported an aircraft took the runway and departed opposite direction to them as they were conducting a touch and go at RYW non towered airport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th><strong>ACN:</strong> 1586851 <em>(30 of 50)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot reported being cleared for takeoff while on a taxiway, turned onto runway and while turning, observed an aircraft on final. Pilot advised Local Controller, who sent aircraft on final around.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th><strong>ACN:</strong> 1586544 <em>(31 of 50)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Controller and an air carrier Captain reported a runway incursion resulted in the departure flight crew rejecting take-off.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th><strong>ACN:</strong> 1586544 <em>(31 of 50)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGA Tower Controllers reported a tug driver towing an aircraft took another aircraft’s instructions and taxied across a runway while a departure was cleared to takeoff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACN: 1585554 (32 of 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 172 student pilot reported a ground conflict while taxiing for takeoff. The student added the cause of the problem was pilot error due to inexperience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1584236 (33 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-IV flight crew reported landing on a runway that had a damaged aircraft still on it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1582962 (34 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIA Ground Controllers reported a runway incursion due to the wrong tug being crossed at the wrong intersection as a departure starting to roll.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1582946 (35 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Controller and Air Carrier Captain reported taking closed runway resulting in RTO due to similar callsign with another aircraft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1582943 (36 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC Tower Controller reported an aircraft landing on the wrong runway, causing another aircraft to go-around.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1582690 (37 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWR Controller and an air carrier flight crew reported another air carrier's tail was not clear of the runway environment, resulting in a runway incursion and jet blast event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1582402 (38 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C172 pilot reported a conflict developed after taking the runway in front of an arriving aircraft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1582316 (39 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJ-900 Captain reported being unable to exit the runway when a CRJ failed to completely clear the runway, which resulted in landing traffic being sent around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACN: 1579165  (40 of 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA44 flight instructor reported a rejected takeoff due to a ground conflict with crossing traffic at a non towered airport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1578923  (41 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAX Tower Controller reported two side by side departures and a runway crossing that were not coordinated correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1577880  (42 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot of piston twin-engine reported the engines stalled on landing rollout precluded crossing runway hold short line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1577416  (43 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF Tower Controller reported an aircraft landing on the wrong runway and have a ground conflict with a departure aircraft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1576800  (44 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ2 and PA28 pilots reported runway incursion resulting in both aircraft taking evasive action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1574535  (45 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C152 student pilot reported a NMAC and runway incursion by opposite direction departing aircraft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1571079  (46 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Captain reported traffic conflict with an inbound aircraft just as the Tower was closing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACN: 1568679  (47 of 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PA-28 pilot reported critical ground conflict with another aircraft making opposite direction takeoff.

ACN: 1567572 (48 of 50)

Synopsis
Tower Controller sent an aircraft on short final around when they observed another aircraft taxi onto the runway without a clearance.

ACN: 1564884 (49 of 50)

Synopsis
GA pilot reported a conflict during their final approach to PAE airport when an aircraft was cleared to takeoff on same runway then stopped by Tower, but not before aircraft had incurred the runway. Reporter was instructed to go-around. Pilot reported ATC training had been a contributing factor.

ACN: 1564572 (50 of 50)

Synopsis
B737 flight crew reported a runway incursion.
Report Narratives
**ACN: 1609973 (1 of 50)**

**Time / Day**
- Date : 201901
- Local Time Of Day : 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport : FTW.Airport
- State Reference : TX
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions : Marginal
- Weather Elements / Visibility : Rain
- Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility : 1
- Light : Night
- Ceiling.Single Value : 800

**Aircraft**
- Reference : X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower : ZZZ
- Aircraft Operator : Air Taxi
- Make Model Name : Light Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew : 2
- Operating Under FAR Part : Part 135
- Flight Plan : IFR
- Mission : Passenger
- Flight Phase : Landing
- Flight Phase : Taxi
- Airspace.Class B : ZZZ

**Person**
- Reference : 1
- Location Of Person.Aircraft : X
- Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
- Reporter Organization : Air Taxi
- Function.Flight Crew : First Officer
- Function.Flight Crew : Pilot Not Flying
- Qualification.Flight Crew : Flight Instructor
- Qualification.Flight Crew : Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
- Qualification.Flight Crew : Multiengine
- Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument
- Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 5200
- Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 45
- Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 800
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1609973
- Human Factors : Confusion
- Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : Taxi

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

We landed FTW RWY 31L. Tower stated we were allowed to vacate right on upcoming taxiways E, or C4. As we slowed down, we noted there were two right turns off of the runway, one which was clearly marked C4 and the one closest to us, which was not clearly marked. The visibility was low and the windshield was covered with water. Pilot Flying assumed the exit was E and started a right turn to vacate the runway. As the turn was completed, we realized this was in fact not a taxiway, but a closed off part of either an apron or old runway. There were no signs or runway edge lights to prevent us or warn us that this area cannot be used, instead there was red lights some 80 feet ahead, so we pretty much knew this was a dead end prior to fully vacating the runway. Crew realized we had made wrong turn and proceeded to turn back to the adjacent taxiway (C4), to vacate. As we completed the turn we realized ATC had cleared another aircraft who announced we were still in use of the runway and was requested to abort rollout. We contacted Ground once cleared of runway and were given taxi instructions and a phone number to call due to deviation. The PIC contacted them and was advised there would be an investigation on the matter.

I question some aspects that possibly lead to this incident. The fact that there are no visible runway edge lights or signs to prevent aircraft from entering this part of the runway. The lack of information on the taxiway plate, though there is a X mark, there is not a hotspot highlighted as high risk for deviations, and ATC’s decision to clear another aircraft for takeoff during precipitation and low visibility conditions without the certainty that us (the landing aircraft) had fully cleared the runway.

Synopsis

Air taxi First Officer reported inadvertently exiting the runway into a non-movement area rather than a taxiway.
ACN: 1609177 (2 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201901
Local Time Of Day: 0001-0600

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

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: A320
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Flight Plan: IFR
Mission: Passenger
Flight Phase: Taxi
Route In Use: None
Airspace.Class C: ZZZ

Person: 1
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Facility: ZZZ.TOWER
Reporter Organization: Government
Function.Air Traffic Control: Instructor
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: 1609177
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

Person: 2
Reference: 2
Location Of Person.Facility: ZZZ.TOWER
Reporter Organization: Government
Function.Air Traffic Control: Other / Unknown
Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs): 7
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1609191
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector.Person: Air Traffic Control
Assessments
Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors
Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1
Maintenance truck, needed five minutes on Runway XXL and was granted this access while holding short of Runway XY on Runway XXL. Meanwhile, Aircraft X began taxiing to Runway XXL while an inbound was about 10 miles out for Runway XY. The South radar controller briefly called to coordinate something, but then hung up and this got the Trainee and I in a brief discussion about what APREQ [Approval Request] they may have been considering. We were using the correct memory aid to show that Runway XXL was occupied and unavailable, however, our scan broke down and Aircraft X was cleared for takeoff while taxiing on Taxiway D towards D1, as the Runway XY lander was already crossing the Runway XY/ XXL intersection. Maintenance Truck, then reported exiting Runway XXL as he heard our clearance and saw the A320 turning from D1 to begin taking the runway. I quickly verified that Maintenance Truck had exited Runway XXL, and he confirmed this immediately and then Aircraft X continue lining up on Runway XXL and he then commenced his takeoff roll. Training on local control was in progress and I was the OJT instructor.

I could have refrained from discussing a theoretical APREQ and maybe this would helped the Trainee and I from having a degraded runway scan that is obviously much more important.

Narrative: 2
I was staffing a position while training was being conducted on LC and a Developmental worked GC/CD. The session had been fairly steady with crossing Runway ops and LUAW [Line Up And Wait] being utilized. As traffic died down, I went to the computer at the SUP position to reference ART [time and position tracker]. As I did this I heard the trainer on local make a call to verify that Maintenance Vehicle was holding short of Runway XXL. I looked back to the approach end of the runway and saw that Aircraft X was entering the runway environment. I then saw Maintenance Vehicle exiting Runway XXL at TWY A1. The vehicle had exited the runway environment prior to the aircraft starting takeoff roll. Continue vigilance while training is taking place. The busier traffic had been handled well, but as the perceived lull came, the error occurred.

Synopsis
Tower controllers reported a runway incursion with a departure and a vehicle.
ACN: 1609051 (3 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201901
Local Time Of Day: 0001-0600

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

Environment
Flight Conditions: IMC
Weather Elements / Visibility: Cloudy
Weather Elements / Visibility: Fog
Weather Elements / Visibility. Visibility: .25

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Ground: RFD
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: B767 Undifferentiated or Other Model
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR
Mission: Cargo / Freight
Flight Phase: Taxi

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower: RFD
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: Commercial Fixed Wing
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR
Flight Phase: Final Approach
Airspace.Class D: RFD

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew: First Officer
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Not Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1609051
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown. Party 1: Flight Crew  
Communication Breakdown. Party 2: ATC

**Events**

Anomaly. ATC Issue: All Types  
Anomaly. Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe  
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: Provided Assistance

**Assessments**

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

**Narrative: 1**

Event occurred taxing on taxiway F from our ramp to runway 7 for departure. On taxi the ground controller reported the new ATIS was current, which we had and I reported we had ATIS. The weather this morning was poor with reported visibility of 1/4 mile and a 200 feet indefinite ceiling. This ATIS also reported that CAT II/III operations were in effect. After this radio call the controller cleared us for takeoff on Runway 7. At this point we were still roughly 2,000 feet from the end of the runway and taxiing slowly due to the poor visibility. We accepted the takeoff clearance but advised we would need time in position before takeoff (The temp was below 3C we needed to do the engine run up per company procedures). The controller responded with approved and advise when rolling. We figured there must not be any other traffic around but looking back on this the controller probably could not see our location on the airport due to the low vis and thought we were closer to the runway than we were.

When reaching to preset the departure frequency I realized we were still on Ground and were cleared to takeoff on the ground control frequency (The same controller was working both) so I switched to tower. After switching to tower I heard our company aircraft, Aircraft Y, checking in on the ILS. It sounded like approach might have handed them over late. After this aircraft checked on the tower asked us if we had started rolling yet and we responded that we had not yet taken the runway. At this point we were between taxiway H and runway 7 on taxiway F. The tower controller once again asked us to verify that we were clear of the runway. We replied that we were clear of the runway and we were holding short.

At this point we were holding short of Runway 7 on F and we could see on TCAS the inbound traffic was at 700 feet. The captain then asked me if we had entered the ILS Critical Area and neither one of us could remember passing the sign for one but we were not necessarily sure since we had been cleared for takeoff so early. Since vis was low with CAT II/III ops in effect, traffic on short final, and we were not sure if we were inside the ILS Critical Area or not (we were holding short of the runway) we decided to lean on the side of safety and reported to tower that we were inside the ILS critical area. The controller then instructed our company aircraft to go around, which they did. After they went around we were issued a new takeoff clearance and time in position to do our run up. We departed and completed our flight without any problems.
After we departed we studied the jepp charts and could not find a ILS hold line depicted at RFD. Upon arrival [at our destination] we called RFD Tower on the phone and asked to clarify. The controller working our departure had already gone off duty but the controller we spoke to told us that the ILS Critical Area for Runway 7 was co-located with the hold short line and that we had not entered into the ILS Critical Area. He thanked us for taking a proactive approach to safety and said there were no issues. Looking back it seems we caused our company aircraft to unnecessarily go-around by erroneously reporting inside the ILS Critical Area. This was not intentional but since we were in doubt we leaned on the side of safety.

**Synopsis**

B767 First Officer reported low visibility and communications breakdown between flight crew and ATC resulted in ground conflict.
ACN: 1607368 (4 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201901
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

Place
Locale Reference.Airport: DAL.Airport
State Reference: TX
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: DAL
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: Taxi
Route In Use: None

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower: DAL
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: Citation Excel (C560XL)
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR
Mission: Passenger
Flight Phase: Takeoff
Route In Use: None

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Facility: DAL.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): 1
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1607368
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Taxiway
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : Taxi
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working GC (Ground control). Aircraft Y had just landed RWY 31L and was instructed by LC (Local Controller) to turn right at either taxiway E or C4. LC observed Aircraft Y making a right turn off at C4 then cleared Aircraft X for take off (who I believe was in position at the time). I noticed Aircraft Y continuing a right handed turn onto an old decommissioned reverse exit (Juliet I believe was it's name). I immediately yelled to LC to stop his departure and that Aircraft Y was still on the runway. LC immediately canceled the takeoff clearance. By this time Aircraft Y had done a complete 180 and was slightly working his way southbound on the runway, eventually continuing a right hand turn for C4 again.

The old reverse turn off "stub" should have been and still should be completely demolished. Currently it exists as a approximately 50 foot piece of concrete coming of off C4. There are yellow painted X's however at night most likely difficult to see.

Furthermore this airport would greatly benefit from an ASDE-X. This would have given LC an even better idea of the situation.

Synopsis

Tower Controller reported a runway incursion due to an aircraft taking the improper taxi route.
**Time / Day**
- Date: 201812
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport: PDX.Airport
- State Reference: OR
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: PDX
- 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: Taxi
- Route In Use: None

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: PDX
- Make Model Name: PA-34 Seneca Undifferentiated
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Mission: Passenger
- Flight Phase: Landing
- Route In Use: None

**Aircraft : 3**
- Reference: Z
- 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
- Flight Phase: Taxi
- Airspace.Class C: PDX

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Facility: PDX.TRACON
- Reporter Organization: Government
**Function.** Air Traffic Control : Local  
**Qualification.** Air Traffic Control : Developmental  
**ASRS Report Number.** Accession Number : 1606523

### Events

- **Anomaly.** ATC Issue : All Types  
- **Anomaly.** Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical  
- **Anomaly.** Deviation - Procedural : Clearance  
- **Anomaly.** Ground Incursion : Runway  
- **Detector.** Person : Air Traffic Control  
- **When Detected.** In-flight  
- **When Detected.** Taxi  
- **Result.** Flight Crew : Executed Go Around / Missed Approach  
- **Result.** Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance  
- **Result.** Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

### Assessments

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

**Narrative: 1**

I taxied Aircraft X to Runway 10L full length with a clearance to cross Runway 21 on Kilo. At the time of this instruction, I had control of Runway 3/21. There were no conflicts along the taxi route so I passed the strip. Aircraft Y had cancelled IFR and the Local 1 Controller made the decision to bring Aircraft Y to Runway 03. This was based on ragged fog at the approach end of Runways 10 left and right as well as the southwest. The LC1 Controller then asked for control of Runway 3. I scanned my strip bay and the runway and seeing no traffic, I gave control of Runway 3 to the LC1 controller. I did not realize Aircraft X had not yet crossed and reached the approach end of 10L. The Clearance Delivery Controller recognized that Aircraft X was in the process of crossing Runway 21 at Kilo as Aircraft Y was on short final. He recognized the conflict and advised the LC1 Controller. The LC1 Controller issued go around instructions to the LC1 Controller. When I heard the LC1 Controller issue go around instructions I scanned the runway and adjacent taxiways for conflicts. My thought was an aircraft in the vicinity of Echo and Foxtrot had mis-executed my instructions. I did not see Aircraft X and recognize the conflict. Additionally, before regaining control of Runway 3/21, I issued taxi instructions to Aircraft Z via Kilo with the clearance to cross 21. I take full and complete responsibility for this incident. It was my responsibility to ensure that no conflicts existed prior to transferring control of Runway 3/21. Additionally, it was my responsibility to protect the runway when I do not have control of it. I did not execute those responsibilities. I expect to be held accountable as I would expect anyone in this organization to be held accountable for mediocre, sub-standard, unsafe performance. I am completely supportive of any and all remedial training opportunities to include classroom training, skill enhancement training and decertification. I do not want to be a minimally competent controller. I welcome the chance to get better. After discussions with senior experienced controllers about their techniques in this type of situation, I am not going to give up control of my runway until visually verifying that all aircraft in the receiving controllers bin are accounted for prior to releasing the runway. I am open to all constructive comments and ideas to be better. I am available for any clarifying questions.

**Synopsis**
Portland Tower Controller reported a ground conflict and runway incursion were managed by issuance of go-around instructions.
Time / Day
Date: 201812
Local Time Of Day: 0001-0600

Place
Locale Reference.Airport: MSP.Airport
State Reference: MN
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: MSP
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
Route In Use: None

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower: MSP
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: Bombardier/Canadair Undifferentiated or Other Model
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR
Mission: Passenger
Flight Phase: Final Approach
Route In Use.Other
Airspace.Class B: MSP

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Facility: MSP.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): 0.5
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1604127
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector.Person: Air Traffic Control
When Detected : Taxi
Result: Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working the Local Control South position. I observed Aircraft X on Runway 22 approaching Runway 12R/30L. Due to the aircraft's taxi speed I concluded the Aircraft X would be unable to stop without causing a runway incursion. At the same time Aircraft Y was approximately on a half mile final to Runway 12R. I told Aircraft Y to go around. I then observed Aircraft X cross Runway 12R on Runway 22 and turn onto taxiway Whiskey. Wigwag lights and retractable barriers installed at the intersection of 12R/30L and Runway 4/22.

