

ASAP Aviation Safety Action Program

Medallion Foundation

January 2010

In This Issue

[Two Examples of Good Reporting](#)

[Updates You should Know](#)

Quick Links

[AACA](#)
www.alaskaaircarriers.org

Mark your calendars!!!

Are you attending the AACCA (Alaska Air Carriers Association) annual Convention and Trade Show March 1-4, 2009? I will be conducting ASAP updates on March 4th Thursday from 2:00pm-3:00pm. Look at www.alaskaaircarriers.org for more information.

Kent Adams

Two Examples of Great ASAP Reports

Over the last few months we have had a variety of reports. Two caught my attention as examples of reports that can be of benefit to all carriers. One is a dramatic 'near miss' and the other looks like a mundane report but on

further review by the ERC raised some interesting questions that other carriers should review as well.

Let's start with the "near miss." Two highly experienced pilots were involved, a check airmen conducting a six month IFR check to another pilot in a company twin engine airplane. As the airplane was approaching the FAF on a simulated IFR approach the pilot reached for the landing gear handle but never lowered the gear before the check pilot reduced the power on one engine to simulate an engine failure. The pilot then diverted his attention to conducting the simulated engine shutdown and continuing to fly the approach. He later stated that he didn't have time to accomplish the checklist items due to the workload. The check pilot did not notice the gear was not extended as he assumed the pilot had lowered the gear when he reached for the gear handle. It was the check pilot's intention to give the simulated emergency after the gear had been extended. As the airplane was on short final an alert crew from another airplane waiting to take off advised the airplane on final the gear was not extended. They immediately went around and landed without any problems. The company was very responsive to this near miss and provided additional training and re checks for both the check airmen and the PIC. The Company, in coordination with the FAA POI, made several changes to the checklists based on these events. It became apparent that the task of completing the 'engine failure' and the 'before

landing' checklist was not reasonable if an engine failure occurred near or inside the FAF. As a result, the company divided the checklists to identify only critical items necessary for landing and deferred any 'clean up' items. They also revised their training scenarios to clarify the procedures and duties of the check airmen. This is a great learning opportunity for all carriers. Are your procedures and training adequate for a pilot to handle an engine failure on final under IFR conditions?

The second ASAP report is almost the other extreme. At first it might seem to be a non-event but as the ERC worked it several issues came to light worth sharing with everyone.

A flight attendant filed a report concerning an airsick passenger who was so sick he could not get out of the lavatory for landing. As the ERC worked the issue it turned out the flight attendant did not notify the flight crew of the problem until after landing. The flight crew might not have done anything different had they know about it but it is an item that should have been brought to their attention. That raised the issue of how the crew should deal with medical emergencies? If it had been an incapacitated passenger what would be different and how should it be handled? The question was: did the company have procedures in place to guide the cabin and flight crew? Also, how should the captain have reported his deviation from the FAR's? Is your company prepared to deal with a medical emergency? This is the time to think about these issues and get the procedures and training in place.

Program Update

Our program is continuing to grow and provide valuable information to the participants. As of this writing we have received 322 reports. Of those the ERC has accepted 97%. Another important statistic is that over half (56%) have resulted in changes to company training or procedures. This clearly demonstrates the value of the program to bring about improvements. Sometimes we get multiple reports (Capt and FO, for example) for the same event that is why those numbers are different. Also note that 76 % were sole source meaning the FAA didn't know about them until reported by ASAP program.

In addition 32% of the reports involve "operational issues" and 28% are related to "ATC." These are the top two categories of reports.

Total Reports	322
No. of Events	257
Reviewed Reports	315

Accepted	306	Percent	97.14%
Sole Source	239	Percent	75.87%
Success	178	Percent	56.51%

What are your questions about the program?

If you would like to see an issue discussed or have a question we can cover in the newsletter for everyone's benefit, send it to Kent@Medallionfoundation.org. We would be happy to include it in an upcoming edition of our newsletter.

[Forward email](#)

 **SafeUnsubscribe®**

This email was sent to marina@medallionfoundation.org by kent@medallionfoundation.org.

[Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).

Email Marketing by



Medallion Foundation | 5520 Lake Otis Parkway Suite 104 | Anchorage | AK | 99507