UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

INVESTIGATION INTO THE CRASH OF ALASKA AIRLINES FLIGHT 263

Tuesday, August 15, 2000 9:00 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the National Transportation Safety Board:

FRANK McGILL
Maintenance Air Safety Inspector
Office of Aviation Safety
Aviation Engineering Division
National Transportation Safety Board
490 L'Enfant Plaza East, SW
Washington, D.C. 20594-2000

MALCOLM BRENNER, Ph.D. Senior Human Performance Investigator National Transportation Safety Board 490 L'Enfant Plaza East, SW Washington, D.C. 20594

RICHARD G. RODRIGUEZ
Senior Air Safety Investigator
IIC and U.S. Accredited Representative
Office of Aviation Safety
Major Investigations Division
490 L'Enfant Plaza East, SW
Washington, D.C. 20594

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

On behalf of Alaska Airlines:

KEVIN L. PAPE MX Quality Assurance Auditor Alaska Airlines Box 68900-SEAMQ Seattle, Washington 98168-0900

LANCE SEYER

Aircraft Technician - Alaska Airlines Aircraft Mechanics Fraternal Association AMFA Local 14 - SEA, HNL, PDX, MWH, BIL Suite 103 19604 International Boulevard Seattle-Tacoma, Washington 98188

DAVID B. JAQUES, ESQ.
Dombroff and Gilmore, P.C.
Suite 300, West Lobby
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20007

On behalf of Boeing Corporation:

MICHAEL R. LASLEY
Hydraulics and Mechanical Systems
Technical and Fleet Support
Douglas Products Division
Boeing Commercial Airplane Group
3855 Lakewood Boulevard MC D035-0035
Long Beach, California 90846

On behalf of the Federal Aviation Administration:

DEAN HAMILTON Aviation Safety Inspector - Avionics Certificate Management Section Federal Aviation Administration Suite 240 4800 South 188th Street Seattle-Tacoma, Washington 98188

GEORGE L. THOMPSON, ESQ. Regional Counsel, Northwest Mountain Region 1601 Lind Avenue, SW

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

Renton, Washington 98055-4099

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

On behalf of the Air Line Pilots Association:

CAPTAIN DAVID B. CRAWLEY, M.D. Alaska Airlines MEC
Accident Investigation
Air Line Pilots Association International Affiliated with AFL-CIO and CLC
12712 471st Avenue, SE
North Bend, Washington 98045-8821

On behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

KRISTON VON KLEINSMID Special Agency Federal Bureau of Investigation Suite 1700 11000 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90024

I N D E X

INTERVIEW OF:	PAGE:
Bill Weaver	983 1078
John Fowler	1121

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	9:00 a.m.
3	INTERVIEW OF BILL WEAVER
4	MR. McGILL: And I'm going to start off,
5	Bill, is Dane do you want Dane to be your
6	representative here today?
7	MR. WEAVER: Yes.
8	MR. McGILL: Okay. Could you start off by
9	giving us a brief sketch of your background, education,
10	how you got here, how long you been here, and so forth?
11	MR. WEAVER: Okay. I suppose I started out
12	in this business in 1976 or so. I went to born and
13	raised in southern Illinois and went to arts college at
14	University. Specializes in aeronautical
15	engineering. And so I went to that school and obtained
16	my A & P license. Worked as an A & P mechanic at Bi-
17	State Airport there in Kohokie, Illinois. Continued on
18	with my education. Received an engineering degree,
19	aeronautical engineering degree. Majored in aircraft
20	maintenance.
21	And I continued working as an A & P and
22	graduated in '79, and interviewed with several
23	companies. There was one particular interview that I
24	enjoyed most, and that was with American Airlines.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

- 1 They were interviewing for what they -- what's really
- 2 kind of a management development program. So graduated
- 3 and left St. Louis. Moved to Tulsa, and was what they
- 4 call management intern for American Airlines, a
- 5 training program that lasted about 18 months. Took me
- 6 through all the facets of the airline, the maintenance
- 7 and engineering business.
- From there I went to being a quality
- 9 assurance engineer. Worked in the quality assurance
- organization for about a year. And then moved over to
- 11 the quality assurance supervision, quality control
- 12 supervision role. Operated in that for about five
- 13 years.
- 14 At that point in time, looked for a bit of a
- 15 change out of quality assurance and into the production
- 16 end -- end of the business and so went into the
- aircraft interiors and structures end of the business,
- 18 the production end of the business. Worked in that
- 19 capacity for about a year and a half, two years.
- 20 Interviewed and became manager of aircraft interiors,
- 21 manufacturing, and composites. Worked in that capacity
- for a couple of years.
- 23 And then essentially was responsible for, at

- 1 that time, an American Airlines moved a composite
- 2 center. American was going through a lot of expansion
- 3 and growth at that time, and so was responsible for
- 4 moving the composite center off-site. So acquired
- 5 properties and renovated facilities and built a
- 6 composite center for the airline. Worked in that
- 7 capacity for I want to say five years.
- 8 Then at that point went over to become the
- 9 product manager of MD 11 and DC 10 aircraft. Went into
- 10 being aircraft dock manager, basically. Worked in that
- 11 capacity for I want to say two years.
- 12 And then was promoted to managing director of
- 13 the component avionics maintenance and -- and wide body
- 14 maintenance. And that included the composite center.
- 15 So worked there for about a year and a half and then
- 16 was recruited out of there to Alaska Air.
- 17 Came to Alaska in December of '96 as
- 18 assistant vice president of maintenance. Worked in
- 19 that capacity for a couple years and then was promoted
- 20 to staff vice president of maintenance and engineering
- and where I am today.
- MR. McGILL: Okay.
- MR. WEAVER: Along the way I've gotten my

- 1 pilot's license and that's -- that's about it.
- 2 (Pause)
- 3 MR. McGILL: In 19 -- in 1996, you moved up
- 4 to staff vice president of maintenance. At that time,
- 5 who was the -- the director of maintenance that was on
- 6 the A-6 part of the Op Specs?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: At what time?
- MR. McGILL: Well, in 1996 when -- was that
- 9 the year that you moved up --
- MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
- 11 MR. McGILL: -- to staff vice president?
- MR. WEAVER: No, I was assistance vice
- president of maintenance in '96.
- 14 MR. McGILL: And at that time would Mr.
- 15 Fowler have been on the Op Specs as vice president of
- 16 maintenance?
- 17 MR. WEAVER: Director of maintenance?
- MR. McGILL: Mm-hmm.
- 19 MR. WEAVER: When I came to Alaska I was the
- 20 director of maintenance.
- MR. McGILL: Who was on the Op Specs of the
- 22 A-6 portion of your Op Specs? Are you familiar with
- your Operations Specifications, the A-6 portion? Those

- 1 were the designations that hold your certificate. I
- 2 was trying to get a feel of who -- who is listed at
- 3 that time frame that held your Maintenance program
- 4 together.
- 5 MR. WEAVER: In -- subsequent to me coming, I
- 6 was the director of maintenance and on the Op Spec.
- 7 MR. McGILL: You were on the Op Specs at that
- 8 time?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 10 MR. McGILL: And you held -- you stayed on
- 11 the Op Specs until what -- what period?
- MR. WEAVER: I don't know exactly.
- 13 MR. McGILL: You don't know when you were
- removed from the Operations Specifications?
- MR. WEAVER: It was when I was promoted to M
- 16 & E responsibilities.
- 17 MR. McGILL: Is that when the other two
- 18 people were assigned on a temporary revision --
- 19 MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 20 MR. McGILL: -- sharing the -- the duties?
- MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm. That's my
- 22 understanding.
- MR. McGILL: Why would you be removed from

- 1 that position until you had already filled that
- 2 position?
- MR. WEAVER: Well, essentially, it's -- it's
- 4 a standing control issue. And with -- with me having
- 5 total division responsibility you -- you can't have the
- 6 responsibility of director of safety and director of
- 7 maintenance. So it's essentially delineating areas of
- 8 responsibility.
- 9 MR. McGILL: Did you feel it important at
- 10 that time to -- obviously, this -- this existed
- 11 starting in 1998 and at the time of the accident it
- would still have been listed with the FAA as a
- temporary revision position. That's over two years.
- 14 Did ya'll try to hire someone in that time frame?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes.
- MR. McGILL: And in two years you couldn't
- 17 find anyone?
- MR. WEAVER: We were unsuccessful in finding
- 19 a candidate in that time frame.
- 20 MR. McGILL: You had said -- you mentioned
- 21 the director of safety. Did that director of safety
- 22 report to you at that particular time?
- MR. WEAVER: The director of safety being Jim

1	Trimberger?
2	MR. McGILL: Yes.
3	MR. WEAVER: Yes. Jim did report to me at
4	that time.
5	MR. McGILL: When you had the title of staff
6	vice president of maintenance, is that correct?
7	MR. WEAVER: And engineering.
8	MR. McGILL: And engineering. In his
9	position as director of quality control he also
10	reported to you?
11	MR. WEAVER: Correct.
12	MR. McGILL: And as director of training?
13	MR. WEAVER: Correct. Yes.
14	MR. McGILL: At what time when did the
15	director of safety move from reporting to you to
16	reporting to Mr. Fowler?
17	MR. WEAVER: I'm not exactly sure as to what
18	when exactly that took place.
19	MR. McGILL: Do you ever remember any issues
20	that were brought to your attention from Mr. Trimberger

MR. WEAVER: Not specifically. Jim and I

when he was in his position as director of safety?

have -- had a and still do have a very good working

20

21

22

23

- 1 relationship and we talk to each other just -- ongoing
- 2 basis.
- 3 MR. McGILL: Your office is, like, right next
- 4 door --
- 5 MR. WEAVER: Exactly. It's not too hard to
- 6 get up and walk from one place to the other, so -- and
- 7 we make it a point to -- to talk with each other and
- 8 discuss the pertinent events and issues that, you know,
- 9 require us to -- to -- to, you know, analyze and
- 10 manager our business by.
- 11 MR. McGILL: Prior to October of '98, which
- 12 in turn whether -- and 1998 is when Alaska went onto
- 13 the ATOS FAA oversight process system.
- MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
- MR. McGILL: Prior to that, though, can --
- 16 can you kind of give me a feel of what the
- 17 relationships from your maintenance position was with
- 18 the FAA prior to ATOS?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: My interaction with the FAA
- 20 specifically is -- actually, has always really been
- 21 very limited. As far as relationship goes, prior to
- implementation of ATOS I would say very businesslike,
- 23 meet with them on a regular basis, and work the issues.

- 1 MR. McGILL: So other than some meeting,
- 2 normally the FAA would -- would meet with other people
- 3 from Alaska Airlines on working issues every day, is
- 4 that correct? You were not involved daily with the
- 5 FAA?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: No.
- 7 MR. McGILL: What about after it was -- did
- 8 anything change or could you see any change when the
- 9 certificate went under this management team, CMM team,
- 10 that was brought about by the ATOS change?
- 11 MR. WEAVER: Change being a big word. I
- mean, obviously, there's been some names changed.
- MR. McGILL: Obviously, you don't -- you
- 14 don't deal enough every day --
- MR. WEAVER: Yeah.
- MR. McGILL: -- on daily issues that you
- 17 would really -- you saw that much difference, then? Is
- 18 that correct for me to state that?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: Yeah, again, because of my
- 20 interaction being so limited with the FAA, again, I can
- 21 try to quantify the change. It'd be hard for me to do
- 22 so.
- 23 MR. McGILL: You come to work in 1996. There

- 1 was an evaluation performed by the FAA, NASAP
- 2 inspection of 1995. Were changes being made that were
- 3 recommended when you first got there? Or were you part
- 4 of that change that they may have --
- 5 MR. WEAVER: Not that I can recall, as far as
- 6 being part of or be involved in. I was aware that an
- 7 inspection had taken place, but the point at which I
- 8 entered the scene I had no involvement with the NASAP
- 9 inspection or --
- MR. McGILL: What about the 1998 DOD that was
- 11 performed, inspection in September?
- MR. WEAVER: I was on the scene, and again, I
- 13 had the responsibility of staff vice president of
- 14 maintenance and engineering, so presented or provided a
- 15 representative, you know, for the DOD to work with.
- 16 And the audit took place and to my knowledge -- I mean
- 17 I haven't -- I haven't gone back over the DOD findings
- 18 since -- since the out-briefing, actually, but you
- 19 know, very, very favorable.
- 20 MR. McGILL: Let's back up. I need to --
- 21 we've had issues that have arisen about the C-5 check
- of Aircraft 963 in 1997 involving the rechecking of the
- 23 end-play MIG 4 card. Is there anything new that you

1	know anything about that particular check?
2	MR. WEAVER: Anything new
3	MR. McGILL: Yes.
4	MR. WEAVER: that I knew about that?
5	MR. McGILL: Has anything else come up that
6	we I've asked these questions for a long time about
7	that particular check. Do you know anything new about
8	were you aware let's just back it up. Were you
9	aware of what was happening in 1997 over that check?
10	MR. WEAVER: I would have knowledge that the
11	aircraft was in Oakland going through heavy
12	maintenance, but
13	MR. McGILL: Were were you knowledgeable
14	that the first inspection required or suggested that
15	the jack screw be removed?
16	MR. WEAVER: At the time?
17	MR. McGILL: Yes.
18	MR. WEAVER: No.
19	MR. McGILL: You had no knowledge of that at
20	any time?
21	MR. WEAVER: No.
22	MR. McGILL: Was there ever obviously, was

there any discussion on purchasing or removing the jack

23

- 1 screw? Did you have any involvement with that jack
- 2 screw decision or check?
- MR. WEAVER: Not that I can recall.
- 4 MR. McGILL: Are you on the -- we've been
- 5 told, like, 8:00 or 9:00 conferencing and so forth.
- 6 Are you on that?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: Today versus '96. In '96 when I
- 8 was --
- 9 MR. McGILL: Well, in '97.
- 10 MR. WEAVER: Yeah, in '97 --
- 11 MR. McGILL: Specifically.
- 12 MR. WEAVER: -- in -- not on a day-to-day-to-
- 13 day basis. If I was in the office or was not -- if
- there wasn't a meeting conflict I tried to be involved
- in the conference, and it just would help me
- 16 understand, you know, what the issues are, what -- the
- 17 problems that the staff are working. So it would be
- my, you know, kind of modus of operandi to -- to
- 19 participate or be, you know, listening in on the
- 20 conference at that time. Today it's -- it's kind of
- 21 infrequent that --
- MR. McGILL: Well, in 1997 do you recall
- 23 listening to anything specific about 963 while it was

- 1 being --
- MR. WEAVER: No. I don't recall.
- 3 MR. McGILL: -- checked? And therefore, you
- 4 wouldn't know anything about any problems involving the
- 5 jack screw on 963 during the C-5 check?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: No, I -- I don't have any
- 7 recollection of it being an issue.
- 8 MR. McGILL: If there were a problem --
- 9 obviously it could have been -- or any other problem,
- 10 would the manager of the base or whichever base --
- 11 would they call you for guidance or direction? Who
- would they normally talk to?
- MR. WEAVER: In regards to?
- 14 MR. McGILL: Anything. Any kind of a
- 15 problem. But in this case I was referring to the jack
- 16 screw. Just say the jack screw and it was written up,
- 17 it needed to be replaced, and it was several days in
- there before it was reevaluated. But would you have
- 19 been called during that time frame?
- 20 MR. WEAVER: That's -- that's kind of
- 21 speculative. So I have an open door. If people want
- 22 to talk to me --
- MR. McGILL: Okay. Let's --

1	MR. WEAVER: So
2	MR. McGILL: Did someone call you about that
3	airplane about that jack screw?
4	MR. WEAVER: Not to my recollection, no. I
5	don't have any recall of that. You know, we're
6	we're a small company and there's a lot of questions
7	and there's a lot of I'm on the floor talking to
8	mechanics. And so there's a number of issues that
9	could be asked and, you know, so but I have no
10	recollection of that.
11	MR. McGILL: Okay. During that time frame
12	can you be more specific of what your your
13	responsibilities were as staff vice president of
14	maintenance and engineering? What did you do every
15	day?
16	MR. WEAVER: During January of '97?
17	MR. McGILL: Well, no. Say, from September
18	of '97 on, until the last until the accident. What
19	what are your responsibilities? What do you do
20	every day?
21	MR. WEAVER: Well, it varies greatly what I
22	do every day. Ultimately, my responsibilities are
23	being the division officer for the Maintenance and

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

- 1 Engineering organization. So I would need to --
- 2 provide support and help to those directly reporting to
- 3 me and --
- 4 MR. McGILL: Who are those people that report
- 5 directly to you?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: Today it is Jim Davey, our
- 7 managing director of engineering.
- 8 MR. McGILL: Not today, but go to the -- up
- 9 to the accident.
- 10 MR. WEAVER: Well, I believe it's the -- Jim
- Davey, managing director of engineering; Steve Zerta,
- the managing director of planning and material
- 13 distribution; Mac McFeary, who's the director of -- and
- 14 contract administration. At that point in time with --
- 15 we -- we had no staff vice president of maintenance, so
- 16 I had at that time directly reporting to me Jim
- 17 McClendon, who was -- manager of maintenance control,
- 18 Director of Base Maintenance Mark Fitzpatrick, and
- 19 Director of Line Maintenance Bob Hindman. And in
- 20 addition to that would have been Jim Trimberger, our
- 21 director of quality control and training.
- 22 MR. McGILL: Okay. That's a lot of people
- 23 there. So you're right. I shouldn't have asked -- a

1 lot of -- a lot of responsibilities. MR. WEAVER: Well, it's -- controls. 2 3 MR. McGILL: So once the director of maintenance was shared by Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. 4 5 Hindman, would you say they talked to you daily? 6 MR. WEAVER: I -- I think you might be able 7 to generally characterize that. I mean daily being if I was in the office or if they were in the office, yes. 8 9 You know, not providing for vacations and/or field 10 trips and station visits and -- and that, but normally, they -- there'd be a daily interface. 11 12 MR. McGILL: Okay. 13 (Pause) 14 MR. McGILL: There was a special inspection that was performed later this -- this year, June of 15 16 this year. And I guess we've all taken a copy of it, 17 looked at it, but could you just very quickly 18 characterize what -- what you noticed in any areas that pertain to your leadership areas off of that 19 20 inspection? 21 MR. WEAVER: I'm not for sure --22 MR. McGILL: Well, --

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

I'm not for sure what you mean.