Synopsis

MSP Tower Controller observed a fast taxing aircraft and sent the aircraft on final around.
Time / Day
Date: 201812
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

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

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
Aircraft Operator: Personal
Make Model Name: Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Flight Plan: VFR
Flight Phase: Landing
Route In Use: Visual Approach
Airspace.Class D: ZZZ

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
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: Landing
Route In Use: Visual Approach
Airspace.Class D: ZZZ

Person: 1
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Facility: ZZZ.TOWER
Reporter Organization: Government
Function.Air Traffic Control: Local
Function.Air Traffic Control: Trainee
Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Fully Certified
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs): 5.5
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1604111
Human Factors: Training / Qualification
Human Factors: Workload
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

Person: 2
Reference: 2
Location Of Person.Facility: ZZZ.TOWER
Events

Anomaly. ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly. Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly. Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly. Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector. Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : Taxi

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was providing OJT on Local Control. Traffic was building with numerous aircraft in the north and south patterns. I asked the CIC to split the Local Control position. It took him a couple of minutes as he was working on an IFR release for us and attempted to take a briefing but it was too busy to brief. I told the Developmental working to make his pattern players full stop so that we could brief and start fresh. Aircraft X was cleared for a full stop landing on RYXXL, number one. Aircraft Y was cleared to land RYXXL, number two, following Aircraft X. Spacing was close, so the Developmental told Aircraft Y that "S turns" south of course were approved for spacing, hoping that the pilot would make them and adequate spacing would be achieved. We moved on to other traffic and by the time my scan made it back to RYXXL Aircraft X had landed approaching a turn of south of the runway at Taxiway P, closely followed by Aircraft Y who had already landed and rolled out. I instructed Aircraft X to exit the runway immediately and Aircraft Y followed him off at taxiway P.

I should have shut down the pattern and then reconvened once we were able to split the Local position. I also could have taken over for the Developmental at a point where we had decent control over the traffic; it had developed to a point that we were reacting and the situation was chaotic.

I do have to mention that the staffing levels are low and would greatly benefit from more controllers so that we could have the Local Control position split.

Narrative: 2

At the time of the event, I was the CIC. Traffic was moderate to heavy with moderate complexity due to the mixture of aircraft in the traffic pattern with itinerant aircraft. There was training on Local Control only. The Local trainer asked to split local operations. I then told our Ground Control to make a split ATIS and I moved over to the local-north position to preview it. As I began to preview the position, I realized traffic was to heavy and complex to split at that very moment. I then instructed local to full stop all traffic and shut the pattern down so we could split positions. Local then began to tell aircraft to land and
taxi back. Aircraft X was at a very slow taxi speed and exiting RY2XXL at Papa intersection when I noticed Aircraft Y rolling out behind Aircraft X, maybe within a few hundred feet. I believe the mixture of training on Local and what appeared to be training in both of the aircraft involved led to the loss of separation. Aircraft X appeared to be at a very slow taxi speed exiting the runway and Aircraft Y appeared to be at a faster than normal roll out for an aircraft cleared to land.

I would recommend training be stopped if traffic level and complexity requires locals to be split.

Synopsis

Tower Controller and Controller In Charge reported a runway incursion after attempting to land all aircraft due to workload and splitting Local Control.
ACN: 1603791 (8 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201812
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

Place
Locale Reference. Airport: BTR.Airport
State Reference: LA
Altitude. AGL. Single Value: 0

Environment
Flight Conditions: IMC
Weather Elements / Visibility. Visibility: 0.25

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory. Tower: BTR
Make Model Name: Cessna Aircraft Undifferentiated or Other Model
Crew Size. Number Of Crew: 1
Flight Plan: IFR
Flight Phase: Taxi
Route In Use: None

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory. Tower: BTR
Make Model Name: Small Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng
Crew Size. Number Of Crew: 1
Flight Plan: IFR
Flight Phase: Takeoff
Flight Phase: Taxi
Route In Use: None
Airspace. Class C: BTR

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person. Facility: BTR. 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: 1603791
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Human Factors: Distraction
Communication Breakdown. Party1: ATC
Communication Breakdown. Party2: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown. Party2: ATC
Analyst Callback: Completed
**Events**

- **Anomaly.Conflict**: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
- **Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural**: Published Material / Policy
- **Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural**: Clearance
- **Anomaly.Ground Incursion**: Taxiway
- **Anomaly.Ground Incursion**: Runway
- **Detector.Person**: Air Traffic Control
- **When Detected**: Taxi
- **Result.Air Traffic Control**: Provided Assistance
- **Result.Air Traffic Control**: Issued Advisory / Alert

**Assessments**

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

**Narrative: 1**

BTR was LIFR [Low Instrument Flight Rules], VV002 and Vis was 1/4. Aircraft Y was taxied to RWY13 via Echo--Bravo without issue. Aircraft X was taxied to RWY 13 using the same route. The Ground Controller kept Aircraft X on a short leash and issued multiple hold short and reporting instructions. Aircraft X was first told to hold short of Bravo. Aircraft X reported holding short of Bravo and was told to make a left onto Bravo and hold short of RWY 22L at Bravo. Ground Control received the crossing from me (Local Controller) and crossed Aircraft X across RWYs 22L and 22R, and Aircraft X reported across RWY 22R.

Aircraft Y called ready at [Runway] 13. I instructed Aircraft Y to hold short of [Runway] 13 and stated I wanted to verify the position of another aircraft one more time. Ground Control confirmed that Aircraft X was established on Bravo. I cleared Aircraft Y for takeoff. After Aircraft Y departed, Aircraft X reported that he was sitting at Echo/Echo 1. In order for Aircraft X to be at Echo/Echo 1, Aircraft X never made the turn onto Bravo and never crossed the parallel runways, but crossed the active, RWY 13, [which] Aircraft Y departed from. The Ground Controller issued a Brasher Warning and taxied Aircraft X to RWY 22R since that would be the easiest/closest runway to depart from.

BTR has had multiple issues with incursions. As part of the LSC [Local Safety Council] that just got updated, [it] recommended to the airport that their vehicle/mower operator numbers be simplified, which they did. [Also], on each controller’s birth month, each controller gets an airfield tour by Airport Ops.

We received word from AJI [Safety and Technical Training] [that] we did everything that we could have to prevent this, yet it still happened. The pilot never admitted that they were lost. They lied to the Ground Control when they reported being on the expected taxiway at least 3 times. The pilot needs to be held to the same standard that we are and at a minimum, needs to have their license suspended. I would recommend going through ground school again. It is the weekend warrior that has posed the most danger.

Since BTR is in the Top 5 for [Runway] incursions, I would recommend ASDE [Airport Surface Detection Equipment] as well; [I’m] not holding my breath. I would also recommend “wig wags” at every intersection and in-ground flashing lights at every intersection. During our LSC discussions, it has been stated that we are lucky that we haven’t knocked somebody out of the sky. This was by far the closest I have ever come and it wasn’t because of something that we did as controllers.
Callback: 1
Reported stated same information as reported and would like to see some input/help from the FAA as this is a Top 5 airport, [reporter thought] for runway incursions. Reporter would like equipment as requested in report for the airport.

Synopsis
BTR Tower Controller reported a runway incursion due to weather and pilot not following correct taxi instructions which could have ended in a disaster.
ACN: 1603772

Time / Day
Date: 201812

Place
Locale Reference.Airport: ZZZ.Airport
State Reference: US
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 5

Environment
Flight Conditions: VMC
Light: Daylight

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
Aircraft Operator: FBO
Make Model Name: PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Flight Plan: None
Mission: Training
Flight Phase: Landing
Route In Use: Visual Approach
Airspace.Class E: ZZZ

Aircraft: 2
ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
Make Model Name: Cessna Aircraft Undifferentiated or Other Model
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Flight Phase: Taxi

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: FBO
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
Qualification.Flight Crew: Commercial
Qualification.Flight Crew: Flight Instructor
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 53
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 210
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1603772
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Flight Crew

Events
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
Miss Distance.Horizontal : 0
Miss Distance.Vertical : 10
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

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

Narrative: 1
While performing flight training in the pattern at ZZZ, a runway incursion almost created an accident. While 3 aircraft are in the pattern all using Runway XX and all pilots communicating on the CTAF frequency, Aircraft Y entered active Runway XX during the touchdown phase of our landing. The aircraft was not talking on radios but looked like he was going to stop at the hold short line so we made the decision to continue. On round out just before touchdown aircraft entered runway and a go-around was executed. We missed aircraft by about 10 feet. That aircraft then continued to taxi to Runway XY and departed. I called him on the radios and the pilot responded "Sorry didn't see you." He also stated he was using his radios but no other aircraft nor the FBO could hear him.

Synopsis
PA-28 flight instructor reported a critical ground conflict when an aircraft taxied onto the runway, requiring evasive action.
ACN: 1602681

Time / Day
Date: 201812
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

Place
Locale Reference.Airport: VNY.Airport
State Reference: CA
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Environment
Flight Conditions: VMC

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Ground: ZZZ
Aircraft Operator: Corporate
Make Model Name: Light Transport
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Flight Plan: IFR
Mission: Ferry
Flight Phase: Taxi

Person: 1
Reference: 1
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Not Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1602681

Person: 2
Reference: 2
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1602682
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2: ATC

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector.Person: Flight Crew
When Detected: Taxi
Assessments
Contributing Factors / Situations : Human Factors
Contributing Factors / Situations : Procedure
Primary Problem : Procedure

Narrative: 1
We were repositioning from FBO 1 where we cleared Customs and dropped clients over to FBO 2 to prepare to depart for [destination]. We were given clearance to taxi via Alpha and Papa to hold short of [Runway] 16R. After being told to hold a couple of minutes for other crossing traffic we were given clearance to cross [Runway] 16R at Papa and to join Bravo to FBO. About 10 seconds after being cleared to cross, Ground instructs us to hold short immediately for landing traffic. We advised we were already across the hold short line based on the earlier clearance. We were then cleared to cross once again expeditiously. The other GA aircraft on short final was sent around as a runway incursion would have followed due to our inability to be completely across the hold short line in time.

The Ground Controller seemed a bit overwhelmed due to the amount of GA traffic in the pattern and taxiing for [Runway] 16L. We were vigilant in keeping up with what was going on on the ground and did not see much margin for incursions as separate runways were being utilized for GA and jet traffic.

When there is a busy traffic pattern double verifying cleared across runway instructions.

Narrative: 2
We were doing an FBO repo, without pax, from FBO 1 (for Customs) to FBO 2. We were given a clearance to "taxi FBO 2 via A,P,B, hold short 16R". While holding short, we heard a plane ask to return to the FBO for mechanical issue. Ground went back and forth with them and then cleared us to cross [Runway] 16R, "no delay". [Copilot] read the clearance back and we started rolling. When our nose crossed the hold short line (5 seconds maybe), Ground came back and said "hold short 16R". We stopped abruptly and [copilot] told Ground we stopped but our nose is over the line. Immediately, Ground once again cleared us to cross [Runway] 16R. We proceeded cautiously looking at the approach end as we then saw a small plane on short final. As we cleared [Runway] 16R on the other side, we noticed that aircraft had gone around. We were never told to contact Tower. There was never any confusion over the radio or in the cockpit with what our clearance was at any time. Ground didn’t call us again.

Synopsis
Corporate jet flight crew reported a runway incursion due to Ground Controller's ambiguity and lack of situational awareness.
**Time / Day**
Date: 201812
Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

**Place**
Locale Reference.ATC Facility: ZZZ.Tower
State Reference: US
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 20

**Environment**
Flight Conditions: VMC

**Aircraft**
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: B777-300
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 3
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR
Mission: Passenger
Flight Phase: Landing
Airspace.Class B: ZZZ

**Person : 1**
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew: Captain
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 21600
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 160
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 665
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1601998
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

**Person : 2**
Reference: 2
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew: Check Pilot
Function.Flight Crew: Captain
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
At approximately 20 feet on a visual ILS landing to Runway XXR, tower control said, "Aircraft X go-around." As our main gear began to touch the runway, a go-around was performed. We asked for the reason and tower explained there was a vehicle on the runway. We climbed initially to 4,000 feet on the published missed approach and then we were given a climb to 5,000 feet as well as vectors for a left downwind and base to Runway XXL for a visual approach and landing to a full stop. This flight was leg 4 of an OE training for me and I was being monitored by a Check Captain.

Recently I was performing a QC Check on one of our LCA's who was giving OE to a new Captain, from the second observer's seat. This was a nice weather morning landing in ZZZ, Visual with ILS backup. The student Captain was about to touchdown and the rear axle touched down nicely and the middle and forward axles either were about to touch, when ATC directed our flight number to go around. I heard it from the second observer's seat, and! was ready to verbalize when after a slight hesitation, to probably process, the LCA started the thrust application for the go around maneuver. By that time the air/ground switch most likely went to zero tilt and ground mode, from my position I did not have a clear view of the LCA moving the throttles, but felt the acceleration, then the
go around profile, which was flown well. The interesting part became the debrief after the subsequent landing, and a good debrief with all crew members including myself from my limited view. Startle factor definitely played into the event, and with a quick scan both from information on final and touchdown, there was no identified crossing air traffic on the 1’s conflicting with our landing on XXR. The Tower Controller provided a brief explanation on the balked landing/go around, while I believed I understood the information they were providing, it was not ATC controller phraseology, but it generally identified the threat, as a ground vehicle from a group of workers, working on taxiway lights, that had parked/driver near/on the hold line for XXR, and caused an alarm in the Tower, most likely from the Runway Safety Light System or the ground radar, and the subsequent go around occurrence. On the subsequent landing rollout the men and equipment working, were visible, as we landed and cleared XXL. While they were not on the runway, they apparently fouled the runway environment warning system, and alarmed the Local. After parking and the post flight debrief, much credit to our LCA, as similar to this xx article, either TOGA switch was not pushed, but it most likely would not have been automatically available as described in the Flight Manual Warning, the Caution, and the Rejected Landing procedure with the associated warnings and cautions. In this case the LCA correctly manually pushed the power up at the base of the throttles to provide energy back to the aircraft and the go around mode inputs from the Captain student who was the Pilot Flying. Well done by the LCA!

Narrative: 3

This report is to report a last minute go-around in ZZZ as directed by the Tower that resulted in a balked landing and Altitude Deviation. We were inbound to Runway XXR and ATC had cleared us for the ILS approach. We had also been cleared to land on Runway XXR. I was conducting a Captain OE. I was the LCA flying in the right seat and I was the monitoring pilot and the one communicating with ATC. The weather was improving to the point that ATC was trying to determine whether they could fly visual approaches. I had relayed our flight conditions to the ZZZ Tower and asked if they could relay back to approach for us. During our approach we had a direct crosswind from the right and we were sequenced behind a 777 who was approximately 3 to 4 miles ahead of us on the approach. The 777 landed and exited the runway and was well clear by the time we were on short final. As we got to about 400 FT AGL, I asked the Tower for a final wind check. I observed a 767 departing off of Runway 1R. We were passing about 250’ AGL at the point we saw the 767 crossing our runway on their initial climb. This seemed consistent with normal spacing and normal operations for ZZZ ATC. As the Captain initiated the flare descending below 50 FT AGL, I heard ZZZ Tower direct us to go-around. The Captain focusing on his landing did not hear or process the last minute ATC instruction to go-around. I read back the clearance to go-around, but since my student didn't hear it, I had to direct him to go-around. Not seeing the Captain responding to the ATC direction to go-around, I reached over and aggressively pushed the throttles forward and told him to go-around. This all happened very fast, so I’m not 100% sure on everything that took place in the flight deck. The airplane touched down on the runway momentarily before we became airborne and started the go-around. The Captain continued flying the airplane during the go-around. We did a momentary soft touchdown on Runway XXR before the thrust kicked in and we began climbing during the go-around. Essentially the last minute go-around resulted in a balked landing maneuver. Our go-around was hurried and a few procedural steps got omitted. The Captain failed to initially push the TOGA switches, but the throttles were pretty much full forward as I had interceded and had shoved them forward manually to initiate the last second go-around. We made the initial climb at a higher power setting which resulted in a faster airspeed and a faster climb rate than normal. Fortunately, we did not exceed any engine parameters or flap speeds during the go-around. The Captain re-engaged the autopilot at approximately 500 FT AGL on the go-around. He also re-
engaged TOGA. We were given a further clearance by ZZZ Tower to fly the runway heading and climb to 3,000 FT. With the amount of thrust applied, we were climbing at a high rate of ascent and even with the auto pilot engaged, the auto-flight system leveled off high before it corrected back. We busted the altitude by 100 FT as it captured the altitude. Maximum altitude indicated was 3,100 FT. With 4-crew members in the flight deck we noted that none of us saw a change to the "Runway Status Lighting System", so we were not sure initially on what caused the Tower to direct the last second go-around. We do not believe the go-around was due to a loss of separation with another airplane. We were re-sequenced for a 2nd approach and after landing on Runway XXL, we exited on the forward high speed. As we taxied on XXX taxiway, we noted that there was a vehicle and men located near the taxiway. Although I'm not positive, we believe the go-around may have been triggered due to concerns that a vehicle had encroached our landing runway. We debriefed the event at the gate following engine shutdown.

