

System Service Review

LVK-S-2013/10/20-0001

A1. FAC ID			A2. Date UTC (mm/dd/yyyy)								A3. Start Time UTC				A4. End Time UTC				A5. Position	
L	V	K	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	3	2	0	4	5	2	1	1	5	GC/CD	
A6. Aircraft #1											A7. Aircraft #2									
Aircraft ID			Aircraft Type/Suffix				IFR/VFR				Aircraft ID			Aircraft Type/Suffix			IFR/VFR			
N698SP			C172				VFR				N15TA			PTS2			VFR			

Training	
B1. Were any training issues identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

Weather	
C1. What were the prevailing weather conditions? <input type="checkbox"/> IFR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VFR <input type="checkbox"/> Other If Other, explain	
C2. Was any pertinent precipitation depicted on the radar? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, explain	
C3. Did LLWAS alert? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A If Yes, explain	
C4. Were weather phenomena a factor? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Select all that apply <input type="checkbox"/> Turbulence <input type="checkbox"/> Icing <input type="checkbox"/> Thunderstorms <input type="checkbox"/> Low Ceilings <input type="checkbox"/> Braking Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Wind Shear <input type="checkbox"/> Other	If Other, explain

	Weather (continued)
	C5. Were any SIGMETs or PIREPs in effect? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	If Yes, explain

	Efficiency
	D1. Were any efficiency issues identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

	Airspace/Airport
	E1. Were any airspace/airport issues identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

	Procedures
	F1. Were any procedural issues identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

	Directives
	G1. Were any directive issues identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

	Equipment
	H1. Were any equipment issues identified? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	H2. Was all communications equipment functioning properly? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	If No, explain Position 4 training jack was out of service. Position 1 did not have the ability to transmit. Flight data has no access to landlines or ability to monitor frequencies. The CIC can not monitor more than one position at the same time. The equipment outages have been repaired. The tower equipment capabilities are projected to improve when the IVSR system is installed in March of 2014. CIC was plugged into PSN 1 wearing a headset. LC1 and LC 2 were combined at PSN 2. GC and FD were combined at PSN3 due to the training jack at PSN 4 being OTS. PSN 4, is the normal GC/FD location. The CIC was monitoring LC which was at PSN 2.
	H3. Was all airborne radar equipment functioning properly? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
	If No, explain

Equipment (continued)

H4. Was all surface detection radar equipment functioning properly?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

If No, explain

H5. Was all approach NAVAID equipment functioning properly?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

If No, explain

H6. Was all airport lighting equipment functioning properly?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

If No, explain

H7. Was all operational automation radar equipment functioning properly? (i.e. HOST, STARS, ARTS, ASDE, etc.)

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

If No, explain

H8. Was all operational automation radar equipment configured correctly? (i.e. airspace combination, ASDE configuration, etc.)

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

If No, explain

Equipment (continued)	
	H9. Was all inoperative equipment properly coordinated as out of service across ATO organizations? (i.e. En-Route, Terminal, Sys Ops, Tech Ops, etc.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
	If No, explain
	H10. Was all inoperative equipment properly NoTAMed as out of service? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
	If No, explain
	H11. Were any potential systemic equipment issues identified? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	If Yes, explain CIC is only able to monitor one position at a time. This is a limitation of the equipment. The installation of the new IVSR equipment in March 2014 does not have this limitation.

Customer Feedback	
	I1. Was there customer feedback regarding the operation during this review session? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Resource Management	
	J1. Were any resource management issues identified? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	J2. Who was supervising the operation? <input type="checkbox"/> FLM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CIC <input type="checkbox"/> OM <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	If Unknown, explain
	J3. Was the operational area under review properly staffed? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	If No, explain

Resource Management (continued)

J4. Were any positions not properly staffed?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, explain

When the CIC became aware that the CPC-IT was falling behind the CIC should have opened the FD position.

J5. Were positions/sectors combined/decombined in an appropriate/timely manner?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If No, explain

J6. Were there any distractions in the operation?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, explain

J7. Were any potential systemic resources management issues identified?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, explain

Individual Performance

K1. Was any notable Individual performance identified? (Exemplary and/or needing improvement)

☒ Yes ☐ No

K2. Employee #1:

Employee Name

Position

OSCIC

ATSAP Filed

☒ Yes ☐ No

Explanation

The CIC was engaged in the operation. CIC was plugged into PSN 1 wearing a headset. LC1 and LC 2 were combined at PSN 2. GC and FD were combined at PSN3 due to the training jack at PSN 4 being OTS. The CIC was monitoring LC which was at PSN 2. The CIC was aware that the CPC-IT was falling behind at GC/FD. CIC offered to record ATIS for GC/FD. The OJTI at GC/FD declined the offer and recorded the ATIS herself while the CPC-IT continued to talk to aircraft.

Staffing was available to open additional positions. Traffic volume at LC was moderate with routine complexity and is normally left combined during moderate traffic. Splitting the LC position would have required termination of OJT on GC because GC was using PSN 3 due to the faulty training jack at PSN 4.

It has historically been the practice at Livermore tower to have GC and FD combined during OJT due to staffing limitations or as an opportunity for training on priorities at the GC/FD position. When the CIC became aware that the CPC-IT was falling behind the CIC should have opened the FD position.

Individual Performance (continued)		
K2. Employee #2:		
Employee Name	Position LC1	ATSAP Filed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Explanation</p> <p>The LC controller was scanning and aware of the position of N698SP when he instructed N15TA to cross runway 25L. The LC controller assumed that N698SP would begin taxi prior to N15TA reaching the South side of the runway. LC failed to provide traffic information to N15TA in accordance with JO 7110.65 Paragraph 3-1-6.</p> <p>LC had several options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinate with GC to make sure N698SP was moving. 2. Instruct N15TA to begin taxi and issue traffic information. 3. Hold N15TA between the runways until there was room to cross runway 25L. 		
K2. Employee #3:		
Employee Name	Position GC/CD	ATSAP Filed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Explanation</p> <p>The CPC-IT at GC did not provide timely assistance to the aircraft involved after the accident had occurred. The prioritization of duties was not in accordance with JO 7110.65 2-1-2.</p>		
K2. Employee #4:		
Employee Name	Position GC/CD	ATSAP Filed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Explanation</p> <p>The OJTI made the ATIS for the trainee which diverted her attention away from the position. The OJTI did not take over the position after the accident when the CPC-IT was failing to assist the aircraft involved in the accident.</p>		

QC Findings
<p>Local controller did not advise the Pitts of the Cessna ahead. JO 7110.65 3-1-6. Situations where advisories to taxiing aircraft are appropriate will be covered in a team briefing.</p> <p>The Position 4 training jack and Position 1 problem with transmitting have been repaired. Remind all CIC's in team briefing to keep the tower staffed appropriately which would include the option of opening FD even if training is in progress at GC. Team briefing will include a refresher on the requirements of JO 7210.3X 2-6-1. Watch Supervision. Emphasis will be placed on 2-6-1 (10) Situational awareness.</p> <p>After becoming aware of the accident the CPC-IT was very slow in responding to the aircraft involved. The OJTI did not take over the position. The OJTI's FLM with discuss the importance of using good judgement in taking control of a position during training with the OJTI.</p> <p>Collaborated lessons learned uploaded.</p>

Review Team
Matthew Zizzo, Douglas Jones, Troy White, Timothy Johnson, ,