MR. WEAVER:

23

- 1 MR. McGILL: Well, the -- it's a big -- big
- 2 report here.
- MR. WEAVER: Oh, okay. You're talking about
- 4 this --
- 5 MR. McGILL: Yes.
- 6 MR. WEAVER: -- Independent Safety Assessment
- 7 Team?
- 8 MR. McGILL: Yes. What they did --
- 9 MR. WEAVER: That -- there's been so many
- 10 inspections that -- okay.
- MR. JAQUES: You know, actually, that's --
- we're talking about three different things here. You
- 13 were asking about, I thought, the FAA's special
- 14 inspection --
- MR. McGILL: Yes.
- 16 MR. JAQUES: -- hold-out and airworthiness
- 17 and operations action plan, and then I think Bill now
- is talking about --
- MR. McGILL: This was -- you're right.
- 20 MR. JAQUES: -- just so we're clear on -- on
- 21 what we're dealing with here.
- MR. McGILL: You're absolutely correct. That
- 23 was the action plan to the inspection, right. So did -

1 - is -- from this -- from the inspection itself, ya'll 2 created this plan, right? 3 MR. WEAVER: The FAA inspection? MR. McGILL: Yes, the FAA inspection. 4 5 MR. WEAVER: Okay. We --6 MR. McGILL: Do you feel that -- what I'm --7 what I was just trying to get at is that was that a fair assessment that was performed by the FAA and did 8 9 you address all of the areas that you feel that --10 adequately that was initially brought to your -- to Alaska Airlines? 11 12 MR. WEAVER: I could say that I -- that we have responded to the FAA's inspection findings with --13 14 with the appropriate action and responsiveness to the items that they --15 16 MR. McGILL: So if you were -- you were part 17 of all of these -- these new areas that are going to be 18 done? You were part of this team that --19 MR. WEAVER: Yes. 20 MR. McGILL: -- says this is what we're going 21 to --22 MR. WEAVER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

MR. McGILL: -- do and how we're going to do

23

- 1 it and so forth?
- MR. WEAVER: Correct. Yes.
- 3 MR. McGILL: Were you surprised that there
- 4 were -- some of these areas that needed to be
- 5 reevaluated? Were you aware of that previously?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: Well, in terms of surprise, the
- 7 -- the findings are, you know, straightforward. And
- 8 again, I think we've -- we've addressed 'em. As to the
- 9 issue of me being surprised, I don't think "surprised"
- is the word that I would use. It's just anytime
- there's an inspection there's things to learn as best
- 12 practices to -- to -- to consider, and you just go
- 13 forward.
- 14 MR. McGILL: Do you communicate with Mr.
- 15 Fowler daily?
- MR. WEAVER: Pretty much, yeah. Yeah, I mean
- 17 he's my boss, and I -- report to him. And again, on a
- 18 -- on a daily basis I can tell you there's times where
- 19 both of us are in the office and we do not talk. But
- 20 in general, I think, to characterize the working
- 21 relationship is that we talk on a daily basis.
- MR. McGILL: Part of the -- some of the
- 23 people here fall under your guidance we interviewed

- 1 yesterday with Mr. Davey in Engineering. We've been
- 2 talking about the -- the changing of the lubrication.
- 3 Were you involved in some of these decisions?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: No, I was not. "In some of
- 5 these decisions" meaning was I involved in the decision
- 6 to change the lubrication?
- 7 MR. McGILL: Yes, sir.
- 8 MR. WEAVER: No.
- 9 MR. McGILL: Who initiated those changes?
- 10 MR. WEAVER: I do not know.
- 11 MR. McGILL: As staff vice president of
- 12 maintenance, do -- when changes like this are made do
- 13 -- would you at least be advised that a change has
- 14 been made?
- MR. WEAVER: Not necessarily, no. I mean to
- 16 -- to say that any maintenance manual revision or
- 17 maintenance program revision that takes place am I
- briefed on and -- and knowledgeable of? I'm not.
- 19 MR. McGILL: So you really don't -- you --
- 20 you weren't any part of the process that moved from
- 21 Mobil 28 to Aeroshell 33, is that correct?
- MR. WEAVER: No. Not involved in that
- process.

- 1 MR. McGILL: Weren't involved in the process.
 2 (Pause)
- 3 MR. McGILL: Do you ever -- do you have a --
- 4 any type of an internal audit system in the Maintenance
- 5 that allows you to check different areas of the
- 6 Maintenance organization?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: Yes. We have our Quality
- 8 Assurance organization that does both external and
- 9 internal auditing.
- 10 MR. McGILL: Do you ever recommend areas that
- 11 need to be audited or do they kind of come up with that
- 12 idea themselves?
- MR. WEAVER: Predominantly, it's my
- 14 understanding that they do that pretty much themselves.
- 15 In the event, though, that -- that a bit of
- 16 information that I would come across would -- would, in
- 17 my opinion, leading the division, necessitate a special
- 18 look or review I would -- I wouldn't hesitate to ask
- 19 them to do so.
- 20 MR. McGILL: Was -- lately there's been some
- 21 issues brought forth about the tooling that is used,
- the tooling fixture that is used on the end-play check.
- Is there anything about that that you would know?

1 MR. WEAVER: The restraining fixture used --2 MR. McGILL: Yes. That's correct. 3 MR. WEAVER: My knowledge is that there's a restraining fixture. As to knowledge about it and --4 5 and -- and its use, you know, I've never seen the --6 the end-play check done. 7 MR. McGILL: Even after the accident you've never gone out and looked at it to see how it was done? 8 9 MR. WEAVER: No. 10 MR. McGILL: If -- do -- do you recall any letters that were issued by Boeing about April that 11 12 told audit operators to take a look at these restraining fixtures? 13 14 MR. WEAVER: No. MR. McGILL: So you -- you don't know 15 16 anything about any letters sent by Boeing requesting 17 the different carriers, which Alaska would have been 18 one of 'em, --19 MR. WEAVER: No, I don't. 20 MR. McGILL: Well, I've had a -- I have a 21 copy in Washington, D.C. I've asked several people, 22 you know, was anything done, did they try to -- and no

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

one seems to know that they've ever received this

23

- 1 letter. And I was just curious if it were, it's
- 2 obviously not to you and you were running the show, but
- 3 it could have been someone below in your staff, but I
- 4 haven't been successful in determining who would have
- 5 received that and if anything had to be done about
- 6 verifying the -- the different tooling.
- 7 MR. WEAVER: Frank, I don't recall seeing any
- 8 letter covering restraining fixtures.
- 9 MR. McGILL: Since the accident -- at the
- 10 time of the accident you only possessed one of these
- 11 tools to do this end-play check, is that your
- 12 knowledge?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: I -- I don't -- I don't know
- 14 from that --
- 15 MR. McGILL: -- since that time purchased
- 16 some more and you have built some more, in-house
- 17 building these jack screws. Are you aware of any --
- 18 anything about that?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: I'm knowledgeable that we have
- 20 bought more as a result of the increase in inspections
- 21 and -- and that sort, so --
- MR. McGILL: What about in-house
- 23 manufacturing?

- 1 MR. WEAVER: My understanding is that there
- were some restraining fixtures that were built in-
- 3 house.
- 4 MR. McGILL: Who -- who would -- who would --
- 5 who could I talk -- who would be -- who made that
- decision, for instance, to build some in-house?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: I don't know. I don't know who
- 8 made that decision.
- 9 (Pause)
- 10 MR. McGILL: Allow me -- if I were to ask the
- different people, which I probably will. I'm just
- trying to get to -- are all the same people are still
- here that at the -- there was a vacancy, of course, and
- 14 you got a new person, but Mr. Davey, Mr. Trimberger,
- 15 Mr. Hindman, Mr. McClendon, and Mr. Fitzpatrick, all of
- these people are still here and they still all work for
- 17 you?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: Yes.
- 19 MR. McGILL: Do you think one of those people
- 20 would know who -- something about the --
- 21 MR. WEAVER: Could -- could I ask a question
- 22 today?
- MR. McGILL: Yes.

1	(Pause)
2	MR. WEAVER: Just clarification on everybody
3	that worked for works for me is Bob Hindman no
4	longer works for Alaska Airlines effective yesterday,
5	so.
6	MR. McGILL: He's the director of line
7	maintenance?
8	MR. WEAVER: Correct.
9	MR. McGILL: And who's he who is
10	obviously, do you have a replacement already for him?
11	MR. WEAVER: Paul Miller's the existing
12	Seattle line maintenance manager, and
13	MR. McGILL: Paul Paul Miller?
14	MR. WEAVER: Paul, yeah.
15	MR. McGILL: Yeah, I see him right here.
16	MR. WEAVER: Paul is is an acting will
17	essentially take on the role of acting director of line
18	maintenance, and we're moving to back-fill Paul with
19	with an individual, and that person will be back-
20	filled, so but I just you know, I just thought it
21	was important, you know, specifically clarify that Bob
22	Hindman no longer works for Alaska Airlines.
23	MR. McGILL: Is there some reason why he no

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

- 1 longer -- that you can share with us that he no longer
- 2 works here?
- 3 MR. JAQUES: You know, I -- I don't think
- 4 that's an appropriate topic for -- for a record like
- 5 this, that the reasons that Hindman may have chosen to
- 6 leave or if he was asked to leave -- and I don't know
- 7 what the circumstances were, but unless you feel
- 8 strongly, I just don't think that's the kind of thing
- 9 you ought to be inquiring about, individual personnel
- 10 actions like that.
- MR. McGILL: Okay.
- 12 (Pause)
- 13 DR. BRENNER: I'm interested. I feel
- 14 strongly.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah, I do, too.
- DR. BRENNER: I'd like to know why --
- 17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I do, too.
- 18 MR. JAQUES: Why don't we talk about it on a
- 19 break?
- 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah, we'll come back to it,
- 21 Malcolm.
- 22 (Pause)
- MR. McGILL: Bill, are you involved in or

- 1 have been involved in the various -- do you do
- 2 escalations of the check intervals?
- 3 MR. WEAVER: No. Well, in my role today I
- 4 may be aware of it, but to my knowledge, I've -- I've
- 5 not seen any of that. Since my coming, actually, to
- 6 Alaska Airlines I've not been involved in any
- 7 escalations.
- 8 (Pause)
- 9 MR. WEAVER: And you're -- you're
- 10 specifically speaking to C-check escalations?
- 11 MR. McGILL: Yeah, any types of C-checks or
- 12 any cards that are attached to C-checks or A-checks or
- 13 lubrication cards, anything, those types.
- 14 (Pause)
- MR. McGILL: Have you ever seen the -- I'd
- 16 asked about the lubrication change. This was your ME-
- 17 01 that produced that change. Have you ever seen that?
- MR. WEAVER: This is the first time I've seen
- 19 this.
- 20 MR. McGILL: Okay. There's no place for you
- 21 to sign. I was just curious if you had gotten -- had
- 22 been involved in --
- MR. WEAVER: No, sir.

- 1 MR. McGILL: Okay. I don't -- why don't we
- just wait right here on -- on you, and let's move over
- 3 to Dean?
- 4 MR. HAMILTON: I'm going to pass right now.
- 5 MR. McGILL: Mike?
- 6 MR. LASLEY: I don't believe I have anything
- 7 at the moment.
- 8 MR. McGILL: Lance?
- 9 MR. SEYER: I have a few. Are you aware of
- 10 the "no technical objection" letter from the FAA to
- 11 Alaska Airlines Engineering regarding the switch from
- Mobil 28 to Aeroshell 33? Boeing, excuse me. Not from
- 13 the FAA, from Boeing.
- MR. WEAVER: I'm aware, yes, that there was
- one, yes.
- 16 MR. SEYER: Do you know who made the decision
- to switch over to the Aeroshell 33?
- 18 MR. SEYER: No, I do not.
- 19 MR. SEYER: Yet it's on our task cards to --
- 20 currently we are using that at Alaska Airlines, is that
- 21 correct?
- MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
- MR. SEYER: But you don't know who made the

1 change or authorized it? 2 MR. JAQUES: He already answered that. MR. WEAVER: I mean in -- I guess -- which 3 time frame are you talking? 4 5 MR. SEYER: I believe the "no technical 6 objection" letter was sent around, I believe, September 7 of '97? 8 MR. WEAVER: So that's -- so that's the time 9 frame you're speaking to --10 MR. SEYER: Right. MR. WEAVER: -- as to who made that decision? 11 12 MR. SEYER: Right. 13 MR. WEAVER: No, I do not know. 14 (Pause) MR. SEYER: Mr. Trimberger is -- one of his 15 titles at the time was director of safety. You said 16 17 that he never as such brought safety issues to your 18 concern? 19 MR. WEAVER: No, I don't -- I said that he's 20 never brought safety issues to -- to my attention. I -

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

there's a possibility that he's brought issues before

- I don't recall any specifically that he's brought to

my attention and mentioned that. We meet regularly and

21

22

23

- 1 me, but I don't recall one specifically.
- 2 MR. SEYER: Okay. Do you know who Holly
- 3 Geiger is?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: She's the manager of safety. I
- 5 believe that's still her function and responsibility.
- 6 MR. SEYER: Have you ever had any
- 7 conversations with Ms. Geiger concerning safety issues,
- 8 bringing it to the corporate attention?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: I've had a number of
- 10 conversations with Holly, yes.
- MR. SEYER: Can you give us an example of one
- of those -- one of those might have been?
- 13 (Pause)
- MR. WEAVER: I -- I recall Holly attending
- our safety meetings. We have monthly safety meetings,
- 16 and I recall having a dialogue with her asking her to
- 17 -- to participate in those and feel welcome and to
- 18 provide any feedback, you know, from her perspective
- 19 and her grain of, you know, expertise and -- and what
- 20 not. So in that general nature, I've had those
- 21 discussions.
- 22 (Pause)
- MR. SEYER: The Training Department under

- 1 you, Maintenance Training, Technical Training?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes. I mean directly underneath
- 3 me, no. But it reports directly to Jim Trimberger, who
- 4 reports to me.
- 5 MR. SEYER: Prior to the accident, say the
- 6 period between '97 and the time of the accident, Alaska
- 7 Airlines was going through a period of I use the term
- 8 rapid growth. We were getting increased amount of
- 9 airplanes and we were flying longer, utilizing the
- 10 aircraft more. And we were also at the same time
- 11 extending the check intervals for these aircraft.
- 12 During the same time of rapid growth of the company was
- 13 the Maintenance Training Department increased at any
- 14 time during that time frame, do you know?
- MR. JAQUES: Are you asking him to comment on
- 16 your statements about increased flying time and
- 17 increase in intervals or are you just asking him what
- 18 training increases were made during that time frame? I
- 19 want to make sure it's clear on whether you want him to
- 20 comment or asking him about this factual predicate of
- 21 that question, you're -- you're just asking about
- 22 training during that period.
- MR. SEYER: I am asking about Training

- 1 Department. Was it increased during that period of
- 2 rapid growth?
- 3 MR. JAQUES: During what time frame?
- 4 MR. SEYER: '97 to the date of the accident.
- 5 MR. WEAVER: I could not specifically answer
- 6 definitively as to whether or not it has grown. As to
- 7 how many people have been added, subtracted, you know,
- 8 without looking at any organizational head-count
- 9 information and all I -- I couldn't answer that.
- 10 MR. SEYER: Do you review the ME-01s that are
- 11 forwarded to the FAA for approval?
- 12 MR. WEAVER: I do not review ME-01s. I've
- 13 not reviewed ME-01s, put it that way.
- 14 (Pause)
- 15 MR. SEYER: That's all I have.
- 16 MR. McGILL: Kristen?
- 17 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Have you recently filled
- 18 the position of director of maintenance?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm. Yes.
- 20 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And who's currently in
- 21 that position?
- MR. WEAVER: It's a gentleman named Brian
- 23 Hirschman.

- 1 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And when did you start
- 2 looking for a replacement or someone to fill this
- 3 position?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: The director of maintenance?
- 5 Subsequent to my promotion to being the staff vice
- 6 president of M & E.
- 7 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And approximately what
- 8 date was that?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: To the best of my recollection,
- it's approximately May time frame of '97, I believe.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. So -- so you
- 12 actively --
- 13 MR. WEAVER: May of '98. '98.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay.
- MR. WEAVER: Sorry.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Time flies when you're having
- 17 fun.
- 18 MR. WEAVER: Yeah. Doesn't it?
- 19 MS. VON KLEINSMID: So it's taken you two
- 20 years plus of actively recruiting?
- 21 MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm. Any increased steps
- 22 since the FAA inspection in pursuing this position to
- 23 be filled? The white -- white-glove inspection, the

- one that came out in March? I mean did you step up
- 2 activity levels to try to fill the spot?
- 3 MR. WEAVER: No. It's been a key position
- 4 that we have put forth the effort to fill.
- 5 MS. VON KLEINSMID: What type of actions have
- 6 you taken since May of '98 to try to fill the position?
- 7 Putting advertisements in papers? What -- what sort
- 8 of things have you -- have you pursued to try to find a
- 9 person to fill this spot?
- 10 MR. WEAVER: This wouldn't be all inclusive,
- 11 but from my knowledge of what we have done is pursued
- 12 executive recruiters to fill the position. That was
- 13 initiated immediately after the position was vacated by
- 14 myself. I do not know as to whether or not we have
- 15 advertised through magazine publications or the media
- 16 and/or through our web site. I don't know if that was
- 17 accomplished. Internally and externally, networking
- through the industry. There have been industry
- 19 meetings of which the position was made known as a
- 20 vacancy and sought input and recommendations. And
- 21 that's the -- the effort that we've put forward in
- 22 trying to fill the position.
- 23 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Back to Aircraft 963 and

- 1 the C-check, the C-5 check in approximately late
- 2 September of '97. You made a statement that you were
- 3 aware that the aircraft was in heavy check, is that
- 4 correct?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: What was the question again?
- 6 MS. VON KLEINSMID: In -- in September of '97
- 7 --
- 8 MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
- 9 MS. VON KLEINSMID: I'm referring to Aircraft
- 10 963 being in C-check -- and you -- I think you stated
- 11 that you were aware that the aircraft was in -- in
- 12 heavy check, that that was the extent of your
- 13 knowledge?
- MR. WEAVER: Generally -- generally
- characterizing that I would know that it was in heavy
- 16 check. In other words, as I look at the maintenance
- 17 delay report and -- and know of the conversations that
- take place in the 8:00 conferences, the tail number of
- 19 the airplane is often mentioned and, of course, on the
- 20 maintenance delay report it's identified. So if I were
- 21 looking at those I would have -- would have known that
- 22 it was in check.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Any knowledge that

- 1 Aircraft 963 was going to be late scheduled completion
- 2 date of the heavy check?
- MR. WEAVER: I have no recollection of that
- 4 today, no.
- 5 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Who approves -- if the
- 6 jack screw's required to be purchased, who -- who has
- 7 to give authorization for that?
- 8 (Pause)
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Specifically, I do not know who
- 10 that person is. I mean it's -- it's dependent upon the
- 11 type of inventory and -- and -- and part that it is
- 12 that that -- whether or not we can order the part or it
- 13 takes approval, based upon dollar values and things
- 14 like that, so.
- 15 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Who has -- based on
- 16 dollar value, if it's over -- is there a certain limit
- 17 that the -- the base manager can -- has a
- 18 responsibility over, if it's under, say, \$5000 or --
- 19 that he can give authority or do you know what that
- 20 cut-off is?
- 21 MR. WEAVER: No, I don't. I'd have to go to
- the signature authorization forms and find out what
- their authority is. Again, it would depend upon

- 1 whether or not it was -- what type of inventory it was,
- 2 whether or not it was available, whether it was
- 3 expendable or repairable. It varies.
- 4 MS. VON KLEINSMID: So would you know the
- 5 answer if it was a -- part and you didn't have any in
- 6 stock as to who would have to -- who would have the
- 7 authority to order one?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: In a specific example, I could
- 9 sort through and know who to go to and find that
- 10 information out, yes.
- 11 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Regarding the -- the
- 12 change in the lubrication, I think you've stated that
- 13 you're not aware -- I mean today you're aware of the
- 14 change, the request and the changes that were made in
- going from Mobil 28 to Aeroshell 33. You have no
- 16 recollection of any communication with anyone under you
- in late or middle July regarding this issue?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: July?
- MR. JAQUES: What year?
- MR. WEAVER: Of what year?
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: '97.
- 22 MR. WEAVER: No. I have no recollection.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Who's -- what

- 1 organization is responsible for tooling?
- 2 MR. WEAVER: Tooling, I'd have to refer to
- 3 the GMM as to the tooling, tooling issues, and
- 4 responsibilities.
- 5 MS. VON KLEINSMID: The -- the managers that
- 6 are still left, I guess -- I guess Fowler's now -- he's
- 7 ahead -- above you, I know that. But he's retired.
- 8 Hindman's gone. Chet Yancey's on medical leave.
- 9 Robert Fowler has been transferred. You've got a new
- 10 director of safety, a new director of maintenance. J.
- 11 Maloney left in July. Well, who's left? How do you
- 12 feel -- Jim Davey and -- what's your opinion of Mr.
- 13 Davey and his responsibilities and how he does his job
- and his knowledge?
- MR. WEAVER: So, is your question what is my
- 16 opinion of Jim Davey?
- 17 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Yeah, I guess that's my
- 18 question. Of who's left under you, what's your opinion
- of Mr. Davey in his responsibility in managing the
- 20 Engineering Department?
- MR. WEAVER: I have a good working
- 22 relationship with Jim. Jim's a smart individual. I
- 23 believe he's developed a good organization with good

- 1 succession planning and addresses the issues as the
- 2 department head.
- 3 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Is he knowledgeable about
- 4 everything that needs to go on in Engineering and what
- 5 his responsibilities include? I mean do you feel he's
- 6 knowledgeable of engineering, of the Alaska Airlines
- 7 Engineering Department?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: Do I believe that he's --
- 9 knowledgeable of his responsibilities? Yes
- 10 MS. VON KLEINSMID: What about knowledgeable
- in terms of being able to answer questions on the spot
- 12 without having to refer to a GMM?
- MR. WEAVER: Because there are so many issues
- 14 we deal with I -- I think it would be impossible for
- any one individual to have knowledge on all the issues
- that even one department may be involved in in this
- 17 business.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Well, Zerta, Z-E-R-T-A, I
- 19 don't have the org chart -- is the planning -- is your
- 20 director of planning?
- MR. WEAVER: Steve Zerta.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: What about his
- 23 capabilities?