Synopsis

Pilots reported going around due to a vehicle in close proximity to a runway, and then overshooting the assigned altitude by 100 feet.
ACN: 1601070 (12 of 50)

Time / Day
- Date: 201812
- Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

Place
- Locale Reference.Airport: MPTO.Airport
- State Reference: FO
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Environment
- Flight Conditions: VMC

Aircraft
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: MPTO
- 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: Takeoff

Person
- Reference: 1
- 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: Multiengine
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
- Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 1609
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1601070
- Human Factors: Time Pressure
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness
- Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
- Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
- Communication Breakdown.Party2: ATC

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

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

Narrative: 1

Sitting number one for takeoff while holding short of Rwy 03R in MPTO, we believed we heard in very broken English "line up and wait 03R, be ready for an immediate". I saw Aircraft Y approaching and thought it would be tight but doable. I responded to ATC with "Line up and wait 03R, and we'll be ready". Practically all the ATC communications were in Spanish, except for our clearance. This makes it very difficult to have situational awareness. We heard an ATC transmission while we were taking the runway in Spanish that included "[our company callsign]" and had intensity in his voice (I can only assume this was the Aircraft Y pilot asking what the heck was going on with [our company callsign] taking the runway).

Then ATC said something that seemed like a takeoff clearance. At this time the Captain was straightening the aircraft onto the runway centerline. I asked ATC "say again." There was no immediate response so the Captain keyed the mic and said "confirm cleared for takeoff." We both heard "affirmative." We proceeded with the takeoff roll. I was flying pilot and the Captain was non flying pilot. While we were on the takeoff roll we heard in Spanish "Aircraft Y... [unintelligible]... Going around."

Once we got in the air around 800 ft AGL, ATC told us that our instruction was to "line up and wait after landing traffic and be ready for immediate." The Captain responded that we did not hear the "after landing traffic" portion. Since we did not hear that I never responded when I accepted the lineup and wait clearance. I read it back and ATC had that opportunity to correct the situation before we took the runway. Also, why did we hear "affirmative" after the Captain asked to "confirm cleared for takeoff"?

I believe the majority of the transmissions in Spanish played a large role in this event due to not giving us complete situational awareness. Also the controller's English was very poor and they spoke fast making it difficult to understand. I personally feel that ATC made a mistake and was trying to put the blame on us after their bad decision to issue us a takeoff clearance.

Synopsis
Air carrier First Officer reported communication breakdown with ATC regarding takeoff clearance from MPTO.
Time / Day
Date: 201812
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

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

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
Aircraft Operator: Personal
Make Model Name: PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Flight Plan: IFR
Flight Phase: Takeoff
Route In Use: None

Person: 1
Reference: 1
Location Of Person. Facility: ZZZ. Tower
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): .5
ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1600001
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Human Factors: Distraction
Communication Breakdown.Party1: ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Other

Person: 2
Reference: 2
Location Of Person. Facility: ZZZ. Tower
Reporter Organization: Government
Function.Air Traffic Control: Ground
Function.Air Traffic Control: Instructor
Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Developmental
ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1600003
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Human Factors: Distraction
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2: ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Other
Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
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 : Human Factors
Primary Problem : Human Factors

Narrative: 1
I was on position as a stand-alone CIC during the event. Training was being accomplished on Ground Control. Vehicle X was holding short of Runway XX on W. Ground Control issued instructions to the vehicle to cross Runway XX without coordinating with Local Control. Local Control had just cleared Aircraft X to takeoff on Runway XX. Knowing this, I shouted "No, no, no!" which can be heard on the tapes, towards the Ground Control Trainee. The Trainee then stopped in the middle of the transmission. Vehicle X began to cross the runway, and then read back the crossing instructions. Aircraft X was on takeoff roll and slightly airborne when Vehicle X crossed in front of it. Vehicle X was clear of the intersection of Runway XX and W before the aircraft reached it.

At the time, there was a coyote running around the field, including on active runways. Myself and the Ground Control Trainee were trying to keep an eye on the coyote in order to relay its position to Vehicle X, which is the reason the vehicle came out in the first place. I believe this may have been a contributing distraction to the event.

As the CIC, I think that instead of shouting "No, no, no!" I should have shouted "Hold short" instead. Perhaps that may have cued the Trainee to say those words instead of just stopping the transmission altogether. Memory aids were used properly at the time; I think this is just a freaky mistake that is a one-time thing. I don't know that anything else could have been done on my part to prevent this incident. The Trainee could possibly learn to scan better (looking at the board to see that Ground Control did not have Runway XX for crossing) and the OJTI [On-the-Job Training Instructor] perhaps could have keyed up over the Trainee and told the vehicle to hold short.

Narrative: 2
I was acting as an OJTI [On-the-Job Training Instructor] for Ground Control training a developmental. The developmental told Vehicle X to cross Runway XX at taxiway W. Vehicle X immediately started crossing the runway before reading it back as Aircraft X was beginning their takeoff roll on Runway XX. The CIC in the cab alerted us to the departing aircraft, but it was too late to intervene as the vehicle had already crossed in front of the departing aircraft. I did not intervene in time to prevent the runway incursion judging that it would be safer for the vehicle to continue across the runway in fear it may stop in the middle while traffic was departing.

In this situation, Vehicle X did not read back the clearance/instructions until after he was across the runway. I recommend that vehicles should either read back the clearance while proceeding or before proceeding to ensure compliance and to allow time for intervention.
**Synopsis**

Two Local Controllers reported a runway incursion between a departing aircraft and a crossing vehicle.
ACN: 1598958 (14 of 50)

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport: ZZZ.Airport
- State Reference: US
- Altitude.MSL.Single Value: 1800

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
- Make Model Name: Commercial Fixed Wing
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Taxi
- Route In Use: Vectors
- Airspace.Class D: ZZZ

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- Make Model Name: Cessna Citation Undifferentiated or Other Model
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Final Approach
- Route In Use.Other
- Airspace.Class D: ZZZ

**Aircraft : 3**
- Reference: Z
- Make Model Name: Gulfstream V / G500 / G550
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Initial Approach
- Airspace.Class D: ZZZ

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Facility: ZZZ>Tower
- Reporter Organization: Government
- Function.Air Traffic Control: Local
- Function.Air Traffic Control: Instructor
- Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Fully Certified
- Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs): 5
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1598958
- Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
- Human Factors: Workload
- Human Factors: Training / Qualification
Communication Breakdown. Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown. Party2 : Flight Crew

Events

Anomaly. ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly. Conflict : Airborne Conflict
Anomaly. Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly. Ground Incursion : Runway
Anomaly. Inflight Event / Encounter : CFTT / CFIT
Detector. Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : In-flight
Result. Flight Crew : Executed Go Around / Missed Approach
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 doing OJT on Local Control. We were using the ILS RWY XX circle to RWY XY approach. The trainee cleared an Aircraft for takeoff then canceled the takeoff clearance. The Aircraft crossed the hold short line. The trainee issued the next arrival Aircraft Y a go around to fly heading 280 and maintain 018. I then issued the published missed approach. Aircraft Y then began to turn south. Aircraft Z was the next arrival and had a 60 to 70 kt overtake on Aircraft Y. I issued a 250 heading to Aircraft Y to avoid Tracon overhead traffic and to keep them away from Aircraft Z. I issued a 300 heading and 018 to Aircraft Z to avoid conflict with Aircraft Y. While I was trying to handle separation between Aircraft Y and the ZZZ1 arrival I didn't give Aircraft Z a frequency change to Tracon. Tracon called and asked me to switch Aircraft Z which I did, however Aircraft Z had flown out of the 018 MVA area and into the 020 MVA area.

I would maintain better awareness of the proximity of Aircraft to the higher MVA areas and issue a climb to 020 to avoid MVA conflict.

Synopsis

Local controller reported failing to issue a frequency change to an aircraft resulting in aircraft entering a higher MVA.
ACN: 1598854 (15 of 50)

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

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

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC
- Weather Elements / Visibility: Visibility: 40
- Light: Daylight
- Ceiling.Single Value: 5000

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory: Tower: ZZZ
- Aircraft Operator: FBO
- Make Model Name: Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: None
- Mission: Training
- Flight Phase: Landing
- Route In Use: Visual Approach
- Airspace.Class D: ZZZ

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory: Ground: ZZZ
- Make Model Name: PA-44 Seminole/Turbo Seminole
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Phase: Taxi

**Aircraft : 3**
- Reference: Z
- ATC / Advisory: Tower: ZZZ
- Aircraft Operator: FBO
- Make Model Name: PA-44 Seminole/Turbo Seminole
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Phase: Final Approach
- Airspace.Class D: ZZZ

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
I was performing a closed-pattern training flight with a student pilot at ZZZ. I was in contact with Tower.

On the final leg, Tower advised Cleared to Land XXR, land long for X-2 (taxiway). Student pilot correctly read back instruction and landed between the approach end of XXR and taxiway X-3. Upon landing, Tower instructed "Exit at X-3", which the student pilot read back correctly. Student pilot applied heavy braking to exit at X-3 as instructed.

Aircraft Y was holding short of XXR at X-3, and as our aircraft began exiting on X-3 it became clear that there would not be enough space to exit at X-3. At this time, Tower instructed our aircraft to "Stop right there", which we did. Tower instructed Aircraft Z on final for XXR to go around, and instructed us to taxi to X-2 and exit the runway. I read back the instruction, and affirmed that we had been instructed to exit at X-3. Tower controller disagreed and reprimanded student pilot and instructor.

In summary, Tower provided incorrect instructions to aircraft which were properly read back followed, causing an aircraft on short final for landing to go-around, and for two aircraft on the ground to become close to each other.
C172 flight instructor reported ATC issued taxi instruction that created a ground conflict.
**Narrative: 1**

GC (Ground Controller) coordinated a RWY XX crossing at [intersection] utilizing a conditional clearance after an arrival. Subsequently, RSU [Runway Safety Unit] pickup truck called to access the runway to pick up gear. GC told RSU to proceed onto runway XX
without coordinating possession of the runway.

1. Coaching the controller that runway crossings and runway ownership and separate events and need additional coordination.

2. It is being taught that GC can use a conditional request to access a runway from local control. For example "after the [aircraft] on final, cross Rwy XX at [intersection]?" This is distracting to the local controller and introduces unnecessary risk into the system. I believe this to be a systemic issue and that a 7110.65 change be initiated to close the loop.

**Synopsis**

Tower Front Line Manager reported incorrect coordination that led to a runway incursion.
**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 0001-0600

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport: BUR.Airport
- State Reference: CA
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC
- Work Environment Factor: Poor Lighting
- Light: Night

**Aircraft**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: BUR
- Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
- Make Model Name: Regional Jet 200 ER/LR (CRJ200)
- 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: Company
- Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
- Reporter Organization: Air Carrier
- Function.Flight Crew: Check Pilot
- Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Not Flying
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Multihull
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1598186
- Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
- Human Factors: Confusion
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness
- Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
- Communication Breakdown.Party2: ATC

**Events**
- Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
- Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
- Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Clearance
- Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
- Detector.Person: Flight Crew
When Detected : Taxi  
Result. Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

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

Narrative: 1

On that night, Controller was a little difficult to hear. Instructions were not completely clear and concise.

This detailed report is to explain multiple transmission instructions the interpretation confusion between our flight and Burbank Tower Control.

It is critical and extremely important for me to make clear: At no time were we on the runway after exiting. At no time did we re-enter the runway after clearing the runway during this event. I always make absolute certain I completely exit the runway and bring the aircraft past the runway holding lines at any airport I fly into.

We discussed flying into BUR and the operational differences the day before on our trip and during this day since the First Officer had never flown into BUR. We extensively discussed flying anomalies and techniques due to the short Runway 8 and close proximity the Terminal was to Runway 8/26. We looked at all charts, viewed the 10-7C pictorial discussing the runway/aircraft proximity threat and critical importance of vigilance. We looked closely at the 10-9 and the single Hot-Spot at the corner of 8/26-15/33. There are no hot-spots exiting off right from Runway 8 nor any notes regarding runway end threats, Tower expectations, or standard exiting procedures. To mitigate these threats, we briefed everything well prior to the decent to insure the First Officer had full focus and concentration to conduct stabilized and unstressed approach and landing.

As we rolled to the end of Runway 8, Tower instructed: "Turn right to the ramp taxi parking remain this frequency." Knowing it is very narrow between the runway [and] the terminal, I made a 90 degree right turn and taxied deliberately straight ahead to insure I was completely clear of the runway. Exiting Runway 8, it is very dark and impossible to see surface markings without aircraft lighting illuminating the surface, as there are no taxi lights, yellow line centerline lights or runway entry guard lights.

When I was completely clear of the runway, I slowed to make sure I had a clear look at taxi markings. I saw the yellow taxi line and began a turn to the right to join it. I noted [an air carrier] pushing back 3 gates ahead and tail turning towards us, I did not know how far back they would be pushed so, I made the right 90 degree turn onto the yellow line carefully and not taxiing forward. Lighting is virtually nil exiting from Runway 8 and impossible to see lines on the surface without full aircraft lights on.

20 seconds later- Tower said: "I need you to turnoff sir, traffic 1 & half mile behind." The aircraft was completely off the runway before this. (*Note- On the phone later he told me "Tower cannot really see us down there"). I finished making the turn by this time and was on the yellow line.

Tower then said: "Once your nose wheel is square on...on the solid yellow line hold position" What I heard: "Once your nose wheel...yellow square...hold your position.'
Because transmissions were a little muffled, the tarmac and end of the Runway 8/26 [to our right] was very dark, I thought he wanted us to hold by a 'yellow square or something to make sure we were out of the way for [the air carrier] pushing and/or the aircraft on final for Runway 8 to land. Because I had not flown into BUR for several years, I thought we both had missed some new holding point/line once cleared off the runway and normally awaiting further taxi clearances during our thorough briefings of BUR.

I was perplexed with his instructions, so I began a slow turn to the right, thinking perhaps I was on the wrong yellow line and we both saw the black & yellow hold line. I knew that was not what Tower meant and I stopped.

**We never crossed the black and yellow hold line.**

Tower then instructed: "Once your nose wheel is on the solid yellow line hold position." Tower apparently did not know if we were "square on the yellow line," so he instructed [the air carrier] to go-around.

I turned to the left to get parallel (square) on the yellow line. I replied: "Will advise, my apologies will advise when on the yellow line." Again, T instructed: "Roger, just advise when you're on the solid yellow line sir." (Reconfirming they cannot see us).

I told Tower we were on the yellow line.

Tower instructed us: "Turn right onto Runway 8 back taxi and turn left into the ramp around the 737..." [The] rest of transmission was cut off. First Officer read back what we thought we heard and asked for clarification since the transmission cut off. Tower again instructed us: "Once you're past the 737 pushed out ahead of you join into the ramp and continue to the gate."

To ensure we had the clearance correct, the First Officer asked for confirmation when we were at the point to turn left onto the ramp. Tower confirmed the clearance.

We continued taxiing to the gate.

We were asked to contact Tower regarding a possible Pilot Deviation. I called and had a discussion with the Tower controller related to this event. He told me they cannot see us well down there at that spot. It then became clear to me why he kept instructing us on the yellow line and asking us to report the yellow line. He could not tell where we were.

[The cause was] very poor to no lightning around the south end of Runway 8 (after passing runways 15/33). The only lighting are white flush mounted runway edge lights. No taxi lights on the south side, no lighted runway signage of any kind on the south side, no lighted "yellow line", no runway entrance guard lights.

Nothing in any of the briefing text or any of the various approach plates, nor the Overview charts, 10-7, 10-9 charts regarding this area off runway 8.

No disclosure from Tower when instructing us they have no/limited visibility at that end which made their multiple transmissions about the Yellow line a little perplexing.