1	MR. WEAVER: Again, I have a lot of
2	confidence in Steve. He's a a smart individual,
3	knows his responsibilities, and addresses the issues
4	and deals with the issues that his his department's
5	responsible for.
6	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Whose decision was it in
7	Oakland in, say, around the '97 time frame, maybe even
8	earlier, to go from a five-day work-week to a seven-day
9	work-week?
10	MR. WEAVER: I don't know who
11	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Do you have any did
12	you attend any meetings regarding that?
13	MR. WEAVER: No.
14	MS. VON KLEINSMID: So you could just go make
15	that change as director of planning?
16	MR. WEAVER: Who can?
17	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Well, I believe that kind
18	of come under Planning, right? Scheduling time in
19	C-checks, isn't that under the Planning organization?
20	MR. WEAVER: Well, I I wouldn't
21	characterize that it would be one individual's

MS. VON KLEINSMID: But that type of decision

responsibility to make that decision.

22

23

1	would be below you?
2	MR. WEAVER: Possibly.
3	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay
4	MR. WEAVER: I don't think I understand your
5	question. Are you asking me a question that did Steve
6	Zerta make the decision to go from five-day to seven-
7	day?
8	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Who made the decision?
9	MR. WEAVER: I do not know.
10	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. But you don't have
11	any knowledge of being in on any communication about
12	that change?
13	MR. WEAVER: Specifically to Oakland?
14	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Yeah.
15	MR. WEAVER: No.
16	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Were you in on any
17	meetings in the last three years regarding heavy check
18	delays?
19	MR. WEAVER: Absolutely, yes.
20	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. Can you were
21	you concerned about the time that it was taking
22	aircraft to get through heavy checks?
23	MR. WEAVER: I think more accurately it would

- 1 be a concern with the plan itself, not necessarily the
- 2 time that it takes but our ability to -- to meet the
- 3 plan.
- 4 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. So did you
- 5 recommend changes? I mean it was more not so much an
- 6 ability to meet the plan but there was an inability to
- 7 meet the plan. Would you say that's an accurate
- 8 assessment of the past few years?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: There have been times where we
- 10 have not met the plan, yes.
- 11 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Would there be more times
- when the plan's been met than the times that the plan
- was met?
- 14 MR. WEAVER: Without specifically looking at
- the charts and graphs, I mean to generally characterize
- 16 whether or not we've met our ATRs more times than we've
- 17 not, I -- I'd be speculating right now.
- 18 MS. VON KLEINSMID: So it's not something
- 19 that you -- you've looked at it in any depth or have
- any recollection of at this time?
- 21 MR. WEAVER: Specifically looking -- me
- 22 personally looking and finding out how many aircraft
- have left on time versus haven't left on time, I don't

- 1 have any recollection of ever doing that.
- 2 MS. VON KLEINSMID: What about communication
- 3 with how better to meet the plan? What steps in either
- 4 meetings or conversations with your subordinates have
- 5 been taken to try to go -- better job at meeting the
- 6 plan?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: Well, I think that we have as an
- 8 M & E staff discussed the -- our abilities to -- to
- 9 meet the plan and produce aircraft in accordance to the
- 10 plan. We've talked about those issues and what the
- inefficiencies and the problems or issues are that
- 12 could better facilitate meeting the plan at a -- staff
- 13 level. More specifically, though, a working group of,
- 14 essentially, a focus team has really -- over the years
- 15 has kind of -- has really focused on that from a
- 16 working group, from the mechanic levels, have -- buy-in
- 17 and -- and/or input into what are the issues and what
- are the hurdles, you know, that are inhibiting us
- 19 meeting the plan.
- 20 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And one of those hurdles
- 21 would -- would or would not be the fact that there's
- 22 not enough time scheduled for aircraft in heavy check?
- 23 MR. WEAVER: I don't believe that that would

- 1 necessarily be a hurdle. I think that one of the
- 2 issues that this committee and work group has -- has
- 3 identified in the past was just establishing the plan
- 4 to begin with. In other words, taking into
- 5 consideration all the information necessary to produce
- 6 the aircraft, given all the different variables and
- 7 different bills of work.
- 8 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Do you think it's a good
- 9 plan to go and plug in a Saturday and a Sunday as a --
- 10 as a labor and work day? Just like a regular Monday,
- 11 Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday? The work
- 12 output on a Saturday or a Sunday is equivalent to the
- other five days of the week?
- 14 MR. JAQUES: I'm sorry. Are you asking if --
- if it's a good idea to do that or whether or not the
- 16 work output is the same? There are multiple questions
- 17 there.
- 18 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. Let's take the
- 19 first question. Do you think the work output is the
- 20 same on the Saturday and Sunday as on Monday, Tuesday,
- 21 Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday?
- 22 MR. WEAVER: It's dependent upon staffing.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: And were your staffing

- 1 levels on the weekends that same as Monday through
- 2 Friday?
- 3 MR. WEAVER: I have -- I've not -- I don't
- 4 know. I don't know what our staffing levels are as --
- 5 at the check as to whether or not they're the same on
- 6 Tuesday as they are on Saturday.
- 7 MS. VON KLEINSMID: So you haven't had any
- 8 communication with -- with your subordinates regarding
- 9 staffing on weekends?
- 10 MR. WEAVER: Yes. There's been discussions -
- 11 you know, general discussions about five-day coverage
- 12 versus seven-day coverage and seven-day coverage and
- 13 the staffing. So I mean ideally you -- seven-day
- 14 coverage is that you have essentially similar staffing
- 15 levels, but the way the shifts work, 4-10s, 3-8s, I
- mean it's mathematically I guess next to impossible
- 17 trying to make it exactly 24 people on day shift Monday
- 18 through Sunday. So I mean there are tweaks that take
- 19 place. But the -- the essence or I mean the gist of
- 20 going from a five-day to a seven-day coverage is is
- 21 that, you know, basically staffed such to where that
- those are productive days.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: And do you believe in the

- 1 1996 and '97 time frame that your Saturday and Sunday
- 2 coverage was relatively close in staffing to Monday
- 3 through Friday?
- 4 MR. JAQUES: Where? Any particular location?
- 5 MS. VON KLEINSMID: At Oakland. I thought we
- 6 were talking Oakland.
- 7 MR. WEAVER: Without specifically looking at
- 8 the manning charts and -- I would not know.
- 9 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Have you received safety
- 10 concerns or letters, calls, since the crash from
- 11 employees other than your safety -- Jim Trimberger or
- 12 anyone else? I mean have you received it from --
- 13 questions or concerns or complaints from other
- 14 employees that have gone to you?
- MR. WEAVER: Yeah, I think that subsequent to
- 16 the crash. Is that what you're saying?
- 17 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Mm-hmm.
- 18 MR. WEAVER: Subsequent to the crash we --
- 19 there have been a number of employees that have come
- 20 forward with their concerns, issues, and specifically
- 21 safety.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Mm-hmm.
- MR. WEAVER: I -- yes.

- 1 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And -- and have you
- 2 responded to them? Do you -- do you take any -- what
- 3 action do you take normally if it comes to you and --
- 4 and how you handle that?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: I would write it down and follow
- 6 up. Assign the responsibility to whoever, you know,
- 7 had responsibility for investigating the issue and
- 8 running it to ground and then following up with that
- 9 employee and letting them know what to find -- you
- 10 know, what the issues were, what -- I -- I may do that
- 11 myself personally or I may have someone else do it.
- 12 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay.
- 13 MR. WEAVER: And normally follow up to ask --
- 14 get feedback from that person who is following up for
- me as to whether or not it's taken place.
- 16 MS. VON KLEINSMID: That's all I have right
- 17 now.
- MR. McGILL: Let's try to get one more person
- 19 before the break, and then we'll take a little break.
- 20 Will that be all right?
- 21 DR. CRAWLEY: Mr. Weaver, Mr. McGill had
- 22 asked you what you do every day, and you had a little
- hard time describing that because you said things

- 1 change so much. And could you elaborate a little bit
- on that? Why -- why is it that things change so much
- 3 or what -- from day to day?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: It's demands of the business.
- 5 Things change every day in the sense that I have
- 6 different meetings scheduled throughout the week. I
- 7 have different station visits throughout the year.
- 8 Have different issues that come before me that, you
- 9 know, are new issues or old issues. So it's -- I mean
- if you're looking for me to explain what my typical day
- 11 is --
- DR. CRAWLEY: It's hard?
- MR. WEAVER: -- it's -- it's just hard to do.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Okay.
- 15 MR. WEAVER: It's a variation. I mean thank
- 16 God there is.
- 17 DR. CRAWLEY: Does it involve a lot of
- 18 prioritization of setting things of most important to
- 19 the least important, kind of like everybody else?
- MR. WEAVER: Oh, yeah, absolutely.
- 21 DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. I was just wondering,
- 22 back in early February shortly after the crash how much
- you got personally involved with this whole jack screw

- issue and what kind of things came across your desk
- 2 about it and what kind of meetings you had about it,
- 3 and I would think it would be a high priority item at
- 4 that point?
- 5 MR. JAQUES: Pretty broad question. You're
- 6 free to answer it. Just make sure --
- 7 MR. WEAVER: I'll -- I'll --
- 8 MR. JAQUES: -- answer.
- 9 DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. Let -- I -- I can do it
- 10 a little more specifically, then. On -- on February of
- 11 -- 11th, I believe, was the date when the emergency AD
- came out to inspect the -- the jack screws within 72
- 13 hours. Was that a high priority item for you on
- 14 February 11th?
- 15 MR. WEAVER: I'm -- I'm going back to my
- 16 memory, which is at that point in time not crystal
- 17 clear. So I cannot really tell you whether or not I
- was even in Seattle at that time or whether or not I
- 19 was at Oxnard. Such -- such an AD, though, in this
- 20 business or any type of AD that is time-sensitive is of
- 21 the utmost and high importance.
- DR. CRAWLEY: With -- with that in mind, did
- 23 -- were you involved in any of the discussions on how

- 1 it was going to be done, whether you were going to form
- 2 a particular team, what -- what were the -- the limits
- 3 that were set out in the AD? Did somebody explain the
- 4 AD to you, go over the details of it, what kind of
- 5 tools were -- did you get involved at that level of it
- 6 at all?
- MR. WEAVER: As to the level of knowing what
- 8 tools were involved, no. No.
- 9 DR. CRAWLEY: How about --
- 10 MR. WEAVER: I think --
- DR. CRAWLEY: -- just the general
- 12 requirements?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: The general requirements of what
- 14 the inspection, the visual inspection requirements
- were, yes.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Did somebody explain that to
- 17 you or did you just read it yourself and understand it?
- MR. WEAVER: Well, I read the AD.
- 19 (Pause)
- 20 MR. WEAVER: I take that back. I believe I
- 21 read the service bulletin from -- from Boeing, and
- 22 again, through my involvement -- I believe that I was
- 23 back in Seattle at that time when the inspections were

2 and level of detail that I would have been briefed on, 3 essentially, from an engineering standpoint, --4 (Pause) 5 I'm sure that, you know, it was MR. WEAVER: 6 discussed but to what detail I couldn't -- or who it 7 was I -- you know, I mean I wouldn't know. DR. CRAWLEY: Did -- did you --8 9 MR. WEAVER: I guess what I'm trying to answer your question is is that I don't ever recall a 10 time where Engineering huddled and said, Mr. Weaver, 11 12 here's the AD, do you understand the AD, do you know 13 the game plan here? No, that never took place.

started. I believe I was, so, you know, the briefing

- DR. CRAWLEY: Did you draft any memos or issue any directives as the staff vice president of
- 16 maintenance and engineering to assure the quality of --
- of these inspections or to set forth any kind of a
- 18 policy regarding how these inspections would -- would
- 19 be done? Or was that at a -- some lower level that
- 20 that was done?

1

- 21 MR. WEAVER: I don't recall ever -- I don't
- 22 ever recall writing any such memo, and -- and again,
- 23 that -- you would have the Maintenance Manual that

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 would be the referencing source to use for
- 2 accomplishing -- either that or the service bulletin
- 3 that would -- would be the reference for, you know,
- 4 accomplishing whatever maintenance function it was.
- 5 DR. CRAWLEY: Has the Maintenance Manual been
- 6 amended or changed as far as troubleshooting of a
- 7 jammed stabilizer since the crash? If I as a captain
- 8 pulled into Seattle today with a -- with a trim motor
- 9 that didn't work, for example, and the mechanics out
- 10 there went to troubleshoot that problem, has the
- 11 procedure in troubleshooting changed since the
- 12 accident, been amended?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: I don't have any knowledge of
- 14 that.
- DR. CRAWLEY: You haven't had -- had any
- 16 concerns about -- about that? About whether it should
- 17 be changed or amended or at least somebody looking at
- it or reviewing what's being done?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: Do I have any concerns about
- what's presently being done?
- 21 DR. CRAWLEY: About it being the same
- 22 procedure --
- MR. WEAVER: No.

1 DR. CRAWLEY: -- that it was before the 2 crash? Should be adequate? 3 MR. WEAVER: Again, I -- I can answer the question in -- in the sense that do I believe that the 4 5 mechanics are -- have issue with what it is that 6 they're doing and -- and that hasn't been brought to my 7 attention. So, I have a lot of faith in the mechanics. And I think that if they had issues with the 8 9 troubleshootings or felt uncomfortable with what they 10 were doing, I think the management team would be made 11 aware of that. And I have no knowledge that they're 12 uncomfortable with the procedures, so --13 DR. CRAWLEY: So you -- you wouldn't 14 necessarily change your procedure unless there was a problem brought up with it? 15 16 MR. WEAVER: Well, I guess it goes back to 17 your word "concern." 18 DR. CRAWLEY: Well, we -- we had an airplane 19 land in Reno that turned back where neither trim motor, 20 the primary or the alternate, was working and they went 21 through that troubleshooting procedure down there,

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

jack screw or an end-play check. And then that jack

which did not involve actual physical inspection of the

22

23

- 1 screw subsequently, several days later, after the
- 2 airplane had flown, it was determined that it -- the
- 3 jack screw needed to be replaced because of excessive
- 4 wear.
- 5 MR. JAQUES: Do you have a question there? I
- 6 know you stated a bunch of facts. I'm not sure he's
- 7 familiar with any of that. Do you have a guestion you
- 8 want to ask him?
- 9 DR. CRAWLEY: With -- with that statement in
- 10 mind, would you think that maybe this procedure needs
- 11 to be reviewed?
- 12 MR. JAQUES: Are you going to ask him whether
- 13 or not he believes those statements to be true? I mean
- 14 you're asking him about something in the absence of --
- DR. CRAWLEY: Do you know that those
- 16 statements are true?
- 17 MR. WEAVER: No, I don't.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. But in any case, the --
- 19 the -- as far as you know, the procedure has not been
- 20 revised as far as inspection of a -- as far as you
- 21 know, the inspection -- the inspection and
- troubleshooting procedure for a jammed stabilizer has
- 23 not been revised since the crash?

1	MR. WEAVER: That would be my understanding.
2	DR. CRAWLEY: I'd like to change to questions
3	regarding the change in grease. And you have already
4	stated that that you weren't really aware that the
5	change had been made prior to the crash, is that
6	correct?
7	MR. WEAVER: Correct.
8	DR. CRAWLEY: And subsequent to the crash,
9	you are now aware that that grease change has been made
10	previously, is that correct? You are now aware that
11	the grease has been changed for lubricating the jack
12	screw and other parts of the aircraft with controlled
13	surfaces? From Mobil 28 to Aeroshell
14	MR. WEAVER: Subsequent to the accident, am I
15	aware that we have gone from Aeroshell 33 back to Mobil
16	28 on any of the aircraft? Is that the question?
17	DR. CRAWLEY: No. There was a change in
18	grease from Mobil 28 to Aeroshell 33.
19	MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
20	DR. CRAWLEY: Back in January of 1998. And -
21	- and you have stated that you weren't aware of that
22	change. Is that correct?

MR. WEAVER: That's correct.

23

- DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. Subsequent to the crash,
- 2 now, have you become aware that that did happen back in
- 3 January of 1998?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: Sort of.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. And you have stated that
- 6 you were not aware back in 1998 or that time frame that
- 7 the grease had been changed from -- from Mobil 28 to
- 8 Aeroshell 33.
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
- DR. CRAWLEY: And my question is, now,
- 11 subsequent to the crash of 261 have you become aware
- that that change was made prior to the crash?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes.
- 14 DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. And are you also aware
- that there's some concern in the investigation
- 16 regarding that switch and that some studies are in
- 17 progress over that switch of the grease?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: -- switch? Oh, with the -- with
- 19 the change of grease.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Back in 1998. Are you aware
- 21 that there's some concern over that and there's some
- testing being done?
- 23 MR. WEAVER: I'm aware that the issue is

1	being
2	DR. CRAWLEY: Investigated?
3	MR. WEAVER: researched.
4	DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. And since you've become
5	aware of of that or you are aware of that, have you
6	launched any kind of an internal investigation within
7	the company to find out who initiated the change in the
8	grease back in 1998 or how that all occurred?
9	MR. WEAVER: No.
10	DR. CRAWLEY: You haven't been concerned
11	about that?
12	MR. JAQUES: I'm sorry. Concerned about
13	what?
14	DR. CRAWLEY: About the the change in the
15	grease or who how it all occurred.
16	MR. JAQUES: Which one?
17	DR. CRAWLEY: The change back in 1998 from
18	Mobil 28 to Aeroshell 33. Has there been any concern
19	on your part about how that whole process of the grease
20	changed and why you weren't aware of it?
21	MR. WEAVER: Again, I'm not aware of all the
22	Maintenance Program changes, and so I don't again, I
23	my concern as to whether or not I was aware of the

- 1 grease being changed at that time is not an issue with
- 2 me now.
- 3 DR. CRAWLEY: I'd like to ask some questions
- 4 about the restraining tool that is used to do the end-
- 5 play check. About two weeks ago we had a grounding of
- 6 17 airplanes, and I believe Alaska Airlines did that
- 7 voluntarily when they discovered that this tool was not
- 8 the correct tool in doing the -- doing the end-play
- 9 check. Have you launched any kind of an internal
- 10 investigation to -- to find out who made the decision
- 11 to -- to make this restraining fixture in-house and
- 12 find out how this tool ended up being used --
- MR. WEAVER: No, --
- 14 DR. CRAWLEY: -- all this time? This caused
- 15 the grounding of 17 airplanes, loss of revenue,
- 16 customer inconvenience, public embarrassment, it was on
- 17 the front page of the paper, and there's been no effort
- 18 within the company to find out how this tool got there?
- 19 MR. JAQUES: I'm sorry. You -- your first
- 20 question was what he did or didn't do. Now you're
- asking him what the company did or didn't do?
- DR. CRAWLEY: Well, what -- yes. Well, what
- 23 -- what -- within the company has there been any

- 1 investigation into that, as far as you're aware of? As
- 2 to -- as to how this occurred?
- 3 MR. WEAVER: Well, first of all, I did not
- 4 initiate any type of investigation in regards to -- to
- 5 your question.
- 6 DR. CRAWLEY: Okay.
- 7 MR. WEAVER: In regards to the issue, it's --
- 8 it's being pursued from the NTSB investigation. And so
- 9 we have done a run with a parallel investigation.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. I don't have any more
- 11 questions.
- 12 MR. McGILL: Okay. Let's take a break right
- 13 now.
- 14 (Brief recess)
- 15 MR. McGILL: Okay. Malcolm, let's start
- 16 again.
- 17 DR. BRENNER: I guess on the issue we
- discussed in the hallway, in general, do you think
- 19 there's been a large turnover -- would you say there's
- 20 been a large turnover in the management of the
- 21 Maintenance group since the accident?
- MR. WEAVER: Turnover meaning people are no
- longer in their positions and may be in other positions

- or turnover being that they're no longer with the
- 2 company, with --
- 3 DR. BRENNER: However you'd like to
- 4 characterize it.
- 5 MR. WEAVER: No, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't
- 6 characterize that we've had a large turnover in the
- 7 management ranks since the accident.
- DR. BRENNER: Okay. Thank you. And you
- 9 mentioned Mr. Hindman the director of line maintenance
- 10 stopped working for the company yesterday. Can you
- 11 give us any sense as to why that is and how -- in the
- sense that it might relate to the investigation?
- MR. WEAVER: It's our employment policy that
- 14 I would not speak or -- or comment on a past employee.
- DR. BRENNER: Okay. Thank you. A personal
- 16 question. Have you personally had any leave since the
- 17 accident? This is a question that came up --
- MR. WEAVER: Yes. Mm-hmm.
- 19 DR. BRENNER: How much leave did you have?
- 20 MR. WEAVER: I think totalling up around two
- 21 weeks. I was able to dump a canoe.
- 22 (Laughter)
- DR. BRENNER: Where was that?

1	MR. WEAVER: My son and I. Sixth grade. I
2	was one of the parent chaperones to a sixth-grade
3	retreat, so I was able to my son and I were able to
4	get the distinction of dumping a canoe in Lake Hannon,
5	so and there's been I don't call that vacation.
6	That was work. But it was getting away, and I've been
7	able to get away since then.
8	DR. BRENNER: Okay. And this is the nature
9	of personal leave, is that right?
10	MR. WEAVER: Personal leave, just taking time
11	off like
12	DR. BRENNER: Just taking time off, exactly.
13	Thank you. You mentioned that talking, I guess,
14	the period 1996 to '99 that you had limited interaction
15	with the FAA. I believe you said that you did have
16	regular meetings with them. When when were these
17	regular meetings?
18	MR. WEAVER: My understanding is that the
19	regular meetings with the FAA happen every Tuesday.
20	DR. BRENNER: Okay. Were you personally
21	involved in the meetings?

22

23

MR. WEAVER: No. I did not attend those.

DR. BRENNER: Did you have -- who did you

- 1 have contact with on the FAA side, if anyone?
- 2 MR. WEAVER: The PMI. Essentially, all of
- 3 the staff I had, you know, passing conversations and/or
- 4 interaction. I mean we all know each other by first
- 5 names, and -- but interaction to really discussion --
- 6 discussing the issues, I -- there hasn't been.
- 7 DR. BRENNER: At -- at what level did, say,
- 8 the PMI -- I guess we're talking -- is it John Hubbard
- 9 we're talking about?
- 10 MR. WEAVER: Him and Bill Whitaker. I've
- 11 had, you know, one-on-one dealings with both of those
- 12 at -- when they were in the responsibility of the PMI
- of the -- for Alaska Airlines.
- DR. BRENNER: Tell me about John Hubbard.
- What were his strengths?
- MR. WEAVER: What was his --
- 17 DR. BRENNER: Describe the man to me. Tell
- 18 me about him from your -- your interactions. What was
- 19 he like? What is he like?
- 20 MR. WEAVER: John was a -- kind of a
- 21 straightforward, tell it like it is. Pretty much knew
- where he was coming from.
- 23 (Pause)

1	MR. WEAVER: He was a straightforward guy.
2	DR. BRENNER: Mm-hmm. Good. Do you think he
3	was too strict with the airline?
4	MR. WEAVER: I wouldn't have any example of
5	where he would be too strict in terms of I mean in
6	the rules as he interpreted them and
7	DR. BRENNER: Can you give me examples of
8	some of his concerns during this period, '96, '99?
9	MR. WEAVER: I I think the issue that
10	between John and I that comes to my mind is the
11	approval of our cold-weather procedures manual. He was
12	very much on top of that and aware of the issues, and -
13	- and during this time frame we went from the use of
14	Type One to Type Four and the application of Type Four,
15	his interpretation of how it should be applied. So I
16	mean that's an issue that was discussed and
17	DR. BRENNER: How did you resolve that?
18	MR. WEAVER: We essentially did it the way
19	John believed it needed to be done.
20	DR. BRENNER: Do you think his point was
21	reasonable?
22	MR. WEAVER: Well, I understood his

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

perspective. I understood his position. Didn't --

23

- 1 didn't agree with it personally, but -- but, you know,
- 2 again, we move on. It's --
- 3 DR. BRENNER: What -- what time frame was
- 4 that?
- 5 (Pause)
- 6 MR. WEAVER: I want to say June -- you know,
- 7 '98. Sometime around -- sometime in '98.
- BRENNER: How about Phil -- Phil Hoy?
- 9 Tell me about Phil Hoy.
- 10 MR. WEAVER: I really don't know the guy. I
- mean I essentially -- little or no dealings with Phil
- 12 Hoy.
- 13 DR. BRENNER: There might be a suggestion by
- 14 some people that the FAA during this period, the
- 15 managers did not encourage strict enforcement of the
- 16 airline. Can you help us put this in perspective?
- 17 Would you agree or disagree or anything that might help
- 18 us in the investigation along those lines?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: Again, what constitutes a
- 20 perspective is somewhat opinionated, and all I can say
- 21 is our dealing with the FAA is straightforward. We
- 22 have the issues, we discussed them as an airline every
- 23 Tuesday, and the issues get resolved. There's follow-

- 1 up, follow-through, and I don't believe there's any of
- 2 those people in those meetings in -- in -- involved in
- 3 that kind of dialogue and working relationship would --
- 4 would believe that there's any issues being discounted.
- DR. BRENNER: Okay. In the -- in '97 time
- frame, the Oakland facility, how -- how was the on-time
- 7 performance of the C-checks during that period?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: Really, without specifically
- 9 looking at the -- the data itself I -- I don't know.
- DR. BRENNER: How has the performance been in
- 11 general from '96 to '99?
- MR. WEAVER: '96 to '99. They've had their
- 13 successes and they've had their failures. I mean they
- have succeeded in accomplishing their goals, and
- there's times that they've not.
- 16 DR. BRENNER: And in the cases when they have
- 17 not been able to or when they have, either one, have
- 18 you been involved in trying to change it?
- 19 (Pause)
- 20 MR. WEAVER: Involved in a direct sense, not
- 21 necessarily. If -- if, for instance, the -- let's say
- 22 I go to Oakland and Oakland had just produced an
- 23 airplane and there -- there may be some comments that

- 1 the employees will, you know, address on that, so --
- 2 fairly open and, you know, those things that need to be
- 3 addressed are addressed, so it's --
- DR. BRENNER: '97 time frame, how was morale
- 5 at the Oakland facility?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: At what time frame?
- 7 DR. BRENNER: '97.
- 8 (Pause)
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Again, I can just do a general,
- 10 you know, analogy, and that is in -- in Oakland the
- 11 morale has always seemed to be high. It is a
- 12 tremendously diverse work force that are very attuned
- 13 to the issues, and -- and it's a jab work force. I
- 14 tend to believe that morale in Oakland's always been
- 15 favorable.
- 16 DR. BRENNER: And you mentioned that because
- 17 it's a small company you have an opportunity to get out
- on the floor. During that period how often did you
- 19 visit the Oakland floor, '96 to '99?
- 20 MR. WEAVER: Oh, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't
- 21 know without looking at my --
- 22 DR. BRENNER: How could you characterize it
- in general? Once a month or once a year?

1	MR. WEAVER: I generally characterize it as
2	three times a year maybe, four if I'm lucky.
3	DR. BRENNER: And any observations
4	MR. WEAVER: That may be more. There's
5	again, I can be surprised going back through my
6	calendar as to the times that I get out and actually
7	meet and greet and talk with the work force. So I mean
8	that's a real general character assumption, you
9	know, as to how many times I get down there.
10	DR. BRENNER: John Leotine who worked
11	there, what what he did he report to the his
12	concerns to the Internal Evaluation Board or to the
13	management of the company?
14	MR. JAQUES: I let's take a short break.
15	DR. BRENNER: Okay.
16	(Pause)
17	MR. RODRIGUEZ: This is Mr. Rodriguez. I
18	just wanted to put on the record for everyone's
19	specific knowledge, and most especially for you, Mr.
20	Weaver, that the Safety Board does not intend nor do
21	any of the people here want to get involved in
22	information or aspects that are encompassed in the
23	grand jury and criminal investigations that are ongoing

- 1 even at this time. And specifically, as we talked with
- 2 Mr. Jagues outside, I made the point that the reason we
- 3 are so late in interviewing you and -- and other
- 4 employees of Alaska Airlines is because those other
- 5 investigations were in progress.
- And so the Safety Board is interested in
- 7 safety aspects, in the accident, and the prevention of
- 8 similar accidents in the future. To that extent our
- 9 inquiry has a very broad background and -- and base,
- 10 and we do kind of parallel or perhaps touch on those
- 11 areas.
- 12 But I want you to feel comfortable in -- in
- 13 the questions and at any time that -- that you feel
- 14 like it's -- we're probing in an area that is involved
- in the current ongoing criminal investigations, feel
- 16 free to confer with your lawyer and either decline to
- 17 answer or whatever course -- I don't want to put words
- in your mouth. I just -- whatever course of action you
- 19 feel is prudent for you, know that the Safety Board's
- 20 intent -- I hope it's clear to you what our intent is
- 21 and where we are headed and -- and what our motives
- 22 are. Is it?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes.

- 1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: On that statement? Is that -2 MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
- 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- acceptable, Mr. Jaques?
- 4 MR. JAQUES: Yes, that is. I think that lays
- 5 it out well.
- 6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Go ahead, Malcolm,
- 7 with the questioning.
- DR. BRENNER: In the '96 to '99 time frame,
- 9 were there any complaints that you're aware of from the
- 10 Oakland facility maintenance staff that came to your
- 11 level?
- 12 (Pause)
- 13 MR. WEAVER: I don't have anything specific
- in mind, but I would have -- I would venture to say
- that there may have been, yes.
- 16 DR. BRENNER: At what level would they have
- 17 been made? Who would they have complained to or
- 18 addressed?
- MR. WEAVER: Well, they -- I don't know who
- is "they." If it's a mechanic over the issue of --
- 21 over time shortage or whatever, they would make that to
- their supervisor. Again, I'm just generalizing.
- DR. BRENNER: Okay. Thank you. Mr.

- 1 Trimberger. Tell me about Mr. Trimberger. How is he
- 2 as a manager?
- 3 MR. WEAVER: Jim's rock solid. He's a --
- 4 he's just a remarkable human being, individual. Smart.
- 5 Knows his job. And very capable.
- DR. BRENNER: Now, there's a possible
- 7 criticism as a director of safety he had too large a
- 8 staff to control to adequately be a -- a focus for
- 9 safety issues. Could you -- could you help us put that
- in perspective?
- 11 MR. WEAVER: I'm not aware of there being
- issues or a concern with his span of control.
- DR. BRENNER: Okay. I believe we --
- 14 MR. WEAVER: I mean he -- he reported to me.
- 15 Never voiced to me issues of his span of control or
- inability to accomplish his responsibilities.
- DR. BRENNER: I believe that during that
- 18 period the FAA indicated that they were pushing to have
- 19 that -- an independent director of safety. Do you
- think that was a reasonable approach on their part?
- MR. WEAVER: Again, it's the FAA's
- recommendation that that happen, and as to whether or
- 23 not that's reasonable, I mean that is their

- 1 recommendation and because it's their recommendation we
- 2 implemented it.
- 3 DR. BRENNER: Okay. Can you give me some
- 4 examples, '96 to '99, of some issues that were raised
- 5 by the Internal Evaluation Board or the safety
- 6 director?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: Some examples of issues raised -
- 8 -
- 9 (Pause)
- 10 MR. WEAVER: I believe -- I believe as one
- 11 example would have been our FOD Program, Foreign Object
- 12 Damage Program. And again, I think the issue would
- 13 have been that Jim was just briefing me on the issues
- and I think it was an IEB topic of discussion that,
- again, reviewed the program and believed that there was
- 16 some training that took place or some additional -- so
- 17 I mean that's just one issue that comes to my mind
- 18 first as to something that the IEB was involved in.
- 19 DR. BRENNER: Good. When was that?
- MR. WEAVER: Oh, --
- 21 (Pause)
- MR. WEAVER: I'm guessing. I'm trying to be
- 23 exact as I could, and I'm -- I'd say it was most likely

- 1 some time in early '98 time frame.
- DR. BRENNER: Thank you. John Fowler, how
- 3 was he as a boss?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: He was a good teacher.
- 5 Straightforward. You know where you stand. Very
- 6 intelligent.
- 7 DR. BRENNER: How about Mr. Kelly?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: I have very little interaction,
- 9 really, with John. Very outgoing. Intelligent, again.
- 10 Cordial.
- DR. BRENNER: And -- and yourself as a
- manager, what do you emphasize to support that?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: I -- I think that I would focus
- on and have always and continue to do is
- 15 responsibility. Safety, quality. And this is -- this
- is a business that's -- we're in a very critical
- business, so it's one of which is very, very
- 18 unforgiving. And so it's compliance. And --
- 19 (Pause)
- 20 MR. WEAVER: I think that we -- there again,
- 21 those are generally -- I like to -- how I operate.
- DR. BRENNER: Could you describe the culture
- 23 at Alaska Airlines? How is it different from other

- 1 airlines? I love this room, for example. I would
- 2 start -- thank you for that. I haven't decided yet on
- 3 that -- that whirling water thing, but I admire the
- 4 imaginative -- but in general, how do you see it? How
- 5 is the company different from others?
- MR. WEAVER: Well, it's hard for me to base
- 7 that because I'm not really attuned to other companies'
- 8 cultures.
- 9 DR. BRENNER: Well, compared to American
- 10 Airlines, for example?
- 11 (Pause)
- MR. WEAVER: Well, again, just a
- 13 generalization of culture for Alaska Airlines would be
- 14 an airline that's very caring, focused, and capable of
- 15 change.
- DR. BRENNER: Okay. Thank you.
- 17 MR. McGILL: Dick?
- 18 (Pause)
- 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have little or no
- 20 experience in maintenance. My experience is on the
- operations side, so I may ask some dumb questions but
- 22 I'm looking for background information as to how Alaska
- 23 Airlines' Maintenance and Engineering functions

- 1 function. Specifically, what are the expectations and
- who is involved in what? That's the scope of the
- 3 initial questions I have for you.
- 4 With respect to such things as we have been
- 5 discussing with your subordinates over the last several
- 6 days, we have asked about acquisition, internal
- 7 functioning, technical training, reliability, quality
- 8 control, and it doesn't seem that we're -- that we have
- 9 derived the answers that I'm looking for in those
- 10 areas, so I'm going to repeat them to you. Some of
- them you've already heard, but I'm going to repeat them
- to you and I'm going to show you some examples and ask
- 13 you to comment on those. Do you understand?
- MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
- 15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Let's talk about the jack
- 16 screw. In terms of Stores and that sort of thing,
- where does that fall, if at all, within Maintenance and
- 18 Engineering?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: Stores organization reports to
- 20 -- essentially, the manager of Stores is Bill
- 21 Johanson, who reports to Steve Zerta.
- 22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And he reports to you?
- MR. WEAVER: Steve Zerta reports to me.

1	MR. RODRIGUEZ: So it'd be two levels below
2	you that this would be
3	MR. WEAVER: In this function, yes.
4	MR. RODRIGUEZ: parts and that sort of
5	thing?
6	MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm. That the movement of
7	parts and shipping and receiving of parts.
8	MR. RODRIGUEZ: As a practical matter, do you
9	have any knowledge at all about the storing or the
10	the availability of jack screws prior to the accident
11	at Alaska Airlines?
12	MR. WEAVER: No, I don't.
13	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do you know if they had ever
14	replaced a jack screw on an MD 80 at Alaska Airlines
15	prior to the accident?
16	MR. WEAVER: No.
17	MR. RODRIGUEZ: You have not been privy to
18	any conversations at the management level within the
19	company about whether or not they have replaced a jack
20	screw prior to the accident?
21	MR. WEAVER: Subsequent to the accident
22	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mm-hmm. Yes, sir.

1

23

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

MR. WEAVER: Subsequent to the accident, I

- 1 know that that's an issue that has been investigated or
- 2 researched. I mean through the NTSB --
- 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But you don't know --
- 4 MR. WEAVER: -- investigation.
- 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, I'm -- I'm talking about
- 6 internally, within your company. Nobody has -- has
- 7 researched that area of whether you had a jack screw
- 8 before the accident in stock? Did you continue -- had
- 9 it in stock?
- MR. WEAVER: Yeah, you mean other than the
- 11 context of the NTSB investigation?
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, sir. Internally, within
- 13 the company.
- 14 MR. WEAVER: No. I mean my understanding is,
- is that that was in support of the NTSB investigation.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, I'm the investigator in
- 17 charge, and at this point I don't know whether Alaska
- had a jack screw prior to the accident or not. Do you?
- MR. WEAVER: My knowledge is that we did not
- 20 have a jack screw prior to the accident.
- 21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Would you classify
- that as from a reliable source within the company? Do
- you think -- wherever you got the information, do you

1 think that was accurate? 2 MR. WEAVER: Yes. 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: As a practical matter --MR. WEAVER: Can -- can I back up? 4 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Sure. 6 MR. WEAVER: Because I'm -- I'm -- I want to 7 make sure that I'm understanding the context and the time frame of -- of -- of your question is subsequent 8 9 to the accident was I aware of any internal research in 10 determining whether or not we had a jack screw available for 963 prior to its accident? 11 12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Essentially, yes. I just 13 wondered if a jack screw is something that you would 14 expect to see in your stores or in your -- in stock in -- in some facility some place? 15 16 MR. WEAVER: Okay. That's a different 17 question, and -- and so --18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Oh, okay. MR. WEAVER: Yeah. 19 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, answer that one. MR. WEAVER: Okay. I'll answer. Again, our 21 22 inventory modeling and, again, would -- would really, essentially, recommend or dictate as to what kind of 23

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 inventory we would keep. And to my knowledge, we did
- 2 not have a jack screw as inventory -- as an inventory
- 3 item.
- 4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: From your level within the
- 5 company, if you needed a jack screw and you don't have
- one in stock, how would you expect that to be acquired?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: The -- the user group or the
- 8 needing group, whether it be a mechanic or supervisor,
- 9 would contact Purchasing and -- and/or Inventory
- 10 Control.
- 11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Who would that be?
- MR. WEAVER: It could be anyone. It could be
- 13 -- it could be a mechanic. It could be a -- a -- a
- 14 lead. It could be a supervisor that has a need for a
- 15 part.
- 16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, I mean who's -- who --
- 17 you said Purchasing. Who would that be?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: Oh, Purchasing is -- is an
- 19 organization so it's a number of individuals, and I
- 20 don't know their names.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.
- MR. WEAVER: Chris Collum is the manager of
- 23 purchasing.