Seems to me from this studying this event that the "yellow line" is the Tower's demarcation of a safety zone/buffer to the runway instead of the black & yellow hold line. Any aircraft not precisely parallel on it is cause to call a go-around.
Having commercial aircraft all exit to the right off Runway 8 instead of exiting off left creating a safer environment.

I get the impression from reviewing this event, the lack of standard lighting or any lighting is due to light pollution restrictions for neighboring homes. Which removes safety from this part of the field.

Tower uses some non-standard terminology: "get ya flipping" (to another aircraft for clearance prior to us) and "nose wheel square."

I have spent an extensive amount of time replaying the event in my mind, looking over charts, Google Maps Satellite of the ramp/runway, listening to Live ATC to make sense of what caused this communications problem and the layout problems of Burbank.

My suggestions are:

Tower should opt to have aircraft exit left, 180 degree and hold short of the Runway at [Taxiway] A. The north side is properly lighted; it is wide-open, taxiway is properly marked and no threat of aircraft pushing back or yellow line problems. Would reduce south side congestion dramatically and safety improved greatly.

More charts. Include a satellite overview of the airport with several zoomed in sections as well for terminal areas.

Add a Hot Spot at the south side end of Runway 8 all along the terminal, not just the intersection.

Add some form of acceptable lighting for that entire area. Some signage to insure all aircraft know what the tower demarcates as 'off the runway,'

Yellow Line lighting, low intensity would be sufficient.

Generate a separate 10-9 type chart that outlines that yellow line, the specifics on what tower expects when you exit south off of runway 8. With an overview drawing with arrows perhaps.

If none of this, then at a minimal level- when Tower gives taxi instructions as aircraft are rolling out, be VERY SPECIFIC as to what they want. i.e. Aircraft XXX, turn right off the end, right again, taxi aircraft parallel onto the solid yellow line closest to the terminal and stop.

**Synopsis**

Air carrier flight crew reported radio transmissions from the Tower Controller were somewhat broken and there was some confusion over taxi instructions after landing. They were on the yellow taxiway center line, but non-standard terminology used by ATC caused them confusion.
**ACN: 1597971** (18 of 50)

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference: Airport: ZZZ.Airport
- State Reference: IL
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: IMC
- Weather Elements / Visibility: Snow
- Light: Night

**Aircraft: 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory: Tower: ZZZ
- Make Model Name: EMB-505 / Phenom 300
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Landing
- Route In Use: Other
- Airspace.Class C: ZZZ

**Aircraft: 2**
- ATC / Advisory: Tower: ZZZ
- Make Model Name: Citation II S2/Bravo (C550)
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Landing
- Route In Use: Other
- Airspace.Class C: ZZZ

**Aircraft: 3**
- ATC / Advisory: Tower: ZZZ
- Make Model Name: Citation II S2/Bravo (C550)
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Landing
- Airspace.Class C: ZZZ

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person: Facility: ZZZ.Tower
- Reporter Organization: Government
- Function: Air Traffic Control: Local
- Qualification: Air Traffic Control: Fully Certified
- ASRS Report Number: Accession Number: 1597971
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness

**Events**
Anomaly. ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly. Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly. Deviation - Procedural: Published Material / Policy
Anomaly. Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector. Person: Air Traffic Control
When Detected. Other:
Assessments
Contributing Factors / Situations: Human Factors
Primary Problem: Human Factors

Narrative: 1

Heavy snow falling and lots of snow accumulating Runway XX in use. Shortly before this time I had received a call from TRACON saying Aircraft X was minimum fuel and was having vertical and horizontal problems and was asked if the runway was clear enough to land on. I was working Ground and Local combined and had a CIC in the back. I asked the 2 guys working on the runway trying to clear it off for the 2 IFR aircraft, Aircraft Y and Aircraft Z that were proposed to come in behind Aircraft X if the runway was clear enough to bring him in. [They] said to give them 10 minutes and it would be. Based on where Aircraft X was I told TRACON that we could take him. I then told [people working on runway] that Aircraft X is coming in and that they can work till the he was 5 miles out to try to clear as much of the runway as they could for them. Aircraft X was inbound about 5 miles out and, I had told Aircraft X that I had them working on the runway trying to clear as much of it as they could for him. I told [people working on the runway] the aircraft was 5 miles out and to exit the runway and report when clear, since the snow was so thick I could hardly see the 2 plows on the runway I had them report clear.

I was told [one] was going to A5 and would report clear and [the other] was going to Runway YY the off runway. [The first] reported clear and then I asked [the other person] again to report clear. [He] told me he was stuck but he was off the runway, close but clear. I then told Aircraft X that the plow had slipped off the runway close but clear around Runway YY on the left side of his Runway and even asked if he was comfortable with that. Aircraft X said he was and landed safely. Behind Aircraft X was Aircraft Y who told me he was having moderate rime ice from 3,000 feet and needed to land. I informed him about the plow that was stuck on the left side of the runway close but clear and asked him if he was OK with it. He told me "I need to land" so I cleared him to land. After Aircraft Y landed I seen Aircraft Z on the screen coming in on the ILS Runway XX when he was inbound I told him about the plow that was stuck and asked him if he was OK with it and he said it was fine. What led to the event is the CIC did 2 reports for the plow that was stuck and the emergency Aircraft X. My supervisor told me today that I had 3 deals because the plow that got stuck was in the RSA [Runway Safety Area] and since he was stuck that he is an obstacle. We have many charts upstairs and not a single one of them defines the RSA on them, nor does SOP define the RSA.

Inform other controllers that if a vehicle gets stuck close but clear he is now an obstacle, also define the RSA that is not defined anywhere.

Synopsis
Local Controller reported three aircraft to landed with a snowplow was stuck off the runway in the RSA area.
**Time / Day**

Date: 201811  
Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

**Place**

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

**Environment**

Flight Conditions: VMC  
Light: Daylight

**Aircraft : 1**

Reference: X  
ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ  
Aircraft Operator: Personal  
Make Model Name: PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior  
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1  
Mission: Passenger

**Aircraft : 2**

Reference: Y  
Make Model Name: Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer  
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91  
Flight Phase: Taxi

**Aircraft : 3**

Reference: Z  
Make Model Name: Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer  
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91  
Flight Phase: Parked

**Person**

Reference: 1  
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X  
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck  
Reportor Organization: Personal  
Function.Flight Crew: Single Pilot  
Qualification.Flight Crew: Private  
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 134  
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 30  
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 134  
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1595243  
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown  
Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew  
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Flight Crew

**Events**
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Excursion : Runway
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

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

Narrative: 1
While inbound, 10 miles east of the airport I made a position call on CTAF frequency. An unknown person called back and asked if I was familiar with the airport. I called back and answered "yes, I am, I know I have to stay east of the runway." They called back and confirmed, and informed me they are using Runway XX. I continued to make position calls at 5 miles, then 2 miles at which time I entered the downwind for Runway XX. I then continued to make my base call followed by my final call. As I touched down on XX, a pilot proceeded to make taxi call for XX and entered the runway about 1,000 feet ahead of me. I had to slam on my brakes and divert off to the left of Runway XX onto flat dirt and skidded to a halt sideways to avoid hitting her aircraft on the runway, and avoid hitting aircraft parked in the dirt. The pilot then apologized and said "sorry, I didn't see you." I departed a little later to my next destination.

Synopsis
PA28 pilot reported an aircraft taxied onto the active runway down field, which required an evasive maneuver resulting in a runway excursion.
**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

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

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
- 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: Taxi

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
- Aircraft Operator: Personal
- Make Model Name: Cessna Aircraft Undifferentiated or Other Model
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Phase: Takeoff

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Facility: ZZZ.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): 7.9
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1594673

**Events**
- Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
- Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
- Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
- Detector.Person: Air Traffic Control
- When Detected: In-flight
- Result.Air Traffic Control: Provided Assistance

**Assessments**
- Contributing Factors / Situations: Human Factors
- Primary Problem: Human Factors
**Narrative: 1**

I was working Ground Control, and our Supervisor was training on Local 1. I had an aircraft call me clear of Runway 28L at Taxiway G1 (Aircraft X). I immediately noticed he was not clear of Runway 28L and appeared his tail was partially over [Runway] 28L. I alerted Local Control as Aircraft Y was departing Runway 28L and airborne as they passed Aircraft X. I then taxied the aircraft to transient ramp. The trainee on LC1 did not observe the issue until I pointed out and had an aircraft on takeoff roll and airborne before noticing the event. The Supervisor was involved and notified of the event when it happened. I estimate 10/15ft lateral separation, and 50ft (at the most) vertical separation when the event occurred.

I recommend recurrent training for the trainee involved and/or emphasis on scan especially when issuing departure/landing clearances. I believe the lack of scan and tower cab awareness led to the event happening. This trainee is near their max hours, recommend an evaluation to see whether or not they can truly make it at ZZZ.

**Synopsis**

Ground Controller reported a runway incursion due to developmental on Local not scanning runway to ensure arrival was clear of runway.
**ACN: 1594330 (21 of 50)**

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport: TUS.Airport
- State Reference: AZ
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: TUS
- Aircraft Operator: Military
- Make Model Name: Fighting Falcon F16
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Takeoff
- Route In Use: None
- Airspace.Class C: TUS

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: TUS
- Aircraft Operator: Military
- Make Model Name: Fighting Falcon F16
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Takeoff
- Airspace.Class C: TUS

**Aircraft : 3**
- Reference: Z
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: TUS
- Make Model Name: Medium Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turbojet Eng
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Landing
- Airspace.Class C: TUS

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Facility: TUS.TOWER
- Reporter Organization: Government
- Function.Air Traffic Control: Supervisor / CIC
- Function.Air Traffic Control: Local
- Function.Air Traffic Control: Handoff / Assist
- Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Fully Certified
- Experience.Air Traffic Control.Time Certified In Pos 1 (yrs): 4
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1594330
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Human Factors : Distraction
Human Factors : Workload
Human Factors : Situational Awareness
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

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

Narrative: 1

I was the only CPC in the building, working LC1, LC2, LA, and CIC, with our two lowest time developmentals beside me in GC and FD/CD. A CPC came in early to work credit, and I told him to get plugged in. A call from the supervisors' office requested him downstairs for a briefing, and I told him to call back downstairs and say he was needed for the operation. Downstairs overrode me, and added that a second CPC had also arrived early for credit but was being held downstairs for the briefing as well.

Several minutes later, I cleared Aircraft X two-ship for takeoff with Aircraft Z several miles out. I did not see or hear that Aircraft Y [part of Aircraft X's flight] had aborted takeoff partway down the runway, and I was too task-saturated with traffic and phone calls to notice him. There is certainly a chance he was behind the beam that blocks a portion of the runway directly in front of the LC1 position. I was further distracted by the extremely unusual circumstance of Aircraft X coming back to my frequency off the departure end and asking to stay with me to high key. I asked if it was for both aircraft or just a single, and he was fairly nonchalant in responding "Yeah, I'd just like to check on my wingman". Again, not something that in anyway don't my attention to the fact that his wingman was still on the runway. While attempting to coordinate Aircraft X's request with Arrivals and Departures, I was able to make out part of Aircraft Z's transmission over the loudspeaker asking if he was cleared to land. Again, not knowing about Aircraft Y, I again cleared Aircraft Z to land. Our newest developmental made a comment as Aircraft Z was rolling out that he was probably asking because of the [aircraft] on the runway. This was the first moment I became aware Aircraft Y had not taken off. Even once I was alerted to it, actually seeing him out the window took a moment because they are almost perfectly runway colored anyway.

Well, clearly all these positions combined during the middle of the day with the Air National Guard out and still departing is not a safe situation. But that isn't a procedure change. We already know that, it's been talked about many times. I really don't like the feeling of throwing anyone under the bus, but the fact is I was the lone CPC/CIC in the
building with three FLM’s downstairs, and when additional CPC’s came in early to help they were kept out of the operation despite my protest. I had multiple frequencies, a mix of arrivals and departures, as well as at least one phone call about another aircraft. We spend too much time operating this way, and it is just too many tasks to balance when something goes awry.

Synopsis

TUS Tower controller reported not noticing a rejected takeoff, due to heavy workload from combined sectors and lack of staffing, and landing traffic causing runway conflict with the RTO aircraft.
**ACN: 1592650 (22 of 50)**

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference.ATC Facility: PDX.Tower
- State Reference: OR
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Ground: PDX
- 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
- Route In Use: None

**Aircraft : 2**
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: PDX
- Aircraft Operator: Air Taxi
- Make Model Name: Small Transport
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 135
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Flight Phase: Final Approach
- Route In Use: Visual Approach
- Airspace.Class C: PDX

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Facility: PDX.Tower
- Reporter Organization: Government
- Function.Air Traffic Control: Ground
- Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Developmental
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1592650

**Events**
- Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
- Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
- Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Published Material / Policy
- Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
- Detector.Person: Air Traffic Control
- When Detected: In-flight
- When Detected: Taxi

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

Narrative: 1
When I had taken the GC [Ground Control] position, RWY 03/21 had just been returned to GC after a small arrival to the runway. RWY 03/21 is typically used by GC unless prior coordination usually when traffic permits a small prop to land on it and [Local Control] LC2 requests use of it from GC. LC2 had requested the use of RWY 03/21 for another arrival no more than 15 minutes after I took the position. I, working GC had also [Clearance Delivery] CD/FD combined with me, so I had multiple things taking my attention. I authorized the use of 03/21. Aircraft X had called for taxi and I gave them standard routing for the flow we were in, "RWY 10L, taxi via Tango, Kilo, Cross RWY 21." I had forgotten that I had given 03/21 to LC2 position. The other LC had come over and was standing next to me which I thought was strange and I made a comment to why he was there and he drew my attention the fact that Aircraft X was crossing the departure end of RWY03 and Aircraft Y was short final for that runway on the opposite end. The LC2 controller was made aware of the situation at the same time. We observed that Aircraft X had been clear of the runway edge before Aircraft Y crossed the landing threshold. In air traffic control, we can't always rely on our memories - there is too much at stake for that. That is why we have memory aids that we utilize. I was using a memory aid when this occurred and my scan had failed me. I had gotten into a flow that is more common and rattled off a standard instruction without giving a second thought to it. In order to prevent this situation from occurring again, I need to utilize my good scanning techniques that have saved situations from happening in the past. By doing this, I would have seen the memory aid and could have and will prevent this from happening in the future.

Synopsis
Portland Tower Ground Controller reported crossing an aircraft, while the Local Controller had an aircraft on final.
ACN: 1592051 (23 of 50)

Time / Day

Date: 201811
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport: MYNN.Airport
State Reference: FO
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Environment

Flight Conditions: VMC

Aircraft: 1

Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: MYNN
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
Flight Phase: Landing

Aircraft: 2

Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower: MYNN
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: Medium Transport
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR
Flight Phase: Takeoff

Person

Reference: 1
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: Instrument
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 9399
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1592051
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2: ATC

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

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

Narrative: 1

[We were] cleared to land runway 9 in Nassau. No hold short instructions of any kind were issued prior to touchdown. After touchdown and while braking to vacate the runway at taxiway H (the end of the runway), Tower Controller cleared Aircraft Y to depart runway 14, an intersecting runway with an obscured view of runway 9. [The] FO (PF) (First Officer, Pilot Flying) heard Aircraft Y's readback and queried the Captain. The crew transferred controls and Tower was asked if there was an aircraft taking off runway 14. Tower replied "No." The Captain was able to get the aircraft stopped before the intersection of the two runways. Aircraft Y was rotating and getting airborne prior to the intersection of the runways, but was cleared to takeoff during [our] landing roll. When asked again, Tower claimed to have issued instructions to [us] to hold short of runway 14. Neither the CA (Captain) nor FO heard, responded, or acknowledged any such radio call.

It was a clear day, and there was minimal radio traffic on Tower frequency. Only the two aircraft involved in the incident were on the frequency at the time.

Synopsis
B737 First Officer reported a ground conflict during landing rollout when ATC cleared an aircraft to took off from an intersecting runway at MYNN.
ACN: 1591856 (24 of 50)

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

**Place**
- Locale Reference: Airport: LAX
- State Reference: CA
- Altitude: AGL. Single Value: 0

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC

**Aircraft**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory: Tower: LAX
- Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
- Make Model Name: B737-800
- Crew Size: Number Of Crew: 2
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
- Flight Phase: Takeoff

**Person: 1**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person: Aircraft: X
- Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
- Reporter Organization: Air Carrier
- Function: Flight Crew: Captain
- Function: Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Multiengine
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Instrument
- Experience: Flight Crew: Total: 13168
- ASRS Report Number: Accession Number: 1591856
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness
- Human Factors: Confusion
- 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)
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Instrument
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Multiengine
- ASRS Report Number: Accession Number: 1591859
- Human Factors: Confusion
Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.General : None Reported / Taken

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

We were cleared to line up and wait on Runway 25R at LAX. Upon entering the runway, we were cleared RNAV DOCKR, cleared for takeoff Runway 25R. Takeoff Checklist was completed and power was applied. The 80 knot call was made and checked. At approximately 125 knots we realized that a plane appeared to be crossing at the far end of the runway. Judging our speed and rate of acceleration and the distance between our aircraft, the decision to continue the takeoff was made. In my judgement, this was the safest course of action not knowing the stopping distance that would be required and feeling confident in our ability to clear the aircraft if it did not completely cross the runway before we reached it. We executed a normal rotation. The aircraft exited the runway before we crossed its path on the runway by a margin of perhaps 75 feet.