1	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Chris Collum?
2	MR. WEAVER: Uh huh. Yeah.
3	(Pause)
4	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. And again, as a
5	practical matter, is there is there a form that you
6	would fill out to get that? What would you expect the
7	individual who had a need for a jack screw to do to get
8	that part?
9	MR. WEAVER: I'm really not familiar with
10	MR. RODRIGUEZ: You're not?
11	MR. WEAVER: the process or the paperwork,
12	necessarily. I I just know the requests come from
13	all different disciplines.
14	MR. RODRIGUEZ: I think we asked others
15	have asked, but I I didn't get a sufficient level of
16	information. With respect to ordering of parts,
17	expenditure of airline funds, is it your testimony or
18	statement that you don't know specific amounts that are
19	authorized at specific levels within the company?
20	MR. WEAVER: No, I don't.
21	MR. RODRIGUEZ: You don't?
22	MR. WEAVER: No. I mean just off the top of
23	my head

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

1	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Well,
2	MR. WEAVER: I do not know
3	MR. RODRIGUEZ: let me ask you if a if
4	you would think that a line mechanic, a lead mechanic
5	in the heavy check facility at Oakland would have
6	authority to requisition a jack screw?
7	MR. WEAVER: Dick, it would depend upon the
8	whether or not it was an inventory item or
9	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, it's not inventory.
10	We've established that, so
11	MR. WEAVER: So
12	(Pause)
13	MR. WEAVER: Your question is, then, the jack
14	screw, not being an inventory item, does a lead
15	mechanic have the authorization to requisition a jack
16	screw?
17	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, sir.
18	MR. WEAVER: I I believe so.
19	(Pause)
20	MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's a fairly expensive
21	item, isn't it? You don't know?
22	MR. WEAVER: I don't exact dollar on a
23	jack screw, no.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

MR. RODRIGUEZ: We've been led to believe 1 2 that it's in the \$60,000 range. Is that fair? 3 MR. WEAVER: Is that expensive? MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, I mean is that -- do you 4 5 have any concept at all of the cost of a jack screw? 6 MR. WEAVER: I've not -- no. I -- I have 7 seen the cost of overhauls of jack screws, but I've not seen what a new jack screw costs. 8 9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What does the cost of an 10 overhauled jack screw? 11 MR. WEAVER: It varies. 12 (Pause) MR. WEAVER: It varies based upon the bill of 13 14 work for the specific jack screw. 15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You can't give me any 16 approximation? 17 (Pause) 18 MR. WEAVER: I -- I want to say that it's just generally 30,000. 19 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: 30? 21 MR. WEAVER: I'm just -- I've seen several 22 invoices, multiple invoices that have multiple bills of

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

work, and so I couldn't -- I couldn't state that the

23

- 1 average cost for a repair is 30,000, but that's --
- 2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Does Purchasing function
- 3 under you?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: No.
- 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do you meet at the corporate
- 6 level with vice presidents and that sort of thing about
- 7 budgetary considerations and that sort of thing within
- 8 the airline?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Yes.
- 10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: With what frequency?
- 11 MR. WEAVER: Well, we sit down and review the
- budget annually, as far as going forward and trying to
- 13 establish what the budget is going to be and taking
- into all the considerations, all the changes.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: How about a how-goes-it
- 16 meeting during the course of the year?
- 17 MR. WEAVER: Normally, we provide on a
- monthly basis a summary and provide it to Corporate
- 19 Finance, and -- and then Outlook. Normally, projected
- 20 out a number of months, and I don't know exactly the --
- 21 how we project -- how long we project it out.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Does that ever result in such
- as quarterly meetings or evaluation meetings as to how

- 1 the budget process is going through the year that --
- 2 that planned and that expected?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes, we have -- we try to have
- 4 quarterly divisional cost analysis meetings where we
- 5 review, you know, where each division's at. Each
- 6 division officer will speak to their --
- 7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do -- and you attend those?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: Yes.
- 9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do you have any concept of
- 10 how many jack screws Alaska has replaced in the last
- 11 year?
- MR. WEAVER: No. Concept?
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, any idea?
- 14 MR. WEAVER: I -- I don't know of how many
- jack screws we've replaced. I know we've replaced a
- 16 number of 'em.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is -- would that -- see, I
- have no idea of budget, but would that constitute a
- 19 fairly large ticket into your budget for the year?
- 20 MR. WEAVER: Depends. And then it's all
- 21 volume-driven, so I mean repairs or purchases would --
- whether it's a purchase of a \$60,000 unit or a repair
- 23 of a \$30,000 unit, it's -- it's -- it's all volume-

- 1 driven, so.
- 2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What is "volume-driven"?
- MR. WEAVER: Well, that is it needs to be
- 4 replaced, it needs to be repaired, so there's a cost in
- 5 -- entailed with repairing the jack screw, which ends
- 6 up into a cost.
- 7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, as a practical matter,
- 8 you really don't have a feel for how many jack screws
- 9 you've replaced in the last year in terms of -- in a
- 10 ballpark figure?
- 11 MR. WEAVER: Do I have a ballpark figure of
- 12 how many jack screw -- yes, I could come up with a
- 13 ballpark number.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: What would it be?
- 15 MR. WEAVER: 12.
- 16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: 12?
- 17 MR. WEAVER: Yes. Again, that's a ballpark
- 18 figure. I do not --
- 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.
- 20 MR. WEAVER: -- chart it. I do not watch it.
- 21 And so it's not something that --
- 22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is -- is there -- is there a
- way in which you would become concerned about the

number of jack screws that you're using in your airline 2 operation? 3 (Pause) MR. WEAVER: Explain "concern." 4 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What I'm trying to gather is, 6 is there a point at which this would become a problem 7 that might surface at the highest levels of management within the company of excessive wear which is leading 8 9 to inordinate expenditures, unexpected levels of 10 expenditure within the company in a certain area that would be discussed at the management level and -- and 11 12 some resolution or some emphasis or some remedy be 13 sought? MR. WEAVER: Well, I think in managing our 14 15 business we -- we take into account these issues that come at us, whether it's a number three air-oil sill on 16 17 a CFM engine that has a -- a capability of disbonding. 18 We would take on a campaign. It's not in the budget,

1

19

20

21

22

23

but we'd take on a campaign to replace that.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mm-hmm.

addressing the issue and wouldn't be limited as a

result of whether or not it was in the budget or not.

(301) 565-0064

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

MR. WEAVER: So I mean we'd be proactive in

- 1 That's a real-life example that we've gone through this
- 2 year that no one anticipated.
- 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: How much does a seal cost?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: I don't know.
- 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: How many seals have you
- 6 replaced?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: I don't know the exact numbers.
- 8 (Pause)
- 9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Would -- would Mr. Kelly
- 10 attend these meetings?
- MR. WEAVER: The -- which meetings?
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: These meetings with what I
- 13 consider to be vice presidents of various functions to
- 14 discuss the financial health of the organization and
- 15 how we're going through the budget process.
- 16 MR. WEAVER: I think that he's attended them.
- 17 I don't know that he's attended all of them.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Who would chair the meeting,
- 19 then?
- 20 MR. WEAVER: It would most likely be Brad
- 21 Tilton, our CFO. These meetings are really held at
- officers' lunch. Normally what's the venue for the
- 23 divisional cost analysis. Over lunch the officers go

- 1 around the table and discuss their division's cost
- 2 analysis.
- 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do you have a feel for how
- 4 much the CMF -- CFM 56 or whatever it is, the -- the
- 5 737 engine seal campaign cost the company?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: Because it's ongoing, you know,
- 7 I don't -- I don't have --
- 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You don't know how much has
- 9 been spent on it at this point?
- 10 MR. WEAVER: No. It's just important and
- 11 needs to be done.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is this something that's
- 13 being done as the -- as the engines go into overhaul or
- 14 is there -- they become available for removal from the
- 15 aircraft? You don't do it on wing, do you?
- MR. WEAVER: Actually, it's a special program
- 17 that pulls 'em off wing and -- and --
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: On some planned basis?
- MR. WEAVER: A planned basis, right.
- 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: When will it be complete? Do
- 21 you know?
- MR. WEAVER: The plan is to have it done by
- 23 the end of this year.

1	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is there a similar plan to
2	replace all jack screws on the MD 80 fleet?
3	MR. WEAVER: Not to my knowledge.
4	MR. RODRIGUEZ: In the C-check, C-check of
5	'97 on 963, there was a a planned action to replace
6	the jack screw on that aircraft. Are you familiar with
7	that situation at this time?
8	MR. WEAVER: I'm aware of it at this time,
9	yes.
10	MR. RODRIGUEZ: When did you become aware of
11	it?
12	MR. WEAVER: I don't know for for sure
13	when it was. Obviously, post-accident.
14	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Post-accident?
15	MR. WEAVER: Yeah.
16	MR. RODRIGUEZ: You didn't know about it
17	before?
18	MR. WEAVER: No.
19	MR. RODRIGUEZ: As you have I have
20	you thought about the accident in terms of possible
21	corrective action that the company might take? The
22	proactive plans of what we can do since the accident?

MR. WEAVER: Well, the accident investigation

23

- 1 not being done and completed, not knowing the cause of
- the accident, obviously, I'm aware of things that we
- 3 are doing and have done being privy to that and
- 4 continue to, you know, again, respond.
- 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, what I'd be interested
- 6 in is this particular C-check and replacement --
- 7 recommended replacement of the jack screw. Having seen
- 8 that and being aware of it and the subsequent
- 9 reevaluation of the planned action --
- 10 MR. WEAVER: Of -- of 963?
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, sir. In '97.
- 12 MR. WEAVER: In '97.
- 13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Has it occurred to you that
- 14 the company almost replaced a jack screw unnecessarily?
- 15 MR. WEAVER: I'm not for sure I understand
- 16 the question.
- 17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, there was a recommended
- 18 action to replace the jack screw. That was
- 19 subsequently reevaluated, and the aircraft was returned
- 20 to service with the old jack screw still in place. Had
- 21 the initial action been carried through, there would
- 22 have been a replacement of the jack screw.
- MR. WEAVER: Yes.

1	MR. RODRIGUEZ: If the jack screw had been
2	replaced at that time, would you would you consider
3	that to have been necessary?
4	MR. WEAVER: Based upon today's information,
5	no.
6	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. So if they had gone
7	through with the initial recommendation there would
8	have been an unnecessary replacement of a jack screw?
9	MR. WEAVER: Based upon the criteria we use
10	to maintain our aircraft, yes.
11	MR. RODRIGUEZ: And my question is,
12	recognizing that there was almost an unnecessary
13	replacement of the jack screw, has that triggered in
14	your mind any changes that you would want to implement
15	to ensure that the unnecessary replacement would not
16	take place in the future?
17	MR. WEAVER: No. I I, again, would focus
18	on the procedure itself and and the criteria that we
19	have, so.
20	(Pause)
21	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are you familiar with the
22	the volume of discussion and activity surrounding the

end-play check since the time of the accident?

23

MR. WEAVER: I'm aware that it's an issue 1 2 that's being investigated and -- and evaluated. 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: From your position and -- and this end-play check is accomplished within your 4 department, is that -- your division? 5 6 MR. WEAVER: Correct. Correct. The 7 mechanics performing the --MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. From your position, do 8 9 you have any concern about the manner in which the end-10 play check is being accomplished either by your 11 mechanics or by out-sourced contractors? 12 MR. WEAVER: Concern today as -- how it's 13 being done today? 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Since the accident, yes. And with the various iterations and revelations that have 15 occurred during the investigation regarding the end-16 17 play check? 18 I have no concerns today, no. MR. WEAVER: In how the -- the procedure is being accomplished, the 19 20 inspection's being performed, I -- I know --

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

MR. WEAVER: -- issue that's being

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Did you at the time of the

21

22

23

accident?

- 1 investigated and evaluated, but no, I do not have
- 2 concerns of how it's being done today.
- 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Did you -- shortly after the
- 4 accident, for instance when you became aware of the C-
- 5 check revision, that -- I'm sorry. When you became
- 6 aware of the revision to the end-play check on the
- 7 C-check that occurred in '97 -- that was after the
- 8 accident, that's what you said.
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Changing the procedure of -- of
- 10 the end-play?
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: No. I corrected myself.
- 12 We'll start over.
- MR. WEAVER: Okay.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: After the accident you became
- aware that there was a correction or an adjustment to
- the end-play check that was accomplished on 963 when it
- was in C-check in '97?
- 18 (Pause)
- 19 MR. WEAVER: I don't -- I don't know if I'm
- 20 understanding the question. Okay. This is the MIG 4
- that addresses 963's jack screw?
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
- MR. WEAVER: Okay.

1	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Are you aware that a planned
2	action regarding that aircraft and that jack screw was
3	changed?
4	MR. WEAVER: A planned action?
5	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, that's what it says on
6	the form.
7	MR. WEAVER: As to yes.
8	MR. RODRIGUEZ: When did you become aware of
9	that?
10	MR. WEAVER: I it was post-accident.
11	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Post-accident?
12	MR. WEAVER: Right.
13	MR. RODRIGUEZ: My question was, based on
14	what you see on that form there, where one of your line
15	mechanics, a lead mechanic, not line. Lead mechanics
16	found an end-play at 40 thousandths, and a subsequent
17	lead mechanic found end-play of 33 thousandths on the
18	same jack screw during the same check. In other
19	instances of that nature involving discrepancies or
20	disparities in the readings that were achieved by
21	various mechanics both in your company and as out-
22	sourced contractors, were you concerned about the end-
23	play check and the capabilities of your mechanics to

- 1 perform it?
- 2 MR. WEAVER: In -- in the way you're
- 3 explaining it, would I be -- yes, concerned. Concerned
- 4 in -- in the matter of repeatability of the inspection
- 5 itself. That is an issue that I believe is, again,
- 6 being investigated by this team, the NTSB, and again, I
- 7 would not run a parallel investigation. I believe that
- 8 there is enough horsepower and focus on that to where
- 9 if there is issues there that they will -- again, as an
- industry, we would benefit and have knowledge of.
- 11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, your earlier answer to
- my question was that today you're satisfied with the
- 13 accomplishment or the manner in which the end-play
- 14 check is being done.
- MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: With the capabilities of your
- 17 mechanics to perform it.
- MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And my question that
- 20 triggered all this for the last 15 minutes is were you
- 21 satisfied with the end-play check shortly after the
- 22 accident when you began to see disparities in the end-
- 23 play check results that were being turned in by

1	mechanics? I'm I'm trying to figure out when did
2	you become satisfied with the end-play check as a
3	measure of the condition of the jack screw?
4	MR. WEAVER: I guess my I guess my answer
5	is is that I've always been satisfied with the
6	procedure and end-process that the mechanics have to
7	use and inspect the end-play of the jack screw.
8	MR. RODRIGUEZ: And therefore, you see
9	MR. WEAVER: I think if there's things to be
10	learned and and further definition and development
11	of this and we're privy to as an industry, and we, you
12	know, implement
13	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Has Alaska Airlines
14	implemented any technical training with respect to your
15	mechanics in-house or out-house dealing with the
16	accomplishment of the end-play check on the jack screw
17	MR. WEAVER: Not to my knowledge.
18	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do you think they should?
19	MR. WEAVER: No.
20	(Pause)
21	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Your umbrella
22	organizational umbrella encompasses Reliability as

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

23 well, is that correct?

Ţ	MR. WEAVER: Yes.
2	MR. RODRIGUEZ: If you focused in the
3	Reliability area of your job, does the kind of things
4	we've been talking about with respect to end-play
5	variations cause any concern?
6	MR. WEAVER: In terms of the Reliability
7	Department?
8	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mm-hmm.
9	MR. WEAVER: I don't are are you asking
10	if individuals within the Reliability Department had
11	knowledge of
12	MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, I'm asking if you as a
13	manager
14	MR. WEAVER: Mm-hmm.
15	MR. RODRIGUEZ: over areas of reliability
16	within the organization, if you focus on that aspect of
17	your job, does the changes or the variations in end-
18	play checks and that sort of thing with respect to the
19	jack screw give you any heartburn concern?
20	MR. WEAVER: Being knowledgeable of of
21	different test results and them varying would would
22	be a concern. It it could be a concern at the

Reliability Department's level. It could be a concern

23

- 1 at the mechanic's level.
- 2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But again, would it trigger
- 3 any kind of action, proactive action on the part of the
- 4 company or to you or your subordinates?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: In -- in terms of what? In --
- 6 in -- in terms of --
- 7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: A different method.
- 8 Additional training. More qualified people. Anything.
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Again, Dick, what would trigger
- 10 -- what you speaking as far as triggering? The -- I'm
- just trying to understand the question, Dick.
- 12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mm-hmm. I understand.
- 13 (Pause)
- 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: The thrust of the questions
- 15 for the last five minutes have been focused on the
- specific area of your responsibilities I would loosely
- 17 label "Reliability." You have indicated that you saw
- 18 no need for additional training of the Maintenance
- 19 people, the mechanics who perform the end-play check.
- 20 We have discussed the disparity or the variations in
- 21 the values that are achieved by those mechanics getting
- 22 end-play checks. And what I'm asking you to do now is
- 23 to focus on the Reliability aspects of your job and

- 1 those under you and evaluate for me whether or not you
- 2 see as a proactive measure need for additional training
- 3 or any other action by your company with respect to
- 4 reliability?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: Let me -- let me go back to --
- 6 your question was specifically technical training.
- 7 When we mention technical training --
- 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Or anything else.
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Okay. Well, I'll -- I'll try to
- answer the question, and that is when you mention
- 11 technical training I'm equating that to a technical
- training which has an ARTIC number in its course
- 13 development. And we have not -- we have not determined
- that that's necessary. Have we taken actions as a
- 15 company to have those individuals performing these end-
- 16 play checks specialize or on-the-job training? That is
- 17 -- that has been an initiative of the company to -- to
- 18 see that those individuals that are involved in this
- 19 procedure have been involved in it before, have gone
- 20 through it with -- with engineers and with other
- 21 personnel that are, we feel, confident and capable and
- 22 comfortable with -- with their understanding of
- 23 performing the -- the measurement. So I mean we have

- 1 done that.
- 2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Oh, you have?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes. Yes, we have done that.
- 4 And --
- 5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: When was that done?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: I don't know the exact day. I
- 7 mean it's -- it's -- I think it's --
- 8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Before or after the accident?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Subsequent to the accident. The
- 10 ensuing issues pertaining to the procedure itself.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Before or after the grounding
- 12 of the aircraft?
- MR. WEAVER: Which aircraft and --
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Well, this most recent event,
- 15 August the 3rd or whenever it was where you voluntarily
- 16 made the groundings of that -- where -- where you
- 17 voluntarily rechecked a significant -- significant
- 18 number of your aircraft.
- 19 MR. WEAVER: We -- we've been -- we've taken
- 20 this action prior to that.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Was it provided to all
- 22 mechanics or to a cadre of select mechanics that would
- 23 now be end-play check mechanics?

1	MR. WEAVER: It's not provided to all
2	mechanics, no.
3	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is it provided to all people
4	that the company would allow to do an end-play check?
5	MR. WEAVER: It's not as far as company
6	it's not a qualification, so again, the process you
7	would not find people that have never done it before
8	doing it today.
9	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is that in writing anywhere?
10	MR. WEAVER: No.
11	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Was that training
12	MR. WEAVER: Not to my knowledge.
13	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Was that training provided to
14	outside contractors?
15	MR. WEAVER: To my knowledge, yes.
16	MR. RODRIGUEZ: And can you tell us who did
17	the technical well, I call it technical, but it's
18	not administrative, it's who did the on-job training
19	of those mechanics?
20	MR. WEAVER: I believe members of our
21	Engineering group as well as Tech Services group.
22	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Was this a specially-

assembled group that did the training? Hand-picked?