Several factors contributed to this event. First would be the either inadvertent clearing of an aircraft to cross a runway that was already in use for a takeoff, or a crew mistakenly crossing a runway without clearance. We heard no radio call clearing another aircraft across our runway. Another factor would be the time of day and weather conditions. [The] incident occurred approximately [half hour after sunset]. Adding to that was the weather. FEW000 was really more like patchy fog toward the far end of the runway towards the Pacific [Ocean] and the point of entry for the conflicting aircraft, making its detection more difficult.

Continued emphasis on runway incursion events and there avoidance is certainly in order. The installation of red do not cross lights at runway and taxiway intersections would prove helpful though we would have been well past the runway lights when the crossing began, it would have proved helpful for the other aircraft.

Narrative: 2

On our second leg, after a 4+ hour sit at LAX and a confusing push back for a cross bleed start during a busy taxi, we were cleared "on to hold" RWY 25R full length. While lining up with the runway, we were cleared "RNAV DOCKR, RWY 25R, cleared for takeoff" which I read back and confirmed with the Captain that all items were completed and we were ready for takeoff. After the power was set and the 80 knot check, I noticed something moving down field in the incoming fog bank. At approximately 120 knot the [air carrier] crossing our runway became evident. The Captain elected to continue as he/we felt confident we could clear the crossing aircraft, the aircraft would likely be across by the time we got there and we would not be able to stop prior to where he was crossing. We rotated on speed and were approximately 100 feet AGL when we passed over the taxiway
where Aircraft Y crossed, (taxiway P?). The tail of Aircraft Y jet had just cleared the runway when we went over. LAX Tower sent us to Departure before the gear were fully retracted so there was no discussion on the radio. Rest of flight was uneventful.

There was a fog bank rolling in from the west along with dusk lighting from the setting sun which made visibility down the runway degraded. The light color of Aircraft Y jet blended with the color of the cloud bank well enough that the tail was the prominent visual cue that I could see when it came onto the runway. Had the Captain and I saw the jet sooner, a rejected take-off might have been in order. The degraded visibility and lighting was a factor in our delayed recognition of the intruding aircraft.

I did not hear the word "cross" at any time during the lineup or takeoff which leads me to believe Aircraft Y jet crossed our runway, [Runway] 25R, without clearance while we were on takeoff roll. I did not observe any lights on the crossing aircraft (wing or runway turn off lights). Further, the paint scheme of the aircraft was perfect camouflage for the conditions.

Don't cross a runway without clearance, assuming that is what occurred. Training for Tower controllers if they cleared the jet to cross. Installing automated red crossing lights in the runway... additional vigilance during degraded vis, low light operations, by everyone.

**Synopsis**

B737 flight crew reported observing an aircraft crossing downfield during takeoff roll from LAX.
**ACN: 1591438**

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201811
- Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

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

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
- Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
- Make Model Name: Cessna 402/402C/B379 Businessliner/Utiliner
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 135
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Mission: Passenger
- Flight Phase: Taxi
- Airspace.Class E: ZZZ

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
- Make Model Name: Cessna Twin Piston Undifferentiated or Other Model
- Flight Phase: Final Approach
- Airspace.Class E: ZZZ

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
- 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)
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1591438
- Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness
- Human Factors: Time Pressure
- Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew

**Events**
When Detected : Taxi
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

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

Narrative: 1

While back taxiing on runway XX at ZZZ Airport, another twin Cessna, Aircraft Y, announced a 1 mile final on runway XX and then stated that "they had the aircraft lights in sight on the runway." Before entering the runway, the First Officer had made several radio calls on CTAF announcing our position and intentions. At no point over the course of the time since we turned the avionics on to the back taxi on runway XX did we hear another aircraft make a radio call. When we entered runway XX to back taxi, both the FO (First Officer) and I checked left and right and did not see an aircraft on final for runway XX. As soon as we became aware of the aircraft on final for Runway XX, I quickly turned the airplane around and exited onto runway XY. Had I not had all aircraft lights on while taxiing, I believe there would have been a high likelihood of a runway incursion leading to an accident.

Both the First Officer and I followed company SOP and adhered to all applicable regulations to avoid a runway incursion. I believe the cause and fault lies with the pilot of the other aircraft, Aircraft Y, who failed to monitor ZZZ CTAF and make appropriate radio calls. Additionally, he did not have the appropriate lights illuminated on his aircraft that would have alerted us to his position on final before we entered runway XX.

Synopsis
C402 Captain reported hearing an aircraft on final approach during back-taxi at non-towered airport.
**Time / Day**

Date: 201811
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

**Place**

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

**Environment**

Flight Conditions: VMC
Weather Elements / Visibility: Haze / Smoke
Work Environment Factor: Glare
Light: Daylight

**Aircraft: 1**

Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
Make Model Name: Small Aircraft, High Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Flight Phase: Takeoff
Airspace.Class E: ZZZ

**Aircraft: 2**

ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
Make Model Name: Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 2 Eng, Retractable Gear
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Flight Phase: Taxi

**Person: 1**

Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Commercial
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1590954
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Flight Crew

**Person: 2**

Reference: 2
Location Of Person.Aircraft: Y
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1591799
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown. Party 1: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown. Party 2: Flight Crew

**Events**

- Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
- Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
- Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
- Detector.Person : Flight Crew
- When Detected : Taxi
- When Detected : In-flight
- Result General : None Reported / Taken

**Assessments**

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

**Narrative: 1**

After startup at airport, I taxied out, making radio calls on CTAF as I went. I said I would be taking Runway YY, left turnout for [destination]. Meanwhile, there was Aircraft Y taxiing along the runway, taking the parallel taxiway. Since I was at the beginning of the runway, I took the runway, lined up and started my takeoff roll. The Aircraft Y did not stop, it pulled out into the runway, at taxiway Delta near the opposite end. Because I was near rotation speed at this point, I did not hesitate, just continued the takeoff. Unfortunately I did take off over the top of Aircraft Y. There was a lot of room, I felt it best to not abort the takeoff, and so flew on out.

I felt I could have shown better "defensive driving." I never made radio contact with Aircraft Y, could have done a better job at making sure they knew I was taking off. Never again will I assume the other pilot knows I'm there.

**Narrative: 2**

After loading passengers aboard for [the] flight, passengers were briefed. I announced "ZZZ traffic, [aircraft] on the ramp taxiing for a Runway XX departure for ZZZ1," electing to do so as I thought the sun would be slightly behind me on roll-out rather than in my eyes, and the haze which was on the east end of the runway 30 minutes earlier had mostly dissipated but still over the river east of the airport.

I double-checked the AWOS ensuring it concurred that the visibility was better than 10 and not reporting the haze present prior, and again before entering the runway announced CTAF that we would be back taxiing at Delta (intersection) for a XX ZZZ departure for ZZZ1. I looked east on the runway checking for traffic and noting the weather, squinted with the sun, looked west, saw nothing of threat, looked east again and back-taxied on XX. Shortly before turning around for take-off we heard an aircraft roaring above us on an easterly heading. I saw an aircraft overhead, immediately tried to contact them but didn't hear a reply. I checked my radios -- I was transmitting on CTAF with the volume up, and AWOS was back in the back-up position on radio #2 which was now listing (Company frequency). I watched the aircraft turn out to the west. Keeping them in sight I departed Runway XX, stating again that we were headed for ZZZ1, and had the other aircraft in sight. I finally heard the other aircraft state it was headed for ZZZ1, and I reasserted that I had it in sight, and that I would follow it to ZZZ1. When we switched frequencies to [other CTAF] and the other aircraft made a call on that frequency, the call came through poorly and broken. I stated that the call was breaking up, and the other pilot stated some
difficulty with the transmit button that day.

ZZZ has a "new" Runway YY/XX. It's 1000's of feet shorter than the previous ZZ/AA, and now requires back-taxiing from any entry point to utilize the full length of the runway for takeoff. I thought I'd picked the best and safest runway for flying to ZZZ2, which is west of ZZZ1, due to the sun, and potential haze east of the airport. I hadn't heard any other traffic at the airport after Aircraft X taxied out before I loaded passengers. I knew it was bright from the relatively low sun shining on the Delta taxiway to the runway, as it would've been at Bravo for Runway YY, but I thought I'd checked appropriately for traffic. Nothing about the flight was rushed or hurried. In hindsight I think about the "Watch for Motorcycles" bumper stickers that come out every spring, and will personally incorporate a longer look for traffic. ZZZ has a lot of pilots that generally communicate very well with each other, and maybe that "faith" led to some complacency or expectation that anyone present would communicate. I realize that communication at that airport, while advised, is not required, and I feel thankful that I get the opportunity to realize and remember not all aircraft may self-announce, whether taking off or landing.

**Synopsis**

Two pilots reported lack of communication between them resulted in a conflict.
ACN: 1590495 (27 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201810
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

Place
Locale Reference.Airport: SAT.Airport
State Reference: TX
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Environment
Flight Conditions: VMC
Light: Daylight

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: SAT
Aircraft Operator: Corporate
Make Model Name: Cessna Citation Mustang (C510)
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Flight Plan: IFR
Mission: Passenger
Flight Phase: Taxi
Route In Use.Other: Airspace.Class C: SAT

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Corporate
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Function.Flight Crew: Single Pilot
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiflame
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 4530
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 43
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 905
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1590495
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Human Factors: Distraction
Human Factors: Confusion

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: FAR
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Clearance
Anomaly. Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector. Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : Taxi
Result. Flight Crew :Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result. Flight Crew :Became Reoriented
Result. Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert
Result. Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Ground control instructed me to back taxi on closed runway 04 to intersecting active runway 31L. Arriving at runway 31L I became confused because of multiple hold short lines on 2 perpendicular taxiways G and N intersecting the 2 perpendicular runways 04/31L.

There are 6 hold short lines in near proximity on the taxiways and runways at these intersections. The painted lines on both runways are weathered and partially obscured with rubber tire marks. I mis-interpreted the hold short line on runway 04 to runway 31L. I turned on to active runway 31L to stop at the hold short line for runway 04. I checked in with the tower. Then I told tower I thought I was on runway 31L. The response was to hold short. Soon I was cleared for takeoff.

Upon departure I was instructed to call either of 2 phone numbers for possible pilot deviation. I’ve called both numbers 5 days in a row with no answer and no return phone call.

I have since studied aerial photos and airport diagrams. I now see my error of mistaking which hold short line was intended for which runway. Study airport diagram better and request a progressive taxi from ground control at unfamiliar airports.

Synopsis

Corporate pilot reported crossing runway hold short line due to confusing instructions and unclear signage at SAT.
ACN: 1589382 (28 of 50)

Time / Day
Date : 201810
Local Time Of Day : 0601-1200

Place
Locale Reference.Airport : RYW.Airport
State Reference : TX
Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

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

Aircraft : 1
Reference : X
ATC / Advisory. CTAF : RYW
Aircraft Operator : FBO
Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer
Crew Size. Number Of Crew : 2
Operating Under FAR Part : Part 91
Flight Plan : VFR
Mission : Training
Flight Phase : Takeoff
Airspace. Class G : RYW

Aircraft : 2
Reference : Y
ATC / Advisory. CTAF : RYW
Make Model Name : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer
Flight Phase : Takeoff
Airspace. Class G : RYW

Person
Reference : 1
Location Of Person. Aircraft : X
Location In Aircraft : Flight Deck
Reporter Organization : FBO
Function. Flight Crew : Pilot Flying
Qualification. Flight Crew : Student
Experience. Flight Crew. Total : 61.1
Experience. Flight Crew. Last 90 Days : 14.2
Experience. Flight Crew. Type : 61.1
ASRS Report Number. Accession Number : 1589382
Human Factors : Communication Breakdown
Human Factors : Training / Qualification
Human Factors : Confusion
Communication Breakdown. Party 1: Flight Crew  
Communication Breakdown. Party 2: Flight Crew  

Events  
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Critical  
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Published Material / Policy  
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway  
Detector.Person: Flight Crew  
Miss Distance.Horizontal: 1500  
When Detected: Taxi  
Result.General: Flight Cancelled / Delayed  
Result.Flight Crew: Took Evasive Action  

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

Narrative: 1  
Myself and my instructor were performing touch and go's. I announced our turn on CTAF to the left base and final of Runway 15 followed with our intention of a touch and go each time. Upon landing, I retracted flaps, removed the carb heat, and applied full takeoff power. With full power set, I glanced at my engine instruments, airspeed indicator, and back down the runway. Another aircraft was taxiing to the edge of the runway, believing they would be holding short, we continued the takeoff. However, the other aircraft did not hold short of the occupied runway and began to back taxi for Runway 33. At this point, after having looked down to my airspeed indicator and back outside, I decided to abort the takeoff. I reduced my throttle to idle and told my instructor I was aborting takeoff. As I slowed the aircraft to exit the runway, my instructor took control of communications announcing to the other aircraft that they had taken the occupied runway, which was met with no response other than the aircraft announcing they were back taxiing for Runway 33. Upon exiting the runway, we watched the other aircraft take off Runway 33 (the runway with unfavorable winds) and make a climbing left turn within the first 200 feet of the runway.

I believe the cause of this runway incursion to be the other pilot's lack of communication and situational awareness. The other aircraft clearly did not pay attention to the CTAF advisories I had made, stating that our aircraft was on base and later, on final for Runway 17 and indicating our intentions for a touch and go. The other pilot clearly also did not look onto the runway in both directions to notice our aircraft accelerating towards them. Furthermore, the other pilot taking off Runway 33 with a tailwind component and making a low altitude departure turn indicates a clear disregard for common safety practices and procedures in the FAR's, AIM or AC's.

This incident could have been completely avoided by the other aircraft maintaining situational awareness by use of the CTAF and visually checking the runway prior to entrance. I am glad I made my decision to abort the takeoff and acted quickly (preventing what could have been a serious accident) without second guessing myself or waiting for my instructor's approval.

Synopsis
A student pilot reported an aircraft took the runway and departed opposite direction to them as they were conducting a touch and go at RYW non towered airport.
# ACN: 1588175 (29 of 50)

## Time / Day
- Date: 201810
- Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

## Place
- Locale Reference.Airport: RDU.Airport
- State Reference: NC
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

## Environment
- Light: Dawn

## Aircraft: 1
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: RDU
- 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
- Flight Phase: Takeoff

## Aircraft: 2
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: RDU
- Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
- Make Model Name: Commercial Fixed Wing
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
- Airspace.Class C: RDU

## Person
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
- 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)
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Commercial
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
- Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 489
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1588175
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness
- Human Factors: Confusion
- Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
- Communication Breakdown.Party1: ATC
Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : Taxi
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

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

Narrative: 1
We had just finished deicing and were taxiing for departure. There was one controller working all frequencies. As we were taxiing down Echo Taxiway toward [Runway] 5L for departure, we were cleared to depart and to turn left to heading 035. The First Officer acknowledged the clearance. We did the checklist and continued toward the runway. We were about halfway down Echo when we were cleared for departure.

The controller seemed very busy with all the other activity on Ground and Tower. Controller was even trying to find a deice frequency for an aircraft that needed to deice. As we approached [Runway] 5L for departure, I looked to my left to clear final. That's when I noticed [another] aircraft that seemed to be very close to landing. The First Officer acknowledged the clearance. We did the checklist and continued toward the runway. We were about halfway down Echo when we were cleared for departure.

Controller then sent the aircraft around. As the aircraft went around and all was clear, we were cleared for takeoff again. We departed and continued.

Synopsis
Pilot reported being cleared for takeoff while on a taxiway, turned onto runway and while turning, observed an aircraft on final. Pilot advised Local Controller, who sent aircraft on final around.
ACN: 1586851 (30 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201810
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

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

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
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
Flight Phase: Taxi

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: B737-800
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR
Flight Phase: Takeoff

Person: 1
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Facility: ZZZ.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): 5
ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1586851
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

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)
Experience. Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 325
Experience. Flight Crew.Type: 10400
ASRS Report Number. Accession Number: 1586851
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : Taxi
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Returned To Gate
Result.Flight Crew : Rejected Takeoff
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

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

Narrative: 1
Half of our airport in under construction. This has led to complicated taxi routes and more runway crossings than necessary. We are using mainly one runway and having to hit gaps with most of our departures and arrivals. An Airport vehicle was inspecting the runway for a bird strike. I had a Aircraft X on a four mile final and I observed the Airport Vehicle clearing the runway, which was confirmed on frequency. I cleared Aircraft Y for takeoff with traffic on a four mile final.

Ground control had told Aircraft X to "Continue via Charlie, cross Runway 28." The pilot read this back correctly. Aircraft X, I observed at a high rate a of speed continuing on Juliet, not turning onto Charlie to cross the active runway 1R while Aircraft Y was rolling to depart. Cab coordinator, Ground control and I on local control acted quickly. I transmitted "STOP, STOP, STOP!" on frequency, first calling the [transposed call signs] but then used the correct call sign quickly "Aircraft Y STOP STOP STOP!"

Aircraft Y stopped prior to runway 10/28, I sent the aircraft on final around, and Aircraft X stopped before his nose wheel crossed the hold short markings of 1R. Because of the tower teams quick reactions a runway incursion or tragic event did not happen.

The supervisor put [a report] in stating fault in the controllers. He inputted his opinion that with the Ground controller not saying "Turn right on Charlie" that it was a main contributing factor to the pilots error. Also, I did not say "Abort Takeoff" which the correct phraseology is "Cancel takeoff" and that I did not issue the brasher statement and only gave the phone number.

The [reports] are for facts, not opinions. Ground control is not required to say left, right or straight ahead.In the 7110.65 it also states you can use plain language to get your point across and "Stop, stop, stop," will get everyone's attention.

He also put the aircraft was at V1 rotation. This is incorrect. Aircraft Y was told to stop near C3 and stopped prior to Runway 10/28 which is before taxiway Juliet where the Aircraft X was attempting to cross. Runway 10/28 from Runway 1R is less than 2000 feet. How the supervisor worded the [report] places fault in the controllers when this was a pilot deviation. It is a sad thing when your "Superiors" throw you under the bus instead of
saying, you did your job and averted a potentially devastating situation.

Controllers did our job. This is terrible management that we have to work under everyday by the same offenders.

**Narrative: 2**

We were cleared for takeoff. At approximately 65 knots, Tower instructed us to reject the takeoff and stop the aircraft. We did the rejected takeoff procedure, pulled off the runway, and completed the brake cooling requirements. No extra brake cooling was needed. Tower advised us it was due to a possible runway incursion. We notified Dispatch. Due to the rejected takeoff, we had less fuel on board than the minimum fuel for takeoff on our release. We returned to the gate, refueled, and departed uneventfully.

**Synopsis**

Local Controller and an air carrier Captain reported a runway incursion resulted in the departure flight crew rejecting take-off.
ACN: 1586544 (31 of 50)

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201810
- Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport: LGA.Airport
- State Reference: NY
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Environment**
- Light: Daylight

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Ground: LGA
- Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
- Make Model Name: Commercial Fixed Wing
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
- Mission.Other
- Flight Phase: Taxi
- Route In Use: None

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory.Ground: LGA
- Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
- Make Model Name: Commercial Fixed Wing
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
- Flight Phase: Taxi

**Aircraft : 3**
- Reference: Z
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: LGA
- 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 : 1**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Facility: LGA.TWR
- Reporter Organization: Government
- Function.Air Traffic Control: Ground
Aircraft X was a maintenance aircraft under tow repositioning from the west side of the airport to the east side. Aircraft X was instructed to proceed via taxiways DD, G to hold short of RWY4. A portion of taxiway A was closed for aircraft that were parked on the taxiway overnight. On this flow outbound departures typically taxi via A, E and B but with taxiway A closed between E and G they had to taxi via A, G and B. My plan was to have Aircraft X hold short of RWY4 for a few minutes until a couple outbound aircraft cleared taxiway G and taxiway B. After reviewing the audio, Aircraft Y had called for outbound taxi. Mistakenly I called them Aircraft Y maintenance and gave them clearance to taxi via N, A and hold short of M. Aircraft X maintenance took the clearance and read it back. At that point Aircraft X crossed the active departure runway (RWY4) and went onto taxiway B. Even though I missed the read back, at no point did I instruct any aircraft to cross a runway. I am perplexed as to why Aircraft X did not question the clearance. They were holding short of RWY4 at G. The clearance they took was taxi N, A hold short of M and there were not crossing instructions in the clearance. There is no possible way to get to taxiway N from where they were. I got busy with other duties and caught the crossing just as they cleared. Local Control had cleared Aircraft Z for takeoff as Aircraft X was crossing.
It appears that Aircraft Z delayed their takeoff roll and verified with local control that they were cleared for takeoff. I don't believe it is good practice to use an actual callsign to tow/re-position aircraft. Aircraft X is an actual flight in the NAS. [Other companies] use a combination of letters and numbers. These maintenance aircraft are typically driven by ramp workers and not pilots. Giving these guys similar sounding callsigns is not a good idea and will probably lead to more of these incidents.

**Narrative: 2**

[Report narrative contained no additional information.]

**Synopsis**

LGA Tower Controllers reported a tug driver towing an aircraft took another aircraft’s instructions and taxied across a runway while a departure was cleared to takeoff.
**ACN: 1585554** (32 of 50)

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201810
- Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

**Place**
- Locale Reference: Airport: ZZZ.Airport
- State Reference: US
- Relative Position: Distance: Nautical Miles: 0
- Altitude: AGL: Single Value: 0

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC
- Weather Elements / Visibility: Visibility: 10
- Light: Dusk

**Aircraft**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory: CTAF: ZZZ
- Aircraft Operator: Personal
- Make Model Name: Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172
- Crew Size: Number Of Crew: 1
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: VFR
- Mission: Training
- Flight Phase: Taxi
- Route In Use: None
- Airspace: Class G: ZZZ

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person: Aircraft: X
- Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
- Reporter Organization: Personal
- Function: Flight Crew: Single Pilot
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Student
- Experience: Flight Crew: Total: 34
- Experience: Flight Crew: Last 90 Days: 26
- Experience: Flight Crew: Type: 32
- ASRS Report Number: Accession Number: 1585554
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness
- Human Factors: Training / Qualification
- Human Factors: Confusion
- Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
- Communication Breakdown: Party1: Flight Crew
- Communication Breakdown: Party2: Flight Crew

**Events**
- Anomaly: Conflict: Ground Conflict, Critical
- Anomaly: Deviation - Procedural: Published Material / Policy
As a student pilot on his second solo cross-country flight, I was preparing to depart ZZZ for ZZZ1. The wind was from 040, so Runway 05 was in use at the time. Looking at the A/FD while parked at the municipal FBO, I deduced that the best way to taxi to Runway 05 was to taxi to Runway 28, then taxi along Runway 28 to the east side of the field, then taxi to the beginning of Runway 05. After brief confusion about how to taxi to the runway (recent construction at ZZZ has blocked the direct taxi route to the intersection of Runways 05 and 28 seen in the A/FD), I taxied up to the hold line for 10/28, made a radio call announcing my intentions to taxi along Runway 28, looked for traffic along and above said runway, and proceeded to turn left onto Runway 28 and begin taxiing. I did not stop before the intersection of the runways and make a radio call, but continued onwards. Approximately 50 feet before the intersection, I observed to my left a recently-landed aircraft on Runway 05 approximately 100 yards from the intersection rolling towards me. Doubting my ability to stop before the intersection, I firewalled the throttle to rapidly cross Runway 05, admitted my error and apologized over the radio, and after a brief stop to gather my nerves, departed and continued my solo cross-country flight. In my opinion, the problem arose due to my lack of familiarity with the airport and complete inexperience with taxiing along intersecting runways. A contributing factor was that I did not hear a call from the other airplane stating that they were on final, which would have warned me of a landing aircraft. Taking these three points in order: This trip was my first experience with traveling to a new airport that I had not previously been to with my instructor. Although I thought I had properly prepared for the flight, I obviously was not fully prepared for operating out of the airfield - especially with the construction having altered the taxiways. I had planned for takeoffs and departures from Runway 10, and had not figured out the return to the departure end of Runway 05 ahead of time when the winds ended up different than expected. Every field that I have flown to before either has parallel taxiways or requires back-taxiing along the departure runway itself. This was my first time ever taxiing along an inactive runway, and I had never crossed a runway intersection when I was not either landing or taking off. While I am obviously required to stop before crossing any runway while taxiing, I am used to stopping before hold lines - and had never had to deal with the absence of one. Right before I announced my intention to taxi onto Runway 28, I heard a call from an airplane on a left downwind for Runway 05. I did not hear a call from any aircraft on base or final, which may have warned me of the impending situation. It is possible that a call was made by the other airplane on long final while I was trying to figure out my taxi path, and I simply missed it due to the distraction. In summary, the cause of this problem was pilot error due to inexperience. The experience gained by this event will hopefully prevent its recurrence. In the meantime, I have grounded myself from flying solo until I can conduct a flight review and another dual cross-country trip with my CFI.
Cessna 172 student pilot reported a ground conflict while taxiing for takeoff. The student added the cause of the problem was pilot error due to inexperience.
**Time / Day**
- Date: 201809
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference: Airport: ZZZ.Airport
- State Reference: US

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC
- Light: Night

**Aircraft**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory: CTAF: ZZZ
- Aircraft Operator: Personal
- Make Model Name: Gulfstream IV / G350 / G450
- Crew Size. Number Of Crew: 2
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Mission: Passenger
- Flight Phase: Landing
- Route In Use: Visual Approach
- Airspace: Class E: ZZZ

**Person: 1**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person: Aircraft: X
- Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
- Reporter Organization: Personal
- Function: Flight Crew: Captain
- Function: Flight Crew: Pilot Not Flying
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Multiengine
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Instrument
- Experience: Flight Crew: Total: 13000
- Experience: Flight Crew: Last 90 Days: 42
- Experience: Flight Crew: Type: 1087
- ASRS Report Number: Accession Number: 1584236

**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 Flying
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Multiengine
- Qualification: Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew : Instrument
Experience.Flight Crew.Total : 14000
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days : 80
Experience.Flight Crew.Type : 1000
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number : 1584243

Events
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.General : None Reported / Taken

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X was in the final phase of flight into ZZZ with myself and [my First Officer]. We had departed from ZZZ1 on an IFR flight plan. We had the airport in sight and had set up for a right base for runway XX into ZZZ working with Center. We switched over to CTAF at ZZZ and announced our intentions to land on runway XX at ZZZ after obtaining the one minute weather. The weather showed that the wind was favoring runway XX and we think that the wind was 320/5 knots. The weather was no ceiling and visibility was unrestricted.

Running out standard checklist, we had the aircraft configured with flaps 20 and were on right base preparing for gear down when someone came on CTAF and advised that there was an aircraft that had landed with his gear up and the aircraft was on the runway. [My First Officer] and I kept the aircraft configured with the gear up and flaps 20 degrees, announced that we were going to proceed to fly over the airport to gather information on the situation at the airport. I was the pilot monitoring and told [my First Officer] that I was going to recheck the one minute weather. There was no mention of any situation listed on the AWOS.

[We] orbited the airport for 20 minutes (estimated) and worked with the airport ops that were on [CTAF] to assess what we would be able to do safely.

After conversations with the airport ops and looking at all of the landing options, [we] determined that runway XX was the best option for landing. We ran the numbers on our FMS and the landing distance required was 2811 feet. We determined as a team that the downed aircraft was at the 5000 foot mark of runway XX. We asked airport ops what direction the downed aircraft had landed on and they confirmed that the aircraft had landed on runway XY and that there was no FOD for 5000 feet on runway XX.

I was running the radios and confirmed with both airport ops and the van from [the FBO] (he was also on [CTAF] and was at the scene with airport ops) that all vehicles were clear of the downed aircraft and that everyone was clear of runway XX.
[We] proceeded with the plan of landing on runway XX and turning off at X1. We had also briefed that if something did not look safe that we would go around and go to ZZZ1.

We set up on a left downwind and continued to communicate with ops. Ops stated that "landing would be at our own risk" and we acknowledged that we understood.

[We] landed our aircraft in less distance than we had computed and turned off at X1 communicating with airport ops and offering any assistance that we could.

[We] both felt that we handled the situation with safety in mind and after reviewing the FAR's, we can't find anything that says that we did not operate with safety in mind any way. We are filing this so we can learn from it and make sure that we and other pilots have the knowledge and tools to improve in the event that we are faced with a similar situation in the future.

**Narrative: 2**

I was PIC of a G4 on a private flight to ZZZ. Weather was [VMC] and we canceled our IFR flight plan after descending out of 18,000 ft and continued to ZZZ VFR.

ZZZ tower was closed at this time and, after receiving the AWOS, we set up for a right base entry to land on runway XX.

After making our standard radio calls, we received a call from a controller who was still in the tower cab (not controlling) notifying us that there had been a crash on the airport and that the runway may be obstructed.

We were able to contact the Airport Operations personnel on the CTAF frequency, who attend the airport when the tower is closed, and ascertained the exact location of a downed [aircraft]. It had come to rest at the apex of the intersecting runways YY and XX.

We circled the airport, at pattern altitude, while considering a course of action.

After receiving assurance from Airport Ops that the aircraft and debris was contained to the last 900-1000 feet of runway XX, and calculating that our required landing distance was less than half the length of runway XX, we determined that we could safely land and hold short on the first half of runway XX with no risk to our aircraft or the downed aircraft at the end of the runway.

As an added precaution we asked, and were assured by airport operations, that all personnel and equipment were clear of runway XX.

Airport ops advised we would be landing at our own discretion.

We successfully landed on the first half of runway XX and cleared the runway at the mid-field taxiway approximately 2000 feet prior to the accident scene.

I do not believe we caused any risk to either our aircraft or to the crashed aircraft or personnel on the field.

The airport was then NOTAM'd closed 30 min after our arrival.

**Synopsis**
G-IV flight crew reported landing on a runway that had a damaged aircraft still on it.
ACN: 1582962 (34 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201810
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

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

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: MIA
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: A321
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR
Flight Phase: Takeoff
Route In Use: None

Person: 1
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Facility: MIA.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): 9
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1582962
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Maintenance

Person: 2
Reference: 2
Location Of Person.Facility: MIA.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): 2.5
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1582966
Human Factors: Distraction
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector.Automation: Air Traffic Control
Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

While on GCN (Ground Control North) I had 2 aircraft under tow, holding waiting to cross at different locations. One holding short of rwy 8L at L7 and one short of runway 8R at M11. I instructed Tug X to cross runway 8R to which he replied "Crossing runway 8R". Tug X was actually holding short of runway 8L and begin to cross runway 8L instead. At the same time Aircraft X was beginning his takeoff roll on runway 8L. ASDE-X alerted and Aircraft X aborted and returned for takeoff.

Crossing was issued during a relief briefing. Next time let the relieving controller issue the crossing.

Narrative: 2

I had just started my shift and we were in the process of a relief briefing for me to take over the combined GC (Ground Control) positions. I was told about 2 tugs currently holding short of runways. Before giving me the position the relieving controller said something along the lines of "I'll just go ahead and cross him," meaning the one that was only supposed to cross the closed runway. He apparently chose the wrong one and actually instructed the tug that was holding midfield to the active runway to cross. I mentioned to the GC that the other tug was moving and didn't look to be stopping. The ASDE-X alarm went off and the LC (Local Controller) aborted the takeoff of the Aircraft X departure.

The tugs on the ASDE-X were primary targets only. They could have been "tagged up" with their callsigns to alleviate confusion.

Synopsis

MIA Ground Controllers reported a runway incursion due to the wrong tug being crossed at the wrong intersection as a departure starting to roll.
ACN: 1582946 (35 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201810
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

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

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
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
Flight Phase: Takeoff

Person: 1
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Facility: ZZZ.Tower
Reporter Organization: Government
Function.Air Traffic Control: Local
Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Fully Certified
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1582946
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Flight Crew

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 Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 3980
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 930
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1583595
Human Factors: Confusion
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2: ATC
Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Anomaly.Ground Event / Encounter : Person / Animal / Bird
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
Result.Flight Crew : Rejected Takeoff
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was working both locals combined during the planning stages of a runway change. We were on a west operation landing runway XXR and runway XY. We were going to go to runway XXL and runway YY and I was informed of the last XXR arrival. An aircraft reported hitting a fox on runway XXR which closed the runway and I sent the first guy around on final and was able to side step the rest of the arrivals to runway XXL. I had 2 departures for XXL, I cleared the first one in between arrivals and the second one was Aircraft X. Since we were going to be departing runway XXR soon, ground control was instructed to start taxiing aircraft to runway XXR which was closed at the time due to the fox being hit.