23

1	MR. WEAVER: No. I mean it was those people
2	that we believed that have the capability of training
3	and understanding and being able to communicate the
4	procedures and answer any questions.
5	MR. RODRIGUEZ: And how did you how were
6	the people who received the training selected?
7	MR. WEAVER: I don't know.
8	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Who would know?
9	MR. WEAVER: The respective managers
10	responsible for accomplishing the work.
11	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Would the base manager at
12	Oakland know who received training?
13	(Pause)
14	MR. WEAVER: Possibly. In in that if
15	there's a OJT card filled out or there's some
16	documentation of the training then he may have ability
17	to to review that and and know who it is.
18	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Help me understand
19	this. Where I'm at now is I understand that the
20	company initiated some training on-the-job training
21	for mechanics who were doing end-play checks.
22	MR. WEAVER: Correct.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Which I assume would be at

23

- 1 Oakland and Seattle, is that correct?
- 2 MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And also at Phoenix, an out-
- 4 sourced contractor, is that correct?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But the company would not
- 7 necessarily inform the direct supervisor of those folks
- 8 that they were going to come down and give them that
- 9 training, is that what you're saying?
- MR. WEAVER: No, I don't believe that's what
- 11 I'm saying.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: That is what you're saying.
- 13 MR. WEAVER: That these people would show up
- 14 and provide the training without their management
- 15 knowing?
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
- 17 MR. WEAVER: No, that's not what I'm saying.
- 18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Oh. Well, I asked you if the
- 19 base manager would know that they had been down there
- doing training and you said, "possibly."
- 21 MR. WEAVER: Your question was would the base
- 22 manager know who was selected for that training.
- MR. RODRIGUEZ: Would the base manager at

- 1 Oakland know that people were coming to train his
- 2 mechanics?
- 3 (Pause)
- 4 MR. WEAVER: Yes. Would the base manager in
- 5 Oakland know if there was a contingent of people coming
- 6 down to provide some additional training or insight
- 7 into the jack screw -- end-play check? I would -- I
- 8 would think that the manager would know.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Would you provide to Mr.
- 10 McGill the names of those people who gave that
- 11 training, and the names of the people who received the
- 12 training?
- MR. WEAVER: We will do that.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: And the dates it was
- 15 accomplished? As long we're getting the formal
- information, you might as well tell us when you did it.
- MR. WEAVER: Okay.
- 18 MR. RODRIQUEZ: I have fairly extensive
- 19 questioning to go. Would you like to take a lunch
- 20 break now?
- 21 MR. McGILL: Yeah. We probably ought to.
- 22 It's 12:00.
- 23 (Whereupon, at 12:00 p.m., the interviews

1	were recessed, to reconvene this same day, Tuesday,
2	August 15th, 2000, at 12:30 p.m.)
3	
4	
5	
6	AFTERNOON SESSION
7	12:22 p.m.
8	INTERVIEW OF BILL WEAVER (CONTINUED)
9	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Are you familiar with the
10	this MEO-1 process that you have?
11	MR. WEAVER: No. I'm familiar in terms of I
12	know the I know it's a form.
13	MR. RODRIQUEZ: You don't even see the forms?
14	MR. WEAVER: No.
15	MR. RODRIQUEZ: With respect to the end plate
16	check and the jack screw condition, I was inquiring
17	about internal activities that may have been
18	accomplished.
19	Has the company changed their standard for ar
20	acceptable end plate check in terms of the values that
21	are derived? In other words, are you still going by
22	the 40,000 standard?
23	MR WFAVER. Vec

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

- 1 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And in your organization
- description earlier, you mentioned, I believe, Mr.
- 3 McCleary was your budget and administrative or
- 4 something, is that correct?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: Mac McCleary. Robert McCleary.
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: McCleary. Okay. That is the
- 7 budget of Maintenance and Engineering?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Specifically, the mission
- 10 budget?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes.
- 12 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Mr. Fitzpatrick is Director
- or Manager of Base Maintenance?
- 14 MR. WEAVER: Director of Base Maintenance.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: If they were to decide to
- order more tools, restraining fixtures, for the jack
- 17 screw, would he be aware of it?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: I -- I don't know if he would be
- 19 aware of it.
- 20 MR. RODRIQUEZ: What organizational entity
- 21 within the company would do that? Order the additional
- 22 tools?
- MR. WEAVER: That -- typically, who orders

- 1 tools or who orders anything is the Purchasing
- 2 Department.
- 3 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm. Is your under-
- 4 standing at this time, the entire knowledge that you
- 5 have of this restraining fixture, would you consider
- 6 that a maintenance item or an inspection item?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: The -- the tool itself?
- 8 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, sir.
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Would I characterize it as a
- 10 maintenance item or inspection item? I'm not for sure.
- 11 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, --
- MR. WEAVER: It is a -- it -- explain.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: My understanding is that --
- that if a tool requires calibration or that kind of
- thing, you would classify it as an inspection tool, and
- 16 if it's just a maintenance tool, it's something you
- 17 use, like a hammer or pliers, no calibration. It's
- 18 just a tool that you use.
- 19 Is -- is that -- am I off -- is that dumb
- 20 pilot talk or what?
- 21 MR. WEAVER: Well, you know, I don't know.
- 22 But as to -- to really -- I mean, I would want to
- 23 reference the GMM to do -- you know, the reference of

- 1 which we would use as to whether or not it's an
- 2 inspection item or if it has calibration requirements
- 3 or --
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, at the time -- at the
- 5 time that the company was complying with this AD on the
- 6 jack screw, isn't that the kind of thing that -- that
- 7 at your level, you would get involved in, even though
- 8 it may be being done below you? Wouldn't you be
- 9 intimately involved in that? How it's done, who -- how
- 10 many tools you have, how many jack screws, what are the
- 11 source for those things would be, and that kind of
- thing? You're not involved in that?
- MR. WEAVER: You mentioned "intimately", and
- 14 no, I would not be.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, directly. Let me -- is
- 16 that a --
- MR. WEAVER: Or -- or directly, no.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. How about such things
- 19 as utilization of the aircraft? Is that a -- whose
- 20 department would that fall under? Do you know?
- 21 MR. WEAVER: I don't believe there is a
- department that is responsible for aircraft
- 23 utilization.

- 1 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, if Mr. Kelly was -- or
- 2 Mr. Fowler were to decide that we're not getting the
- 3 proper utilization out of these aircraft, who would he
- 4 call on? Who would he speak to?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: I would say that it would be the
- 6 operating officers. Operating officers, those officers
- 7 that are a part of and have responsibility for those
- 8 divisions that are considered operating divisions.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Would Maintenance and
- 10 Engineering be an operating division?
- MR. WEAVER: Here at the table.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. So, you are involved
- in discussions concerning utilization of the aircraft?
- 14 MR. WEAVER: Not personally, but, I mean, the
- 15 division is.
- 16 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, who in Maintenance and
- 17 Engineering would be at the table?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: Normally, it would be Chris
- 19 Nicasea, who's our Manager of -- Manager of -- I want
- 20 to say Line Maintenance Planning, but I don't know if
- 21 that's really his complete title. So.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: That's a descriptor of his
- 23 functions?

- 1 MR. WEAVER: Right.
- 2 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And in any way, are you aware
- 3 of what kind of utilization you get out of your
- 4 aircraft? Daily utilization?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: No, not daily.
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: At any interval? Monthly?
- 7 Annually?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: I mean, we look at it on a
- 9 monthly basis, yes.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you have any sense of the
- 11 rough hourly utilization you get from MD-80 aircraft
- 12 daily at the present time?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: Rough sense, not daily but again
- on a monthly basis, --
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: On a monthly, if you know
- 16 what it is.
- 17 MR. WEAVER: -- I don't know the exact
- 18 number. I mean, I look at some information, but I
- 19 don't recall what it is.
- 20 MR. RODRIQUEZ: I understand. Is that
- 21 something that would be discussed -- I've forgotten the
- title, but these manager meetings, where you and the
- others have a luncheon and how goes it, discussing the

- 1 airline and that sort of thing?
- 2 MR. WEAVER: Yeah. In a very broad sense.
- 3 Aircraft utilization may come up.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you know if, within the
- 5 organization, there is general satisfaction with the
- 6 utilization you're getting from the MD-80 fleet?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: Within the M&E organization?
- 8 MR. RODRIQUEZ: With -- yes. Well, within
- 9 M&E or within Alaska Airlines. For example, if there's
- 10 a Fly Fast Program, I guess its predicate is on-time
- 11 arrivals.
- MR. WEAVER: Hm-hmm.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: It's something that
- 14 management has adopted as a company policy or company
- interest, and my question is, would -- in a similar
- 16 fashion, would aircraft utilization be something that
- 17 the company would have interest in maintaining a
- 18 certain benchmark or any kind of values that they are
- 19 striving for that would be discussed in meetings?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes, hm-hmm.
- 21 MR. RODRIQUEZ: What would that figure be?
- 22 Do you know?
- MR. WEAVER: It's -- it's in the context of

- 1 the officer discussions. It's not, you know, MD-80 is
- 2 a fleet utilization, and I'm not exactly sure what that
- 3 number is.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you know if there's a
- 5 difference between MD-80 and 737 or are they
- 6 comparable?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: Yeah. There's a difference,
- 8 yes. There's a difference in utilization with every
- 9 fleet type.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Which is more heavily
- 11 utilized?
- MR. WEAVER: I believe it's the MD-80 fleet.
- 13 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you have communication
- with counterparts in other airlines?
- MR. WEAVER: Some.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Some?
- 17 MR. WEAVER: Some.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you discuss such things as
- 19 utilization, things of that nature, with their fleets,
- 20 comparing notes, so to speak?
- MR. WEAVER: No, no. Let me say personally,
- 22 I have not.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Mr. McGill was asking you

1	about intervals for C checks and that sort of thing.
2	Are you aware that your company's intervals
3	are based exclusively on calendar?
4	MR. WEAVER: The interval of C checks?
5	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, sir.
6	MR. WEAVER: Yes.
7	MR. RODRIQUEZ: I may characterize this
8	inappropriately. Correct me if I'm wrong. But are you
9	aware that there are standards which specify a calendar
10	or an hourly interval, whichever comes first? Are you
11	aware of that?
12	MR. WEAVER: Well, in again, in
13	relationship to performing heavy maintenance C checks?
14	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes.
15	MR. WEAVER: Yes.
16	MR. RODRIQUEZ: In your mind, what's the
17	difference between those two?
18	MR. WEAVER: In my mind, what is the
19	difference between calendar time when due to perform
20	maintenance versus hours when due?
21	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm.
22	MR. WEAVER: Increment of measurement.

MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you see any wisdom in

23

- 1 establishing either or as opposed to just calendar?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Again, in this business,
- 3 calendar- or -- or hourly-driven, you know, my under-
- 4 standing of the wisdom of one or the other, I don't
- 5 know that I've really --
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, jack screws are checked
- 5 based on C check intervals, correct?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: I believe that's what we do.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: You don't know?
- 10 MR. WEAVER: I mean, yeah, my understanding
- is that Alaska Airlines performs an in-flight check
- 12 every other C check.
- 13 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And that's predicated on 15-
- 14 month intervals?
- 15 MR. WEAVER: That would be true. That's our
- 16 interval.
- 17 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you have any idea what the
- 18 hourly accumulation is in that current 30-month
- 19 interval?
- MR. WEAVER: Not exactly, no.
- 21 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, in questioning of other
- 22 witnesses from your department, personnel that work for
- you, my understanding again is that the standard under

- 1 which you're operating is approximately -- give me the
- 2 figure, Frank.
- 3 MR. McGILL: What's that?
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: What is the standard MSG-2
- for intervals, hourly intervals? 3,000 hours?
- 6 MR. McGILL: Well, there's MSG-2, MSG-3.
- 7 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yeah. I know, but they're
- 8 under 2. So, it's -- it's a thousand -- I don't have
- 9 the page.
- 10 MR. McGILL: I've got it right here. MSG-2.
- 11 Now, for which one were you looking at?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: For C check.
- 13 MR. McGILL: Okay. C check for MSG-2 is
- 14 3,500 flight hours and/or 15 months, whichever comes
- 15 first.
- 16 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. So, that's the -- if I
- 17 can call it, the -- that's what I would call the
- 18 standard standard, is -- you would do a C check every
- 19 3,500 flight hours or 15 months, whichever came first.
- 20 Currently, your standard is every 15 months,
- 21 regardless of hours accumulated. That's the point I
- 22 was trying to make. Do you understand that? Are you
- 23 aware of that?

- 1 MR. WEAVER: I am aware that we perform heavy
- 2 checks every 15 months.
- 3 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Did you know that in
- 4 the recent time frame, that you're exceeding that rough
- 5 7,000 flight hour accumulation standard by several
- 6 thousand hours?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: No.
- 8 MR. RODRIQUEZ: As a function of utilization?
- 9 You're not aware of that?
- MR. WEAVER: No, not to that caliber.
- 11 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. If these figures were
- 12 accurate, would the fact that you are going beyond the
- 13 normal flight hours under some maintenance programs be
- of concern to you?
- MR. WEAVER: Again, it would be taking the
- information, evaluating it, and without going through
- 17 the information in detail, I'm incapable of answering
- 18 that question.
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: If I pointed you in that
- 20 direction, would you review that for me?
- 21 MR. WEAVER: If you asked me to review what?
- 22 The -- the prudence of performing maintenance by an
- 23 hour or calendar?

Т	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes.
2	MR. WEAVER: Are you saying you want me to do
3	that?
4	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Would the company do that for
5	for me? I'm asking you, as a Vice President of
6	Maintenance and Engineering, or is that something I
7	should ask Mr. Fowler?
8	MR. WEAVER: I don't think you need to ask
9	John or you don't need to ask anyone else. I mean, as
10	far as whether or not we review it by hours or by
11	calendar time, the Maintenance Program is an evolving
12	program, and if we're asked to review it, then we'll
13	take it under consideration.
14	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Would you would you review
15	that process and then send me a letter advising me of
16	what corporate decision is made with respect to that
17	criteria?

- 18 MR. WEAVER: Review the process, and
- 19 reviewing our Maintenance Program in terms of flight
- 20 hours versus calendar?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm.
- MR. WEAVER: If that's a request from the
- NTSB, yes, we will.

- 1 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Thank you. Your -- we
- 2 talked about this a good bit, also. Your -- your
- 3 grease for the lubrication of the jack screw was
- 4 changed in January of '98, I guess.
- 5 If -- do you have any experience in your
- 6 background, which is pretty voluminous, where you may
- 7 have been involved in grease programs and that sort of
- 8 thing in the maintenance area?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: No.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: No? From your current
- 11 position, do you have any concept of how you think a
- 12 grease program -- a change in a grease program should
- 13 be implemented?
- MR. WEAVER: I would -- again, I'd defer to
- 15 the experts in regards to that.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: And who would that be?
- 17 MR. WEAVER: Manufacturer.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: We've had --
- MR. WEAVER: Industry, the industry, but --
- 20 but primarily the manufacturer.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: We've had some discussion
- 22 about a -- the creation of a grease purging card, task
- 23 card, or some formal written program within the

- 1 organization to implement a grease change.
- 2 Do you know what that's all about? Are you
- 3 familiar with that at all? Do you know anything about
- 4 that kind of activity?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: I know we've gone from AeroShell
- 6 33 to Mobil 28, and there's procedure cards that --
- 7 that, you know, identify to the mechanic what to do.
- 8 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, my -- my question is,
- 9 my understanding is there's a card that tells them use
- 10 this grease, but there's no card that -- that tells how
- 11 you change from one to the other when a new program is
- 12 being implemented. Is that -- are --
- 13 MR. WEAVER: I have no foundation on that.
- 14 MR. RODRIQUEZ: From your knowledge of
- maintenance and that sort of thing, when you're
- 16 changing lubrication greases, do you think that that is
- 17 something that warrants some formal instruction or
- documentation for personnel to use?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: Again, it's out of my expertise
- 20 level, as to procedures and -- and direction to the
- 21 mechanics in those types of processes. I would think
- that there would be other people that would be more
- 23 knowledgeable what to do or if there was anything to

- 1 do.
- 2 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Is Quality Assurance still
- 3 under you?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: No. Quality Assurance is
- 5 reporting to John Fowler.
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: In your -- you have an
- 7 extensive, I call it extensive, you have, as I wrote
- 8 down, five years, at least on one occasion, a quality
- 9 assurance background.
- 10 Would grease use and -- and quality and that
- sort of thing, would that be of interest to Quality
- 12 Assurance people?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: I couldn't speak for Quality
- 14 Assurance people. I mean, --
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: When you were a quality
- assurance supervisor for five years, were you
- 17 interested in what kind of grease was being used and
- its effectiveness and that sort of thing?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: My concern again was complying
- 20 with procedures. So, my concern would have been more
- 21 along the lines of are we using the proper grease the
- 22 manual calls out?
- 23 MR. RODRIQUEZ: You wouldn't be interested in

- 1 whether it was doing the job or not as a function of
- 2 rejects or mechanical problems or that kind of thing?
- MR. WEAVER: Well, from a personal
- 4 standpoint, I would -- if I was aware of or had an
- 5 issue of it, I'd be concerned.
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: I believe you said in earlier
- 7 testimony that there were monthly meetings to discuss
- 8 operating problems, that's what I wrote down, with
- 9 respect to maintenance, is that correct?
- 10 MR. WEAVER: Yeah. I would imagine there's
- 11 monthly meetings, yes. I'm -- I thought I was speaking
- towards the safety meetings. There's monthly safety
- 13 meetings.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: We also talked about an IEB.
- 15 Is that a different meeting or board?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes, hm-hmm.
- 17 MR. RODRIQUEZ: How often does that meet?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: I believe they meet monthly.
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Are you involved in that?
- MR. WEAVER: Not -- no.
- 21 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Not directly?
- MR. WEAVER: Not directly.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Are your people involved in

- 1 that?
- 2 MR. WEAVER: I have individuals who serve on
- 3 that board.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And the purpose of it is to
- 5 what?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: The Internal Evaluation Board is
- 7 again just a board that is continuous improvement, to
- 8 oversee safety issues and see to that those divisions
- 9 represented, safety issues are addressed.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, is that the same safety
- 11 meeting that I mistook earlier, a few minutes ago, as
- monthly meetings?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: Oh, yeah. There's -- there's an
- 14 array of different safety meetings. The supervisors
- 15 have the topic of safety that they speak about. They
- 16 have structured meetings that take place on a monthly
- 17 basis, and then the IEB meets. So, they are separate
- 18 meetings, yes.
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Is the IEB a maintenance
- 20 meeting or is that all operating entities within the
- 21 company?
- MR. WEAVER: It's -- it's for the airline.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: The airline. Your -- your

- 1 company has been through quite a few investigations,
- 2 and there have been quite a few significant occurrences
- 3 in the past eight months, not the least of which was
- 4 the use of a fixture for restraining the jack screw
- 5 that we've talked about.
- 6 Was this -- was this discussed at that kind
- 7 of a meeting?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: That kind of meeting being the
- 9 IEB?
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Either the IEB or the safety
- 11 -- monthly safety meeting.
- MR. WEAVER: I haven't -- I haven't attended
- any of the safety meetings or IEB meetings subsequent
- 14 to the accident. So, I couldn't state whether or not
- 15 they had.
- 16 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Your people attend them,
- 17 though?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do they ever bring those
- 20 problems that are discussed to you, to brief you on
- 21 what's going on in those meetings?
- MR. WEAVER: There's been occasions that Jim
- 23 Trimberger has come to me over issues that were brought

- 1 up in the IEB meeting. Offhand, I can't recall an
- issue that he's brought up recently.
- 3 MR. RODRIQUEZ: What's the last one you
- 4 remember where Mr. Trimberger came to you with
- 5 reporting something out of the IEB or --
- 6 MR. WEAVER: It's been within a month, month
- 7 or two, that he's -- I'm trying to recall what the
- 8 issue is or was.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, since -- since the
- 10 August -- July 31st-August 3rd time frame when Alaska
- made a self-disclosure to the FAA regarding the
- 12 restraining fixture -- are you familiar with that at
- 13 all? Did you know they did that?
- MR. WEAVER: Hm-hmm.
- 15 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Has -- has that issue been
- 16 discussed internally within the company at all at your
- 17 level?
- 18 MR. WEAVER: The issue of the self-disclosure
- 19 of the restraining fixture?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm.
- MR. WEAVER: Yes.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: And is there -- are -- my
- 23 understanding is that Alaska had tools that did not

- 1 conform to manufacturer specifications. Is that
- 2 accurate?
- 3 MR. WEAVER: I believe that's accurate in the
- 4 sense that -- yes.
- 5 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Now, at that time, did
- 6 Alaska Airlines have restraining fixtures that did
- 7 conform to Boeing's specifications?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: To my knowledge, we had fixtures
- 9 that were purchased by Boeing -- I mean, purchased from
- 10 Boeing.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: At the end of July, you had
- 12 those?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: Yeah. As to when they were
- 14 sprinkled in or when they were brought in, I don't
- 15 know, but, I mean, --
- 16 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. When this -- when this
- 17 was discovered, did you internally, in the company or
- within Maintenance and Engineering, did you pursue or
- 19 seek an understanding of how these non-conforming tools
- 20 got into the inventory?
- 21 MR. WEAVER: No. Again, it's -- it's -- the
- 22 timing on it is such as to where I had no knowledge of
- it until we self-disclosed. I was not even present.