After an arrival touched down I told Aircraft X to line up and wait. He did just that, but subsequently Aircraft Y [similar callsign to Aircraft X] took runway XXR. The supervisor must have taken the closed runway X's off the runway because I never recalled the airport releasing the runways back to the tower. I cleared Aircraft X for takeoff on runway XXL and both aircraft started rolling. I immediately told Aircraft Y to stop and exit the runway and told Aircraft X he could roll. Both aircraft slowly exited the runway and the next arrival for runway XXL was sent around.

I do not have any recommendations for this event, they were similar sounding call signs but the one concern I had was why would the supervisor take the X's off the runway if the runway was still closed which would dismantle that feature of the safety logic. Luckily I was able to stop Aircraft Y from taking off of a closed runway.

Narrative: 2

On Aircraft Y from ZZZ to ZZZ1 on the take-off roll phase. While lined up and waiting for the take-off clearance on runway (XXR) the tower says "Aircraft Y clear for take-off runway XXL." By the time he finished his sentence I was already rolling. As the pilot flying at the time, I initiated the take-off roll, but when I realized he said XXL - and as the FO (First Officer) was trying to clarify what he said - I rejected the take-off roll and got off the runway, then tried to clarify what happened and called Dispatch to let them know the situation.

So, it turns out that there was another [Company] aircraft with similar call sign (Aircraft X) lined up and waiting on runway XXL, and the controller got confused between us and their call sign and runway assignment. After all of the stuff cleared out we went back to the runway and took off with no issues.

On my behalf I should've waited until the controller finished his complete clearance before
I initiated the take-off roll. Confusing take off instruction. Acted little too early before clarifying the clearance instruction. Rejected take-off. Listen until the complete ATC clearance is issued then act.

**Synopsis**

Tower Controller and Air Carrier Captain reported taking closed runway resulting in RTO due to similar callsign with another aircraft.
ACN: 1582943 (36 of 50)

**Time / Day**

Date: 201810  
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**

Locale Reference Airport: APC.Airport  
State Reference: CA  
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Aircraft : 1**

Reference: X  
ATC / Advisory.Tower: APC  
Make Model Name: DA40 Diamond Star  
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1  
Flight Plan: VFR  
Flight Phase: Landing  
Route In Use: None  
Airspace.Class D: APC

**Aircraft : 2**

Reference: Y  
ATC / Advisory.Tower: APC  
Make Model Name: Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172  
Flight Plan: VFR  
Flight Phase: Final Approach  
Route In Use: None  
Airspace.Class D: APC

**Aircraft : 3**

Reference: Z  
ATC / Advisory.Tower: APC  
Make Model Name: HELICOPTER  
Flight Plan: VFR  
Airspace.Class D: APC

**Person**

Reference: 1  
Location Of Person.Facility: APC.TOWER  
Reporter Organization: Government  
Function.Air Traffic Control: Local  
Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Developmental  
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1582943  
Human Factors: Distraction  
Human Factors: Time Pressure  
Human Factors: Workload  
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

**Events**
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Landing Without Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector.Person: Air Traffic Control
When Detected: In-flight
Result.Flight Crew: Executed Go Around / Missed Approach

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

Narrative: 1

I was working local. Aircraft Y and Aircraft X were both on frequency and sequenced to parallel runways, Aircraft Y on 18R and Aircraft X on 18L. Both were issued traffic just prior to them turning base leg. I knew Aircraft Y pilot was good, so I cleared them right away; Aircraft X acted hesitant, so I waited to clear him, so I could check and see if he was lined up for the right runway.

Aircraft X appeared to be lined up for 18L when he turned final and, just before I was going to clear him, Aircraft Z who was unfamiliar with the area called up. I thought I had time to acknowledge Aircraft Z because the parallel runway thresholds are offset. By the time I got back to Aircraft X he had landed on 18R without clearance and Aircraft Y had to go around.

When Aircraft X showed hesitation I should have said the name of the runway Aircraft Y was landing on instead of calling it "the parallel runway." I also should have waited until after I cleared Aircraft X to acknowledge Aircraft Z, even though I was sure Aircraft X was lined up for the right runway.

Synopsis
APC Tower Controller reported an aircraft landing on the wrong runway, causing another aircraft to go-around.


**Time / Day**

- Date: 201810
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**

- Locale Reference: ATC Facility: EWR.Tower
- State Reference: NJ
- Altitude AGL Single Value: 0

**Aircraft: 1**

- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory: Tower: EWR
- 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

**Aircraft: 2**

- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory: Ground: EWR
- Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
- Make Model Name: Widebody Transport
- 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: EWR.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: 1582690
- Human Factors: Confusion
- Communication Breakdown: Party1: ATC
- Communication Breakdown: Party2: ATC

**Person: 2**

- Reference: 2
- Location Of Person: Aircraft: X
- Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Narrative: 1

I crossed Aircraft Y from RWY 22R at taxiway golf, and put Aircraft X in line up and wait. I observed Aircraft Y cross and come to a stop on taxiway B at which point he looked clear of the runway from my point of view and on the ASDEX. I still waited until I saw Aircraft Y moving ahead slightly, and overheard Ground Control issue instructions to taxi via Alpha. Then issued Aircraft X a takeoff clearance. Aircraft X took off and then advised me airborne that an aircraft wasn't clear of the runway. The aircraft was clear of the runway from my point of view, and I issued a takeoff clearance after seeing him taxi up a little. I should have verified with Ground that he would not be held there for a prolonged period of time.

Narrative: 2

We were cleared onto hold Runway 22L at taxiway W. Aircraft Y was crossing 22L around mid-field. First Officer's takeoff. We were cleared to takeoff when Aircraft Y appeared to have crossed the runway. During takeoff roll (high speed regime prior to Vr) it became apparent that Aircraft Y had stopped after crossing the runway but with its tail not clear of
the runway environment but not overhanging the runway itself. I advised the First Officer of the incursion and takeoff was continued. Passing behind Aircraft Y our aircraft attempted to veer to the right. We assume that Aircraft Y had increased its thrust to begin taxiing and our aircraft attempted to weathervane to the right as a result. The First Officer maintained proper track and rest of takeoff was uneventful. We advised EWR Tower after takeoff that Aircraft Y had not been clear of the runway. Had we been a light aircraft, or had there been other complicating issue there may have been more of an issue with aircraft control passing through Aircraft Y’s engine thrust.

**Narrative: 3**

[Report narrative contained no additional information.]

**Synopsis**

EWR Controller and an air carrier flight crew reported another air carrier's tail was not clear of the runway environment, resulting in a runway incursion and jet blast event.
ACN: 1582402 (38 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201810
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

Place
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Environment
Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility: 10
Light: Daylight
Ceiling.Single Value: 4000

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
Make Model Name: Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Flight Phase: Takeoff
Route In Use: None

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Personal
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Function.Flight Crew: Single Pilot
Qualification.Flight Crew: Private
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 96
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 12
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 96
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1582402
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Flight Crew

Events
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector.Person: Flight Crew
When Detected.Other
Result.General: None Reported / Taken

Assessments
Contributing Factors / Situations: Human Factors
Primary Problem: Human Factors
**Narrative: 1**

At the Hold Short line for runway XX, I heard another aircraft announce it was on the RNAV for runway XX and was planning to do a low approach. I asked the aircraft its location and I thought I heard him say 7 miles. I took the runway and announced I was departing runway XX. Within 5-10 seconds the pilot of the other aircraft announced he was breaking off and that I was in his way. He then immediately flew overhead and to the right of my aircraft approximately 300 feet above.

I realized instead of saying 7 miles, he must have said 1.7 or 2.7 or something.

I don't know the aircraft type and didn't catch his tail number, but it was a twin.

**Synopsis**

C172 pilot reported a conflict developed after taking the runway in front of an arriving aircraft.
ACN: 1582316 (39 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 2018-10
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

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

Environment
Light: Night

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
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: Taxi

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower: ZZZ
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: B717 (Formerly MD-95)
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Flight Plan: IFR

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Function.Flight Crew: Captain
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiflight
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1582316
Human Factors: Time Pressure

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : Taxi
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result.Air Traffic Control : Provided Assistance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

While taxiing to Runway XY on Taxiway P in ZZZ we were told follow Aircraft Y and cross Runway ZA at Taxiway Papa. We were cleared across Runway ZA and following Aircraft Y, with traffic landing on Runway ZA on short final. However, as soon as Aircraft Y crossed they immediately stopped and switched frequencies. This left the tail of our [aircraft] on Runway ZA. Ground desperately tried to raise Aircraft Y, advising them to pull forward, and allowing us to clear Runway ZA. They were unsuccessful and we remained on Runway ZA unable to move forward or clear the runway.

As a result the landing traffic for Runway ZA was sent around. Ground control eventually made contact with Aircraft Y and informed them of the situation that had transpired. They then pulled forward and we were able to clear Runway ZA before any additional landing traffic had to be sent around.

The flight was then completed without any additional occurrences.

Synopsis

CRJ-900 Captain reported being unable to exit the runway when a CRJ failed to completely clear the runway, which resulted in landing traffic being sent around.
**Time / Day**

Date: 201809  
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

**Place**

Locale Reference: Airport: TVF.Airport  
State Reference: MN  
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Environment**

Weather Elements / Visibility: Rain  
Weather Elements / Visibility. Visibility: 10  
Light: Daylight  
Ceiling. Single Value: 060

**Aircraft : 1**

Reference: X  
ATC / Advisory.CTAF: TVF  
Aircraft Operator: Personal  
Make Model Name: PA-44 Seminole/Turbo Seminole  
Crew Size. Number Of Crew: 1  
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91  
Flight Plan: None  
Mission: Training  
Flight Phase: Takeoff

**Aircraft : 2**

Reference: Y  
ATC / Advisory.CTAF: TVF  
Aircraft Operator: Other  
Make Model Name: Medium Transport, Low Wing, 2 Turboprop Eng  
Crew Size. Number Of Crew: 1  
Operating Under FAR Part: Other  
Mission: Other  
Flight Phase: Taxi

**Person**

Reference: 1  
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X  
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck  
Reporter Organization: Personal  
Function.Flight Crew: Instructor  
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine  
Qualification.Flight Crew: Commercial  
Qualification.Flight Crew: Flight Instructor  
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument  
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 750  
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 90  
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 60
Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
Miss Distance.Horizontal : 500
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Rejected Takeoff
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Training flight going to KTVF for landings. Setup for left downwind entry for Runway 04 and made traffic calls 10 nm out and while entering downwind. Did a stop [and] go and while rolling down the runway for departure, [we] heard a CTAF call for an aircraft crossing Runway 04. [We] looked to the side of the runway and saw an aircraft crossing the runway hold-short markings. [We] immediately aborted the takeoff and came to a stop approximately 500 [feet] from the intersection while the aircraft crossed. [We] asked if he had seen us and he had not. After the aircraft safely crossed the runway, we initiated another takeoff and returned to base. If the takeoff had not been aborted, I believe that we would've impacted the crossing aircraft.

Synopsis

PA44 flight instructor reported a rejected takeoff due to a ground conflict with crossing traffic at a non towered airport.
Time / Day
Date: 201809
Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

Place
Locale Reference: ATC Facility: LAX.Tower
State Reference: CA
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: LAX
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
Flight Phase: Takeoff
Flight Phase: Initial Climb

Person
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): 3
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1578923
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Human Factors: Confusion
Communication Breakdown.Party1: ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2: ATC

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Airborne Conflict
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion: Runway
Detector.Automation: Air Traffic Control
When Detected: Taxi
Result.Air Traffic Control: Issued New Clearance

Assessments
Contributing Factors / Situations: Human Factors
Contributing Factors / Situations: Procedure
Primary Problem: Human Factors
Narrative: 1

Event started with LC2 requesting a ZILLI (southbound) SID from the South Controller (LC1). LC2 was told to follow the ZILLI in the slot (LUAW). LC1 had one ZILLI in a departure roll while another ZILLI was slowly going into LUAW. LC2 misunderstood and followed the wrong (first) ZILLI and ended up side by side with the second ZILLI. This was legal since they are on diverging heading, however, not preferred by the Departure area controller since it takes extra time and space to build the needed three miles. As the Assist, called the Departure area controller to explain and apologize. The line was busy. I called LC1’s Assist to ask if they had called the Departure area controller to do the same. They said no. I then turned to the CIC who said that he was on the line talking to the Departure area controller. As I turned around and sat back down, I heard Aircraft X say that they had been cleared for takeoff, but had observed the RWSL "Red" lights on and traffic was crossing downfield. I observed traffic crossing at taxiway AA and BB downfield. I had not heard the crossing or takeoff clearance instructions by the LC2 Controller who was also training. Perhaps the use of the memory aid when traffic is crossing or the runway is unusable.

Synopsis

LAX Tower Controller reported two side by side departures and a runway crossing that were not coordinated correctly.
ACN: 1577880 (42 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201809
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

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

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

Aircraft
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.TRACON: ZZZ
Aircraft Operator: Personal
Make Model Name: Small Transport, Low Wing, 2 Recip Eng
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Flight Plan: IFR
Mission: Personal
Flight Phase: Landing
Route In Use: Visual Approach
Airspace.Class C: ZZZ

Component
Aircraft Component: Engine
Aircraft Reference: X
Problem: Malfunctioning

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Personal
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Function.Flight Crew: Single Pilot
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Radar: 35
Experience.Air Traffic Control.Military: 27
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 4800
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 25
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 350
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1577880
Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
When Detected : In-flight
Result.General : Maintenance Action
Result.Flight Crew : Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification
Result.Air Traffic Control : Provided Assistance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

I was vectored to final and instructed to maintain 180 KTS to a point on final. This is the maximum speed of the aircraft. This resulted in a steep and fast final for a visual approach. This resulted in the throttles being pulled all the way back to idle all the way down final. This is a very atypical situation that I had not encountered in this [older] Piston [Twin-Engine]. This would be a very atypical throttle position on final. On landing rollout, the engines stalled due to the throttle position. I rolled off the runway at the taxiway but could not make it across the hold short line and was unable to pull forward until I restarted the engines, which took a couple minutes. A commercial flight was sent around because of this.

This was an entirely new situation for me in this airplane and obviously have never happened before. The chain of events was started when ATC was directing me to hold full speed all the way to the glideslope. Knowing what I know now, I would have told him that I was unable. The engine loss took me as a surprise and as I rolled off the runway, my communication with tower could've been better. My focus was on restarting the engines so I could pull forward and should have been directed more toward giving tower a complete picture of what was happening.

Synopsis

Pilot of piston twin-engine reported the engines stalled on landing rollout precluded crossing runway hold short line.
ACN: 1577416 (43 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201809
Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

Place
Locale Reference.ATC Facility: LAF.Tower
State Reference: IN
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: LAF
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
Mission: Personal
Flight Phase: Landing
Route In Use: None
Airspace.Class D: LAF

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower: LAF
Aircraft Operator: Personal
Make Model Name: SR20
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Mission: Personal
Flight Phase: Takeoff

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Facility: LAF.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: 1577416
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Human Factors: Workload
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Communication Breakdown.Party1: ATC
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Flight Crew

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types
Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Track / Heading: All Types
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : Taxi
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued New Clearance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Aircraft X called inbound from the southwest for a full stop landing. After initially telling him to make straight in for RWY 5, I changed his instructions and told the pilot to make right traffic for RWY 10 and to report a 3 mile right base for RWY 10. I noticed the aircraft on the radar display on the edge of the Class Delta flying NW bound through my final for RWY 5. I told the pilot to continue west so he didn't cut any other aircraft off on final for RWY 5. I observed the target moving westbound. I cleared the aircraft to land on RWY 10 and to hold short of RWY 5 for traffic. The pilot asked me to repeat my clearance, so I did; he read it back verbatim. I had Aircraft Y LUAW [Line Up and Wait] on RWY 5, I scanned all finals then cleared Aircraft Y for takeoff. I saw Aircraft X rolling out on RWY 28, so I immediately cancelled Aircraft Y takeoff clearance. I asked the aircraft on RWY 28 who he was. The pilot gave me his callsign and stated that I cleared him to land on RWY 10. Both aircraft stopped in time and were about 1,500 feet apart. I told Aircraft X that he landed on RWY 28 and not RWY 10. The pilot seemed confused by this and didn't understand that he actually landed on the wrong RWY. I read the pilot of Aircraft X the Brasher Warning and taxied him off the RWY and to contact Ground Control. Our staffing was very short due to Management allowing the 3rd person that would've been there to change shifts. If that person had stayed on their original assigned shift, we would've had an extra set of eyes in the Tower. Traffic was very busy the entire day due to it being a normal busy day and the pilots couldn't do pattern traffic after XA:30 PM local time because of a TFR that would be effective for a sporting event. The traffic was very busy and complex until the TFR started that evening. All other controllers left, so it was just myself and one other controller in the Tower until closing time. The FLM [manager] was in his office downstairs doing the schedule.