- 1 So, once it became -- once I became knowledgeable of
- 2 it, it was essentially part of the NTSB investigation,
- 3 and again I'm careful not to have parallel on-going
- 4 dual investigations.
- 5 It was my understanding that the matter was
- 6 being resolved. Now, we did take some action ourselves
- 7 in terms of making sure that none of these pieces --
- 8 none of these restraining fixtures existed and could be
- 9 used, in essence quarantined those suspect restraining
- 10 fixtures.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: But no activity with respect
- 12 to how you got them?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: Yeah. Do you mean me
- 14 personally?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: You or your subordinates.
- MR. WEAVER: No.
- 17 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And you're not privy to any
- discussions, interdivisional discussions, internally
- 19 within the company of actions or activities to find out
- 20 how those tools got into the inventory?
- MR. WEAVER: Again, yes, I am.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: You are?
- MR. WEAVER: I'm -- I'm understanding that an

- 1 investigation is underway to determine that.
- 2 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Who is heading that
- 3 investigation?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: I do not know.
- 5 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Could you take a guess?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: No.
- 7 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you know what level it
- 8 might be conducted at?
- 9 Frankly, the NTSB investigation isn't going
- 10 anywhere in that area. So, if you're waiting for us to
- 11 find it, forget it. We don't have it.
- So, I'm asking you, do you know of anything
- 13 that's going on internally that would disclose that?
- MR. WEAVER: Again, my response is that I
- 15 believe that people have been interviewed, and
- 16 discussions in terms of trying to determine -- back to
- 17 -- I believe your question was, how were these tools
- 18 fabricated or how --
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: How did they get into the
- inventory, yes.
- 21 MR. WEAVER: How did they get into the
- inventory? To me, I don't know who's driving that
- 23 investigation. I had assumed that it was in -- well, I

- 1 don't know who's driving the investigation.
- 2 I -- I have knowledge, though, that people
- 3 are being questioned in regards to that situation.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Who told you?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: Who told me?
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: That it was being done. What
- 7 conversation was involved that educated you?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: I believe it was a comment that
- 9 Art Fitzpatrick made to me, that he had been spoken to
- 10 about the issue.
- 11 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Who did Mr. Fitzpatrick say
- 12 spoke to him?
- 13 MR. WEAVER: I'm sorry. Would you repeat the
- 14 question?
- 15 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Sure. Who talked to Mr.
- 16 Fitzpatrick about the tools?
- 17 MR. WEAVER: I do not know.
- 18 MR. RODRIQUEZ: He didn't say?
- MR. WEAVER: No.
- 20 MR. RODRIQUEZ: He just said someone has
- called me about the tools, and he did not say who?
- MR. WEAVER: It was my -- no. No.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay.

1	MR. WEAVER: Again, I'd like just to add that
2	through all this post-accident investigation, there's a
3	lot of actions that are taking place, and, so, it's
4	again not that I don't care that someone's being
5	interviewed, it's just there's a lot of activity, and,
6	so, while using the word "assume" around here might not
7	be to everybody's best interests, there are times in
8	going about your business that when people say things,
9	you assume that there's a driving force behind it but
10	might not take the initiative to find out who it is.
11	MR. RODRIQUEZ: I see. Now, focusing on the
12	C check, do at what level of delay in completion
13	would would you become involved in resolution of
14	problems or something like that?
15	MR. WEAVER: Normally, I wouldn't become
16	involved.
17	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Would any of your people?
18	MR. WEAVER: I would assume so.
19	MR. RODRIQUEZ: What level of your
20	organization, Maintenance and Engineering, would
21	problems in the completion of a C check be resolved?
22	MR. WEAVER: Varying upon the problem, it
23	could be at any level.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

1	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, problems that would
2	result in delay of completion date. Can you tell me
3	some things that typically might have varied on the
4	completion date of a C check, what typically might
5	delay it?
6	MR. WEAVER: What might typically delay a C
7	check?
8	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm.
9	MR. WEAVER: Initial inspection, the amount
10	of non-routines generated, specific findings that drive
11	extended ETR, overtime, manning, vacation, parts. I
12	mean, all of these are factors that could extend an
13	ETR.
14	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do do you have any
15	estimate of the frequency of, let's call it, on-time
16	performance with the C check? Do you know?
17	MR. WEAVER: No.
18	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Has the has the length of
19	time allotted for the C check been changed recently?
20	MR. WEAVER: That varies upon each and every
21	aircraft. So, every aircraft's allotted time is
22	subject to change.

MR. RODRIQUEZ: So, the Maintenance Manual

23

- doesn't specify a specific number of days to accomplish
- 2 a C check?
- MR. WEAVER: No, not to my knowledge.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And your -- you're not -- I'm
- 5 getting negative here.
- We had information that the weekend activity
- 7 on the C check is significantly reduced from that
- 8 during the week. Can you comment on that?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: I can comment on that, in that I
- 10 don't know that that exists. I don't know what --
- 11 whoever it is that -- what they define "significant" as
- 12 being, and --
- 13 MR. RODRIQUEZ: I -- I may be
- 14 mischaracterizing it, but the impression I got, and
- these are my words, I guess, is that it was not a full
- 16 crew, it was more of a skeleton crew or that kind of
- 17 language was used, that there wasn't that much activity
- being done on the sixth and seventh days.
- 19 Is it your understanding that the seven-day
- 20 heavy maintenance schedule was essentially --
- MR. WEAVER: Level-loaded.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Level-loaded, yes. A good
- word.

1	MR.	WEAVER:	Yeah.

- 2 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. And that was true from
- 3 '97 on or whenever it was implemented?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: Definitively, I couldn't tell
- 5 you as to whether or not that's the way it started or
- 6 that's the way it is, without looking at the rosters
- 7 and staffing.
- 8 Typically, though, the idea of seven-day
- 9 coverage is, is that it's a level-loaded plan, under-
- 10 standing that you can't, you know, mathematically
- 11 completely level it at times.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, for instance, there's
- 13 no purchasing available on the weekend, is that
- 14 correct?
- MR. WEAVER: To my knowledge, purchasing's
- 16 available.
- 17 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Oh, there is? I want to talk
- 18 a bit about your manual in terms of -- in terms of
- 19 utilization. The -- the information we've been getting
- is -- including you, has referred to the manual on
- 21 several occasions. "Well, I go to the manual. I refer
- 22 to the manual. Whatever's in the manual."
- 23 And I would like to get some expression from

- 1 you about a lack of completeness of documentation on
- 2 the C check, for instance. There have been references
- 3 in the NASEP inspection, both current and previous,
- 4 about completing paperwork and that sort of thing.
- 5 The -- are you bothered by those comments?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: You mentioned "NASEP
- 7 inspection". We haven't had a NASEP inspection since
- 8 1995.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: What about your special
- 10 evaluation by the FAA in 2000?
- 11 MR. WEAVER: Okay. The findings brought
- forward by the FAA pertaining to heavy maintenance?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes.
- MR. WEAVER: It's specifically been that --
- that you're asking me as to whether or not I'm
- 16 concerned about --
- 17 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, I -- I was trying to do
- it generally with comments about incomplete paperwork,
- 19 failing to sign off cards. I don't -- I'm not quoting
- 20 the document. Just as I scanned it, it looked to me
- like procedures weren't being followed, but everybody
- we've talked to refers back to procedures.
- I'm just wondering if that makes sense to

- 1 you.
- 2 MR. WEAVER: It does make sense to me for
- 3 people to refer to the manuals that govern how we
- 4 accomplish our work.
- 5 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, are you concerned about
- an FAA comment that your documentation is incomplete?
- 7 MR. WEAVER: From an FAA comment, I don't
- 8 know who made that comment, but, yes, it would concern
- 9 me.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Let's be specific, and then
- 11 you can comment. There's one that says, "Alaska's
- manual does not specify maintenance training
- curriculums or on-the-job training, OJT, procedures or
- 14 objectives."
- MR. WEAVER: That's a finding.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, sir.
- 17 MR. WEAVER: Yes, I know that. If I can have
- 18 time to look at their response, that we put together --
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Did you participate in the
- 20 response?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes. As to what all it
- 22 encompasses, though, I can't tell you now.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Another comment was that "GMM

1	does not include how-to procedures regarding heavy
2	check planning and/or production control." Has that
3	changed?
4	MR. WEAVER: Has our procedures for heavy
5	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, the FAA perception was
6	that you did not have how-to procedures for heavy check
7	planning and production control. Have you developed
8	procedures for that?
9	MR. WEAVER: We have developed procedures in
10	conjunction with the FAA and revised our manual.
11	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Well, with respect to
12	the time frame from '97, when this C check was done, to
13	the time that this was accomplished, do you feel that
14	what can you say about the guidance or instructions
15	or provisions for the Maintenance Manual with respect
16	to your heavy check planning and production control?
17	MR. WEAVER: I don't have the specifics as to
18	what was done, what it is that they reviewed, and
19	MR. RODRIQUEZ: They didn't give you any
20	details in the out-briefing or anything of that nature?
21	MR. WEAVER: No.
22	MR. RODRIQUEZ: There's a comment that

"numerous MIG-4 cards". Do you know what those are?

23

1	MR. WEAVER: It's not routine.
2	MR. RODRIQUEZ: "Numerous MIG-4 forms had the
3	box checked for partial work completed, but there were
4	no entries on the back of the card for any partial work
5	initiated or completed."
6	Does that does that sound that sounds
7	to you like a paperwork exercise activity? It's a
8	failure to completely fill out the forms? Is that it?
9	MR. WEAVER: It's it's a finding that they
10	have, and again we address it in our response.
11	MR. RODRIQUEZ: There's a comment here or a
12	finding, as you appropriately describe it, "Decisions
13	as to whether a repair is major or minor can be left up
14	to the individual mechanic performing the job per the
15	GMM. Engineering will not always have to get involved
16	with this decision-making process."
17	Are you comfortable with that?
18	MR. WEAVER: Again, I would want to refer to
19	our total response to the finding, Dick, and I
20	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, what I'm curious about
21	I mean, we I'm sure that form we have the
22	response to, I have not seen it, but I'm sure we can

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

refer to that.

1	I'm I guess I'm interested in your
2	particular evaluation you're a pretty high-level
3	individual in the company, and I'm interested in
4	with the vast background in maintenance, I'm interested
5	in your assessment of that activity.
6	It appears to say that a mechanic can
7	evaluate whether a repair is major or minor. Is that
8	what it says to you? Would you like to read it?
9	MR. WEAVER: Yeah. I'll read it again.
10	MR. RODRIQUEZ: It's down at the bottom
11	there.
12	MR. WEAVER: Would you like for me to get my
13	response?
14	MR. RODRIQUEZ: You don't know what it was?
15	MR. WEAVER: Not off the top of my head.
16	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, what I'm interested in
17	is your your knowledge of the company prior to this
18	being elevated to the position of a finding by the FAA,
19	with respect to the classification of major and minor
20	repairs.
21	MR. WEAVER: I do not have the details
22	pertaining to that specific finding.
23	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, apparently the

- 1 Maintenance Manual specifies that classification of a
- 2 repair can be done by a mechanic. Do you know if that
- 3 was true or not?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: I do not know.
- 5 MR. RODRIQUEZ: If it was true, would that
- 6 bother you? Would that be of concern to you at your
- 7 level?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: Again, it would have to be taken
- 9 into consideration with those people that are more
- 10 technically capable of -- of the issues pertaining to
- 11 the responsibilities of the mechanic.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Are you familiar with your
- independent assessment of Alaska Airlines?
- MR. WEAVER: I have --
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: I mean, your company's
- 16 independent assessment.
- 17 MR. WEAVER: Yes. I've gone through it a
- 18 number of times.
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Did you participate in in-
- 20 briefing and out-briefing with regard to this?
- 21 MR. WEAVER: Yes, I did, both. Actually, the
- in-briefing of just M&E function and the out-briefing
- 23 of the airline.

1	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Did the company prepare a
2	response to this? A formal response?
3	MR. WEAVER: Not to my knowledge have we
4	prepared an official response. These are
5	recommendations provided to us by the Independent
6	Assessment Team.
7	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm. What was your
8	assessment of the assessment?
9	MR. RODRIQUEZ: My assessment was that we
10	asked these individuals and this team to come in and
11	provide us with their technical expertise and aviation
12	knowledge, industry knowledge, and provide us with
13	industry best practices recommendations, and to assess
14	our safety vulnerabilities or or issues, and I
15	believe they've done so.
16	They provided us with industry-leading
17	recommendations and and essentially walked away,
18	saying that we run a safe airline, found no violations
19	or safety issue concerns, and recommendations that will
20	make us a better airline.
21	MR. RODRIQUEZ: This was completed in June.
22	That's the date of the report at any rate
23	Have you implemented anything at all in the

- 1 Maintenance and Engineering Division as a function of
- 2 that independent safety audit?
- MR. WEAVER: Yes, we have.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And what kinds of things
- 5 would that be?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: Well, there's one finding in
- 7 there where the mechanics in Portland are to be briefed
- 8 on future facility expansion needs and requirements.
- 9 That's been accomplished.
- 10 I -- I -- again, enhancing and adding to our
- 11 capability of our CAS Program. That's been
- 12 accomplished.
- 13 There -- there are many. There's an -- every
- 14 recommendation has an action item and someone who's
- 15 responsible for accomplishing that action item, and to
- 16 the -- there are some that are -- only a few that
- 17 actually have target dates to be established, where the
- individual who's responsible for that action item
- 19 making sure that it's implemented, reviewed and has had
- 20 time to put together the review to determine when its
- 21 accomplishment will be done. So.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do we have a copy of that,
- 23 Frank?

1	MR. McGILL: I don't know.
2	MR. WEAVER: Okay.
3	MR. McGILL: Can you be a little bit more
4	specific? Maybe I can remember what it is.
5	MR. WEAVER: Well, it's an Excel spread
6	sheet. If you're talking about the action item list or
7	there's an FAA Action Item List, and there's an
8	Independent Assessment Team Recommendation and
9	Implementation List.
10	MR. McGILL: I haven't gone I have several
11	of these that I actually got from you. I don't I
12	didn't get involved, and I've looked over them, but
13	from my perspective, some of these things are
14	they're of very little value.
15	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. When you increased the
16	heavy maintenance activity from five to seven days, did
17	the staff level increase?
18	MR. WEAVER: To my knowledge, it did, yes.
19	MR. RODRIQUEZ: And based on feedback from
20	your subordinates, was it an adequate increase?
21	MR. WEAVER: Yes.
22	MR. RODRIQUEZ: When you ran this latest

campaign, for wont of a better word, to recheck jack

23

- 1 screws, etc., who took the lead on the scheduling and
- 2 master-minding the accomplishment? These will be done
- 3 at this facility, these will be done at that facility,
- 4 and that sort of thing, the distribution of the work,
- 5 who did that?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: I don't believe there was any
- 7 one individual.
- 8 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, who was on the team
- 9 that did it?
- 10 MR. WEAVER: Again, I wasn't present. I was
- in Indiana. So, I was brought in -- I was brought in
- 12 essentially being just briefed as to what was going on.
- 13 So, I really don't know who was involved in that.
- 14 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And what -- may I ask what
- 15 the activity was in Indiana?
- 16 MR. WEAVER: It was my wife's father, their
- 17 ill.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Oh, I see.
- MR. WEAVER: So, I was at home. It's a
- 20 personal thing.
- 21 MR. RODRIQUEZ: I just wondered what was
- 22 going on in Indiana.
- MR. WEAVER: Ripe tomatoes and good sweet

- 1 corn.
- 2 DR. BRENNER: Could we ask for some of that
- 3 good sweet corn?
- 4 MR. WEAVER: It's down in -- it's down in --
- 5 can't right now. Carmichael's or Campinedos.
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: We had a discussion earlier
- 7 about Mr. Henman not working for the company any more.
- 8 May I ask, was that separation favorable?
- 9 MR. WEAVER: Dick, I can't answer that. It's
- 10 against our employment policies to comment on any ex-
- 11 employee.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, I've asked about the
- 13 separation of three or four employees of other people,
- and they've commented that they were favorable
- 15 circumstances.
- So, I guess either they don't know the
- 17 company policy or is it company policy that you don't
- 18 comment on unfavorable separations?
- 19 MR. WEAVER: Just can't comment on an
- 20 employment policy. He's an ex-employee.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you know that -- do you
- 22 know that people within your -- subordinates of yours
- have commented on the separations of company employees?

1	MR. WEAVER: No, I do not.
2	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Were you involved directly in
3	that separation?
4	MR. WEAVER: Yes.
5	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you know if the company
6	has a policy on out-brief for departing employees?
7	MR. WEAVER: No, I don't.
8	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Did you have an out-briefing
9	in this case?
10	MR. WEAVER: No, I did not.
11	MR. RODRIQUEZ: I believe that's all the
12	questions I have. Thank you very much.
13	MR. McGILL: Bill, I got I wanted to
14	follow up real quickly here just because there was a
15	little bit of a little bit of confusion.
16	Mr. Rodriguez had asked about a we were
17	getting into the planning. Under under your
18	position, you do have an Assistant Vice President of
19	Maintenance and Planning, is that correct?
20	MR. WEAVER: It's a managing director.
21	MR. McGILL: What's that?
22	MR. WEAVER: It's a managing director.
23	MR. McGILL: Steve Zerda?

1	MR. WEAVER: Steve Zerda, yes.
2	MR. McGILL: Okay. He's indicated as an
3	Assistant Vice President of Planning and Maintenance,
4	and I wanted to be able to kind of separate whether we
5	were talking about the Vice President of Marketing and
6	Planning versus Maintenance Planning, and which would
7	continue down through Maintenance Production and
8	Control, Maintenance Planning, Long-Range Maintenance
9	Planning, Planning Analysts, all of these people would
10	then be under you in that regard from a maintenance
11	perspective, is that correct?
12	MR. WEAVER: Correct, yes.
13	MR. McGILL: But not necessarily from a
14	marketing or planning perspective or utilization of
15	aircraft and that kind of thing?
16	MR. WEAVER: No.
17	MR. McGILL: But you would in fact know how
18	the air hours are being put on an aircraft from a
19	maintenance perspective versus any kind of a check or
20	whatever? Someone in your grouping down here would
21	also be tracking all of that, is that correct?
22	MR. WEAVER: Yes, but I don't I don't know
23	that it would actually be tracking it in terms of

- 1 hours. They would have -- I'll make an assumption here
- 2 that they would have knowledge or information
- 3 pertaining to that fleet's utilization.
- 4 MR. McGILL: And you don't think they would
- 5 be tracking individual aircraft hours?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: Individual aircraft hours? I
- 7 mean, yes, we do track that, but I -- I'm not sure that
- 8 that is actually covered in those -- in those meetings.
- 9 MR. McGILL: Okay. And you had told Mr.
- 10 Rodriguez that the -- we were -- he was talking --
- 11 discussing about the Quality Assurance, and you said
- 12 that fell under Mr. Fowler's area?
- MR. WEAVER: Correct.
- 14 MR. McGILL: I don't know if I -- do you know
- 15 that under Mr. Trimberger, that Quality Assurance is
- 16 actually under his direction?
- 17 MR. WEAVER: Today?
- 18 MR. McGILL: Well, at the time of the
- 19 accident.
- 20 MR. WEAVER: At the time of the accident,
- 21 Quality Assurance, Quality Control, Maintenance
- 22 Training, were all responsibilities of Jim Trimberger.
- MR. McGILL: Okay. And that's what I wanted

- 1 to clear up because during all this period of time that
- 2 we've been discussing about jack screws and all of this
- 3 stuff, Quality Assurance was in fact under your
- 4 direction?
- 5 MR. WEAVER: There's some differentiation of
- 6 time frames there, of where they were brought out from
- 7 underneath me, and -- and -- and Quality Assurance and
- 8 reported directly to John Fowler.
- 9 MR. McGILL: Well, when -- when did that --
- 10 when was that -- do you happen to know when that would
- 11 have taken place or --
- MR. WEAVER: Officially, it took place when I
- 13 assumed the responsibility of Director of Maintenance.
- 14 At that point in time, then the Director of Quality
- 15 Assurance or essentially the Quality Assurance
- organization, that reported to John Fowler.
- 17 MR. McGILL: Well, I was looking at a 19 --
- October 1999 Organizational Chart that was still
- 19 showing Quality Assurance would be under Mr.
- 20 Trimberger.
- 21 MR. WEAVER: Correct, and Trimberger was
- 22 reporting to me --
- MR. McGILL: Yes.