Management should not have approved a shift change for the 3rd controller.

Synopsis

LAF Tower Controller reported an aircraft landing on the wrong runway and have a ground conflict with a departure aircraft.
**Time / Day**
- Date: 201809
- Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport: ZZZ.Airport
- State Reference: US

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC
- Weather Elements / Visibility: Fog
- Weather Elements / Visibility. Visibility: 10
- Light: Dawn
- Ceiling. Single Value: 12000

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
- Aircraft Operator: FBO
- Make Model Name: PA-28 Cherokee/Archer/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior
- Crew Size. Number Of Crew: 1
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: None
- Mission: Training
- Flight Phase: Taxi
- Route In Use: Direct
- Airspace. Class G: ZZZ

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory.CTAF: ZZZ
- Make Model Name: Citationjet (C525/C526) - CJ I / II / III / IV
- Crew Size. Number Of Crew: 1
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Mission: Personal
- Flight Phase: Takeoff
- Airspace. Class G: ZZZ

**Person : 1**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
- Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
- Reporter Organization: FBO
- Function.Flight Crew: Instructor
- Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Flight Instructor
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
I stared my engine on the ramp at ZZZ taking my student to an Instrument checkride. The AWOS was inoperative but it was VFR conditions with fog present south of Runway XX extending to about 2,000 feet down the runway. Runway XX1 was clear of fog so I chose to taxi from the ramp to Runway XX1 for departure.

I made a radio call on the CTAF stating I was at the ramp taxiing to XX1. I visually scanned the area and began to taxi. There was nobody else making radio calls on the CTAF at this time. In order to get to Runway XX1 I needed to cross Runway XX2/XX. I taxied up to the XX2/XX hold short line, held short and made another radio call stating I was crossing Runway XX2/XX. I looked both ways. Runway XX2 was clear and the Runway XX end was foggy. With no objection from any other traffic I began taxiing across. While about halfway...
across the runway I saw a landing light and nav lights appear to my right coming on us quickly. I immediately went full power and vacated the runway.

A Cessna Citation had begun it's take off roll on Runway XX in the fog as I was crossing the runway on the clear side. He came blasting out of the fog at rotation speed and I just got off the runway in time to avoid a collision. The pilot of the Citation then said, "Where were your radio calls?" To seemingly put the blame on me. I replied "I've made all my position reports I didn't hear you say a word." I think they were on the clearance frequency picking up and IFR clearance and didn't monitor CTAF. They began their take off roll without reporting it assuming the runway was clear.

This was an extremely frightening experience that could have easily been avoided with proper nontowered airport radio communications. I personally think that it should be a requirement to monitor CTAF while picking up an IFR clearance or changing frequencies for any reason at a nontowered airport. And I think that there should be more strict take off minimums under Part 91.

**Narrative: 2**

I was flying a Cessna CJ2 departing on an IFR flight plan from Runway XX. I announced on CTAF that I was taking Runway XX for an IFR departure to the north. No radio calls were made by other aircraft before my taxi out and after my departure call. Just before midfield I noticed a flashing light to my left. It was the strobes of a PA28 on the Taxiway crossing my Runway at a very high rate of speed without any radio calls. I was past V1, so I was past the point of aborting my takeoff. I rotated early to avoid colliding with the crossing aircraft. I was able to watch the PA28 cross from my left, under my nose, and off to the right out my side window.

After getting airborne I call the aircraft on CTAF to ask what they were doing and why they hadn't made any radio calls. He seemed startled and said his radio must not have been working. I do not know what was going on in his cockpit and if an instructor was onboard with the student or not. From my perspective it seemed like the pilot thought he could cross my runway before I reached him at midfield. I thought this because of his excessive rate of speed entering my runway while he taxied across. I monitored CTAF after departure for 15 minutes and the pilot never made another radio call after acknowledging me and that he almost cause a crash.

**Synopsis**

CJ2 and PA28 pilots reported runway incursion resulting in both aircraft taking evasive action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ACN: 1574535 (45 of 50)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time / Day</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 201809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locale Reference.Airport: TCY.Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Reference: CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altitude.MSL.Single Value: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Conditions: VMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather Elements / Visibility.Visibility: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light: Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling.Single Value: 10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aircraft : 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC / Advisory.CTAF: TCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Operator: FBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Model Name: Cessna 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Plan: VFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission: Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Phase: Takeoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route In Use: Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace.Class G: TCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aircraft : 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Operator: Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Model Name: M-20 Series Undifferentiated or Other Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Plan: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Phase: Takeoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace.Class G: TCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Of Person.Aircraft: X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter Organization: Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function.Flight Crew: Single Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification.Flight Crew: Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1574535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Factors: Communication Breakdown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication Breakdown.Party1 : Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2 : Flight Crew

Events
Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
Miss Distance.Horizontal : 50
Miss Distance.Vertical : 0
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

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

Narrative: 1
Active Runway was 30, I was communicating thru the CTAF. I was taking Runway 30 for left downwind departure. I was rolling down the runway, about to rotate when suddenly a Turbo Mooney was lifting. He took off Runway 12 without communicating. Another aircraft on Run-up saw what happened, both of us were trying to call him, he couldn't be contacted. The Mooney was about 50ft away from me and above when I was taking off.

Synopsis
C152 student pilot reported a NMAC and runway incursion by opposite direction departing aircraft.
**ACN: 1571079 (46 of 50)**

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201808
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport: CGF.Airport
- State Reference: OH
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC
- Weather Elements / Visibility: Visibility: 10
- Light: Night
- Ceiling.Single Value: 25000

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Ground: CGF
- Aircraft Operator: Corporate
- Make Model Name: Small Transport
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: IFR
- Mission: Passenger
- Flight Phase: Taxi
- Airspace.Class D: CGF

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- Make Model Name: Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer
- Flight Phase: Final Approach
- Airspace.Class E: CGF

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
- Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
- Reporter Organization: Corporate
- Function.Flight Crew: Captain
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Commercial
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
- Qualification.Flight Crew: Flight Instructor
- Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 16850
- Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 100
- Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 415
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1571079
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
Miss Distance.Horizontal : 2000
Miss Distance.Vertical : 500
When Detected : Taxi
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action
Result.Air Traffic Control : Provided Assistance

Assessments

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

Narrative: 1

Dropped off passengers at Cuyahoga County Airport (CGF). Only the two pilots [were] on board.

We got our IFR clearance to head back to the home airport. [It is] about a 15 minute flight. [We] got a taxi clearance to taxi to Runway 6.

Tower was about to close. While taxiing, Ground Control let us know we had about 30 seconds till they would close and to use the Ground frequency of 121.85 to contact CLE ATC for release. That was the first link in the chain of events, tower facility closing.

Second link, my copilot didn't hear the correct frequency to contact CLE ATC on. He was going to use 118.50. I let him know it was 121.85, but he insisted it was the other. We went back and forth on that 3 times. So, I let him use 118.50. Figured he would figure it out when he tried, and he did as Tower let him know it was 121.85. That ate up a good 30 seconds or more of time. We got our release time from CLE. Jumping from frequency to frequency, thought I heard the aircraft make a call in the pattern.

Third link, as we taxied out, we were notified of an aircraft in the pattern. [We] didn't know [the] exact position of it, but knew it was there.

Fourth link, after landing and then taxiing back out, the side windows were slightly fogged over from our decent on the inbound flight. Cold soaked windows [and] warm moist air caused the side windows to begin to fog over.

Fifth link, since we knew of an aircraft in the pattern, I asked on the frequency if there was anyone on Final Approach to Runway 6 at Cuyahoga. No reply.

It all added up, copilot and I looked for an aircraft on final before we transmitted we were departing Runway 6. Again, no reply from inbound aircraft. [We saw] no landing lights in the sky from the approach direction to Runway 6, possibly due to the side window starting to fog over. Or, maybe the inbound aircraft wasn't yet directly in line for a straight in approach? No idea, either way, we saw no lights. We started to taxi for the runway.

Next we heard the Ground Controller say to the aircraft in the air to make a right 360. I immediately stopped our aircraft. We were across the hold line with the tail of the aircraft
at about the hold line position. The nose of our aircraft was not on the runway itself, but theoretically, we all know, once past that hold line an aircraft is still considered on the runway.

In that position, copilot and I saw the lights of the inbound aircraft turning south in what appeared to be their 360 turn. Looked to be a quarter mile or so away. At that point in time, I chose to make another call that we were departing Runway 6. I decided best to get our aircraft out of the approach end environment of the runway completely. Still heard no reply from the inbound aircraft.

Several things that added up.

I should have simply waited and waited and waited till the aircraft in the pattern was on the ground.

Before the Tower closed, they could have given a position report on the pattern aircraft, or maybe I missed that if they did. Or, possibly saying to us, it would be advised to wait till the inbound aircraft landed as is was on a close base or such.

Hearing the proper frequency by the copilot would have given a better opportunity to get things right first time instead of trying to find the right freq.

Inbound pilot could have replied when asked if anyone was on final, or could have spoken up when we advised we were about to take off. Maybe [they were] student pilot(s), low time, or just distracted with work load.

Glad the Ground Controller was still listening in on the frequency and told the inbound aircraft to make a 360 turn. That broke the chain of events. Tower closing and switching of who to talk with an aircraft in the pattern, improper radio frequency, simple confusion. One thing leads to another. Best to hold position until all knows what is going on.

**Synopsis**

Corporate Captain reported traffic conflict with an inbound aircraft just as the Tower was closing.
ACN: 1568679 (47 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201808
Local Time Of Day: 0601-1200

Place
Locale Reference.Airport: CXP.Airport
State Reference: NV
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

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

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.CTAF: CXP
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: Takeoff
Route In Use: None

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
Make Model Name: Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer
Flight Phase: Takeoff

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Personal
Function.Flight Crew: Single Pilot
Qualification.Flight Crew: Private
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 225
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 100
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 225
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1568679
Human Factors: Communication Breakdown
Human Factors: Situational Awareness
Communication Breakdown.Party1: Flight Crew
Communication Breakdown.Party2: Flight Crew

Events
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : FAR
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Miss Distance.Horizontal : 100
Miss Distance.Vertical : 50
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action
Result.Flight Crew : Rejected Takeoff

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

Narrative: 1
I had made radio calls for taxi and to take Runway 09 while monitoring the CTAF frequency. When I began my ground roll I noticed another aircraft take the opposite end of the runway and begin to accelerate toward me. I immediately aborted my takeoff roll and notified over the airways that I was doing so and the other aircraft continued to depart the opposing Runway 27 and took off over me. They never made a single radio call until I addressed them directly and announced that I was aborting my takeoff. Then they stated they couldn't hear myself or the other aircraft that were in the traffic pattern. They stated that the transmissions were coming through broken. I believe to avoid these kinds of situations everyone should make radio transmissions before entering a runway and actively monitor the com frequency while maneuvering on or around any airport.

Synopsis
PA-28 pilot reported critical ground conflict with another aircraft making opposite direction takeoff.
**ACN: 1567572 (48 of 50)**

**Time / Day**
- Date: 201808
- Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

**Place**
- Locale Reference.Airport: LEX.Airport
- State Reference: KY
- Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 100

**Environment**
- Flight Conditions: VMC

**Aircraft : 1**
- Reference: X
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: LEX
- 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
- Flight Phase: Final Approach
- Route In Use: Visual Approach
- Airspace.Class C: LEX

**Aircraft : 2**
- Reference: Y
- ATC / Advisory.Tower: LEX
- Aircraft Operator: Personal
- Make Model Name: Small Aircraft, High Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear
- Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
- Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
- Flight Plan: VFR
- Mission: Personal
- Flight Phase: Taxi
- Route In Use: None
- Airspace.Class C: LEX

**Person**
- Reference: 1
- Location Of Person.Facility: LEX.Tower
- Reporter Organization: Government
- Function.Air Traffic Control: Local
- Qualification.Air Traffic Control: Fully Certified
- ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1567572
- Human Factors: Situational Awareness

**Events**
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Clearance
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
When Detected : Taxi
When Detected : In-flight
Result.General : Flight Cancelled / Delayed
Result.Flight Crew : Executed Go Around / Missed Approach
Result.Air Traffic Control : Issued Advisory / Alert
Result.Air Traffic Control : Separated Traffic
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 the Local Controller for the following event. Aircraft X had been cleared to land. As he approached the runway, Aircraft Y called up ready for takeoff. I responded by saying "Aircraft Y, Lexington tower, roger." After a minute or so later as I was scanning the runway I noticed that Aircraft Y had begun taxiing on to the runway in front of Aircraft X who was now very short final. I immediately issued go around instructions to Aircraft X to avoid a collision. At the point of go around Aircraft X was less than 100 ft AGL and within 1/8 of a mile of the landing threshold.

Synopsis

Tower Controller sent an aircraft on short final around when they observed another aircraft taxi onto the runway without a clearance.
ACN: 1564884 (49 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201807
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

Place
Locale Reference.ATC Facility: PAE.Tower
State Reference: WA
Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 100

Environment
Flight Conditions: VMC
Light: Daylight
Ceiling: CLR

Aircraft: 1
Reference: X
ATC / Advisory.Tower: PAE
Aircraft Operator: Personal
Make Model Name: Small Aircraft, High Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 1
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 91
Flight Plan: VFR
Mission: Personal
Flight Phase: Final Approach
Airspace.Class D: PAE

Aircraft: 2
Reference: Y
ATC / Advisory.Tower: PAE
Make Model Name: Small Aircraft
Flight Phase: Taxi

Person
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Personal
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Function.Flight Crew: Single Pilot
Qualification.Flight Crew: Private
Experience.Flight Crew.Total: 1800
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 15
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 1500
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1564884
Human Factors: Time Pressure

Events
Anomaly.ATC Issue : All Types
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Critical
Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural : Published Material / Policy
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Air Traffic Control
Miss Distance.Horizontal : 2000
Miss Distance.Vertical : 100
When Detected : In-flight
Result.Flight Crew : Executed Go Around / Missed Approach
Result.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action
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
While on downwind we were cleared to land on 34 left, with no other planes in the pattern. On short final, with all strobes and alternate flashing (wig-wag) headlights operating, our aircraft was at 100 feet AGL and over the threshold, Tower cleared a single engine aircraft to depart on 34L in front of us. Another Tower Controller immediately came on the radio and directed the incursion aircraft to immediately halt and hold position. It complied, but was on the runway side of the hold short line. We were instructed to "go-around" and turn crosswind at our discretion. We climbed to 1,000 feet MSL and entered downwind. The Tower then released the incursion aircraft cleared to depart 34L. We were again cleared to land 34L. PAE ground stated "training" was being conducted.

Synopsis
GA pilot reported a conflict during their final approach to PAE airport when an aircraft was cleared to takeoff on same runway then stopped by Tower, but not before aircraft had incurred the runway. Reporter was instructed to go-around. Pilot reported ATC training had been a contributing factor.
ACN: 1564572 (50 of 50)

Time / Day
Date: 201807
Local Time Of Day: 1201-1800

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

Environment
Light: Daylight

Aircraft
Reference: X
Aircraft Operator: Air Carrier
Make Model Name: B737-700
Crew Size.Number Of Crew: 2
Operating Under FAR Part: Part 121
Mission: Passenger
Flight Phase: Taxi

Person: 1
Reference: 1
Location Of Person.Aircraft: X
Location In Aircraft: Flight Deck
Reporter Organization: Air Carrier
Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying
Function.Flight Crew: Captain
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 322
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1564572
Human Factors: Situational Awareness

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 Not Flying
Qualification.Flight Crew: Multiengine
Qualification.Flight Crew: Instrument
Qualification.Flight Crew: Air Transport Pilot (ATP)
Experience.Flight Crew.Last 90 Days: 431
Experience.Flight Crew.Type: 431
ASRS Report Number.Accession Number: 1564536
Human Factors: Other / Unknown
Events
Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Conflict, Less Severe
Anomaly.Ground Incursion : Runway
Detector.Person : Flight Crew

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

Narrative: 1
While clearing Runway 26L on K in ZZZ, we were given clearance to hold short of 26R. I repeated the clearance to the First officer (F/O) and taxied in. I understood and fully intended to hold short, but somehow misinterpreted the visual cues and continued. The F/O repeated the clearance then stopped the aircraft. Our nose was across the hold short. As we stopped, the aircraft departing 26R passed 100 ft to 200 ft above us. Tower then cleared us across.

Narrative: 2
[Report narrative contained no additional information.]

Synopsis
B737 flight crew reported a runway incursion.