1	MR. WEAVER: at that time.
2	MR. McGILL: So, to follow what we're really
3	talking about, the time frame of Quality Assurance
4	would have been really under your direction?
5	MR. WEAVER: Correct.
6	MR. McGILL: And one other you had talked
7	about the the Director of Safety reporting to you,
8	which was Mr. Trimberger?
9	MR. WEAVER: Yes.
10	MR. McGILL: In the time frame of the
11	accident and after the accident, I believe that Mr.
12	Trimberger would have reported to Mr. Fowler. He was
13	not reporting to you?
14	MR. WEAVER: There was the exact dates, I
15	don't know, but the reporting relationships have all
16	changed subsequent to the accident, yes.
17	MR. McGILL: Well, but at the time of the
18	accident, and then through October of this time
19	frame, I think even then, he would have been reporting
20	to
21	MR. WEAVER: Director of
22	MR. McGILL: Mr. Fowler

MR. WEAVER: Yes.

23

2 Director of Quality Control? 3 MR. WEAVER: Yes. MR. McGILL: Okay. That's clear. 4 5 MR. WEAVER: The IEB essentially reported to 6 John and the Director of Safety. MR. McGILL: Okay. Do we have some more questions? 8 9 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Sorry. As part of the 10 investigation, the NTSB has requested a number of different documents, maintenance logs. Included in 11 12 that were shift term logs. Are you familiar with that? What a shift term log is? 13 14 MR. WEAVER: Hm-hmm. 15 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And the fact that term logs were delivered to the NTSB or --16 17 MR. WEAVER: No.

MR. McGILL: -- and reporting to you as a

MS. VON KLEINSMID: You have no knowledge

MR. WEAVER: I may have, yeah. I do not know

of all the information that the NTSB has requested and

1

18

19

20

21

22

23

delivered?

has.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

about a request had been made and granted and

- 1 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Yes, I understand that. 2 Are you -- do you have any knowledge -- there's a
- 3 number of logs that are missing. Some days. Do you
- 4 have any knowledge as to where those missing log pages
- 5 might be?
- 6 MR. WEAVER: No. I have no knowledge that
- 7 anything is missing, and I have no knowledge of where
- 8 they'd be.
- 9 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. And you had
- 10 mentioned about jack screws, and we talked about the
- 11 cost of the jack screw, and that I think you had stated
- 12 you had seen some invoices on overhaul of jack screws,
- and you had a figure, approximate figure.
- 14 What companies do you use to overhaul your
- 15 jack screws?
- 16 MR. WEAVER: I believe the only company that
- 17 we use is the manufacturer, Pruitt.
- 18 MS. VON KLEINSMID: So, you don't recall
- 19 seeing on any of the invoices that you -- that would
- 20 cause you to ask any other company besides Pruitt?
- MR. WEAVER: Not that I recall, no.
- 22 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And then, Dr. Brenner
- asked you to characterize your strengths, and I'm not

- 1 sure exactly how you phrased the question, but you
- 2 mentioned responsibility. Do you remember that? I
- 3 think that was what you said, right? Responsibility
- 4 came up?
- 5 At any time since the accident, have you ever
- 6 felt that you performed some personal responsibility
- 7 regarding the crash of Aircraft 963?
- 8 MR. WEAVER: I'd answer that in the sense, I
- 9 don't believe any more so than every employee that
- 10 works for this company. I think we all feel
- 11 responsible in some way.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. That's all I have.
- MR. WEAVER: And --
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: And? I'm sorry?
- MR. WEAVER: Again, it's kind of an open-
- 16 ended question and answer. Responsibility in regards
- 17 to what?
- 18 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Well, I think that not
- 19 every employee of Alaska Airlines has -- bear the same
- 20 responsibility in terms of what they -- they manage and
- 21 direct and oversee, such as Maintenance and Engineering
- 22 and Quality Assurance.
- So, to that extent, I think that there's some

- 1 different levels of that. So, I was wondering if you,
- 2 as being basically in charge and overseeing Quality
- 3 Assurance, Engineering, Maintenance, felt --
- 4 MR. WEAVER: In that regard, no.
- 5 MR. McGILL: Bill?
- 6 (Discussion off the record.)
- 7 INTERVIEW OF JOHN R. FOWLER
- 8 MR. McGILL: And one other thing I needed to
- 9 bring forth. I want to make sure that he's -- you want
- 10 him here as your representative.
- 11 MR. FOWLER: That's correct.
- MR. McGILL: Okay. Now, go ahead.
- 13 MR. FOWLER: I guess probably the best place
- 14 to start is where I started in this industry.
- 15 I started working for PanAmerican World
- 16 Airways in 1967. I started working there as an
- 17 aircraft serviceman, which is a different name for a
- 18 cleaner, as they used in their organization. I cleaned
- 19 airplanes for awhile, and then I moved into being an
- 20 avionics tech, did that for a number of years, became a
- 21 supervisor in Avionics, okay, and a manager and worked
- in Tech Services for some bit of time.
- I was a shift manager for a number of years

- 1 in Maintenance. Then I took a position as Director of
- 2 Aircraft Appearance for interior maintenance on the
- 3 airplane.
- 4 From there, I went over to a position called
- 5 Assistant Director of Maintenance Planning and
- 6 Production Control and did that for a couple years,
- 7 also, and then, in 1989, I became Vice President of
- 8 Maintenance and Engineering for PanAmerican World
- 9 Airways.
- In 1991, I left PanAm to come to work for
- 11 Alaska Airlines as Vice President of Maintenance and
- 12 Engineering, was -- had that title up until 1997, as I
- 13 recall, early 1997, and I was promoted to Senior Vice
- 14 President, Technical Operations, which essentially left
- me with the same responsibilities. I still had
- 16 Maintenance and Engineering.
- 17 It also recognized some of the other work
- that I was doing with ATA on the Senior Advisory
- 19 Committee and some across-divisional issues or across-
- 20 divisional items that Alaska Airlines -- between
- 21 operating divisions, and then, in 1998, I was promoted
- 22 to my present position, Executive Vice President of
- 23 Technical Operations and Systems Control, which added

- 1 to what I had before, Systems Operations Control and
- 2 Emergency Response and other issues having to do with
- 3 interdivisional coordination.
- 4 MR. McGILL: And, specifically, in 1998, when
- 5 you added those other duties, what -- what was the
- 6 extra duties that --
- 7 MR. FOWLER: Prior to the -- prior to the
- 8 change in 1998, I had responsibility for Maintenance
- 9 and Engineering as the division officer, and I had
- 10 responsibility as the Alaska Airlines representative to
- 11 the Senior Advisory Committee of the Air Transport
- 12 Association, and I was working various other issues,
- 13 coordination between operating divisions.
- 14 For instance, transition of aircraft in and
- out of the fleet, being sure that everybody was
- 16 coordinated with pre-planning issues and -- and so on
- and so on, as well as the coordination of efforts for
- 18 on-time performance.
- MR. McGILL: Okay.
- 20 MR. FOWLER: And then, in 1998, when the
- 21 title changed, I no longer had direct responsibility
- for all the Maintenance and Engineering activity.
- 23 That's when Mr. Weaver was promoted to Vice President

- of Maintenance and Engineering, and I retained
- 2 oversight responsibility for Maintenance and
- 3 Engineering, but he was the division officer.
- I then took on responsibility for Systems
- 5 Operations Control, which is an organization that
- 6 didn't exist at that time. It was one that we were
- 7 building to prepare for future growth and -- and just
- 8 building infrastructure for the way we believed the
- 9 airline needed to go, and then also formed an official
- 10 Emergency Response Group to work on emergency response
- 11 plan, Federal Family Assistance Act plan, things like
- 12 that.
- 13 MR. McGILL: At that particular time, prior
- 14 to 1998, were you listed on the ops specs as the
- 15 Director of Maintenance?
- 16 MR. FOWLER: I was not.
- MR. McGILL: And Mr. Weaver was?
- MR. FOWLER: Mr. Weaver was Director of
- 19 Maintenance. He was the Assistant Vice President of
- 20 Maintenance. He was the Director of Maintenance.
- 21 MR. McGILL: And then, both of you all kind
- of went up a step, and you took two people and
- requested a temporary position, to assign two people to

1	that?
2	MR. FOWLER: When you say when I took two
3	people on?
4	MR. McGILL: Well, you assigned two two
5	people was assigned. I assume that was you that
6	assigned two people to have that responsibility on A6
7	management personnel listed by the FAA.
8	MR. FOWLER: I don't recall whether it was
9	myself or Bill Weaver. He was the division officer at
10	that time, and I was certainly involved.
11	There were two choices. One choice was for
12	the FAA to leave it vacant and just share the ops spec
13	with that position vacant. We provided we proposed
14	another alternative, which was rather than just leave
15	it vacant and say nobody had that responsibility for -
16	for however long it took to fill the position, that it
17	may be more appropriate to specify who had the
18	responsibility and to list therefore the Director of
19	Line Maintenance and the Director of Base Maintenance,
20	and the FAA agreed with that, and we listed two people

was made, was there any discussion of how the two would

co-share that responsibility of collaborating?

21

22

23

(301) 565-0064

MR. McGILL: Was there -- when that decision

- 1 MR. FOWLER: I did not have that discussion.
- 2 MR. McGILL: We've several times -- I need to
- 3 go back over this, this position of the Director of
- 4 Safety.
- In 1995, did you attend the Washington
- 6 proceedings when that position was defined?
- 7 MR. FOWLER: I'm not sure I know what
- 8 Washington proceedings you're talking about.
- 9 MR. McGILL: Well, in 1995, that position was
- 10 -- was -- the Director of Safety -- the five positions
- 11 that were on the ops specs, they were changed, and this
- 12 one was added.
- MR. FOWLER: That was the Part 119?
- MR. McGILL: Yes.
- MR. FOWLER: Hm-hmm.
- 16 MR. McGILL: And -- and virtually all the
- 17 airlines, I guess, at one time had sent
- 18 representatives. I don't know whether you attended it,
- 19 but probably someone from Alaska Airlines did.
- 20 MR. FOWLER: I did not attend it.
- 21 MR. McGILL: Okay. And I was just wondering
- 22 -- you said at that time, Vice President Gore was on a
- 23 -- we do have this position of Director of Safety, and

- 1 was it your -- did you choose Mr. Trimberger for that
- 2 position?
- MR. FOWLER: Can I go back a second, Frank?
- 4 MR. McGILL: Yes.
- 5 MR. FOWLER: You mentioned 1995. My under-
- 6 standing was that -- my recollection is that Part 119
- 7 didn't come into being until 1997-98 or something like
- 8 that.
- 9 So, I'm not aware of a required ops spec
- 10 position for Director of Safety in 1995.
- 11 MR. McGILL: Well, it originated in 1995.
- MR. FOWLER: Okay.
- 13 MR. McGILL: It was not required in Part 119
- until a little bit later, but definitely it's been
- there for a number of years, and by the time of the
- 16 accident, Mr. Trimberger was on your ops specs in the
- 17 title of that position.
- 18 MR. FOWLER: That's correct.
- MR. McGILL: And he reported to you, is that
- 20 --
- MR. FOWLER: He did.
- MR. McGILL: And he also had several -- two
- 23 other titles?

1	MR. FOWLER: He had one other title.
2	MR. McGILL: What title?
3	MR. FOWLER: He was Director for Quality
4	Control and Training, and he had the title of Director
5	of Safety on the ops spec.
6	MR. McGILL: I was just kind of looking
7	through what was given to me, and it's three separate
8	positions of Director
9	MR. FOWLER: He had he had he had
10	various departments working in his under his
11	responsibility, but he had that title.
12	MR. McGILL: Okay. As in his capacity as
13	Director of Safety, do you recall any particular things
14	that occurred that he would have dealt with you when he
15	wore the hat of Director of Safety?
16	MR. FOWLER: Actually, we interfaced pretty
17	often. I would meet with the Director of Safety once a
18	month. I would meet with the IEB on as many of their
19	quarterly meetings that I could make. If I wasn't able
20	to meet with the IEB at the quarterly meeting, they
21	would share the minutes with me, and Jim Trimberger

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

22 would share with me the activities, what was going on

with the IEB at that time.

23

1	There were numerous issues. I'm not sure at
2	this point I remember any specifically.
3	MR. McGILL: Could you see a difference when
4	whether or not whether he had the title of
5	Director of Quality Control, would the issues be
6	similar, or Director of Safety, would they be the same?
7	MR. FOWLER: They would very definitely be
8	different. They were definitely different.
9	MR. McGILL: Okay. Do you know of any
10	instance where he as Director of Safety approached you
11	about any particular item at all?
12	MR. FOWLER: He he briefed me on the on-
13	going research that was being done between Flight
14	Standards and Maintenance and Engineering relative to
15	the aircraft that we had in Anchorage. I don't
16	remember the tail number or the date, but it was in the
17	dead of winter, I think two years ago or so, where
18	there was a report from the crew that the airplane
19	seemed to be nose heavy or rotate late or have late
20	elevator response. He kept me up-to-date with that.
21	There were other issues that were being
22	worked on throughout the company with Customer Service
23	relative to the development of an automated weight and

- 1 balance system and the interaction that was going back
- and forth between Flight Operations and Customer
- 3 Service and the FAA, on-going updates with various
- 4 other correspondences between the FAA and the company.
- 5 Without referring to notes, I'm not sure what
- 6 --
- 7 MR. McGILL: Was there any references to
- 8 individual people, employees, and the company regarding
- 9 safety issues that were first presented to him, and he
- 10 would report those to you?
- MR. FOWLER: Would you ask -- say that again,
- 12 Frank.
- 13 MR. McGILL: I was just trying to get a feel.
- 14 We had already -- we had -- we had interviewed Mr.
- 15 Trimberger, and I was trying to -- he could not
- 16 remember any offhand that -- where individual employees
- 17 had some concern over some safety issue whereas in that
- 18 capacity as Director of Safety, something was presented
- 19 to him -- maybe he had, and then he had talked to you
- about it, and if you remembered something.
- 21 MR. FOWLER: None -- none that I can recall,
- but I'd just like to point out that the IEB and the
- 23 Director of Safety was not and still is not the only

- 1 avenue that employees can bring up safety concerns.
- 2 So, -- but specifically through him to me, I
- 3 can't recall any.
- 4 MR. McGILL: In that time frame, prior to the
- 5 accident, what -- what were all of the different
- 6 avenues that one could pursue for safety violations?
- 7 MR. FOWLER: Starting at the front-line
- 8 level, at the lowest level, all employees have the
- 9 opportunity and the avenue of reporting safety issues
- 10 to their supervisors or managers, and, quite frankly,
- 11 that's where most effectively we would like to see them
- 12 resolved, at the lowest level possible, and as quickly
- as possible.
- 14 They at that time, also, had crew safety
- meetings with their supervisors, who would hold them
- once a month, and we asked them to keep minutes of
- 17 those meetings, so that they could share what they had
- done with the employees.
- 19 We -- about -- I quess it was about three
- years ago, four years ago, we also created a
- 21 Maintenance and Engineering Quarterly Safety Committee,
- fashioned after the one that ALPA had, okay, in the
- company, where they met quarterly as well.

1	Representatives on that board were the
2	Director of Quality Control, okay, Jim Trimberger,
3	okay, the Director of Line Maintenance, Director of
4	Base Maintenance, as well as a representative from the
5	Inspection Department, a contract employee, union
6	employee, front-line employee, a representative from
7	Base Maintenance, and a representative from Line
8	Maintenance, and we would get together on a quarterly
9	basis and talk about any issues that came up relative
10	to safety, and the employees in the workplace, okay, we
11	went through efforts to try to make them aware, that
12	these people, okay, were in this forum, and they were
13	representatives of them and meeting with us, and if
14	they had any safety concerns, to let them know.
15	There was also the IEB, okay, and I can also
16	tell you that my door is always open for somebody that
17	has a safety concern if they were unable to get it
18	resolved by some other means.
19	MR. McGILL: What actually is your role now?
20	MR. FOWLER: As of right now?
21	MR. McGILL: Yes, sir.
22	MR. FOWLER: I've announced my desire to
23	retire from the company, which I'll be doing officially

- 1 at the end of this year. So, right now, I guess the
- 2 fairest thing to say is that I'm -- I'm in transition.
- 3 As you probably read in the news, my --
- 4 somebody to continue with my level oversight of
- 5 Maintenance and Engineering will start Monday, and
- 6 there will also be other organizational changes on
- 7 Monday that reassign other folks that report to me now.
- 8 MR. McGILL: Does the position take on the
- 9 same function, the same responsibilities, same role as
- 10 you have?
- 11 MR. FOWLER: One of the things that happens
- is at my level, when you announce that you're going to
- 13 leave the company, okay, you're not necessarily part of
- 14 those decisions any more. So, --
- MR. McGILL: Okay.
- MR. FOWLER: So, I didn't get a lot of votes
- 17 in it. So, I -- I don't think -- I can't answer the
- 18 question.
- 19 MR. McGILL: Okay. Let's just back up. When
- 20 you were the Executive Vice President of Technical
- 21 Operations and Systems Control, what -- can you briefly
- 22 tell us your functions, and what -- what you did within
- 23 that capacity?

Т	MR. FOWLER: Okay. Let's just talk about, I
2	guess let's talk about the in-house functions rather
3	than what I did outside outside the company with the
4	ATA and so on.
5	In-house, again as I said before, Maintenance
6	and Engineering, okay, Maintenance and Engineering had
7	a division officer. So, it had Bill Weaver running
8	that division.
9	So, there was on-going interaction between
10	Bill and I to keep me apprised of what was going on, if
11	there was something that he needed to discuss or he
12	wanted counsel on, and he was certainly available for
13	that and so on.
14	Relative to Operations Control/System
15	Operations Control, is a group that we set out to start
16	last August, August of 1999, if you will, and it's beer
17	it's been on-going in its development, in its
18	evolution, ever since that, and Emergency Response was
19	started that same year as well but earlier on that
20	year.
21	And my involvement in in developing the
22	Emergency Response process and the Operations Control
23	process, I probably had more hands-on involvement of

- 1 mine than did M&E at that time.
- 2 For a very short period of time, Flight
- 3 Operations reported to me. As you know, Mike Swan
- 4 again announced in 1999 that he wanted to go back to
- 5 the line and fly effective the end of the year, January
- 6 1st, year 2000, which in fact he did, and from some
- 7 point, days or a week or so after he went back to the
- 8 line, until the reporting relationship was changed
- 9 again, Flight Operations reported to me. I'm not
- 10 exactly sure when it was changed again.
- So, I'll say that Flight Operations reported
- to me for a month or two months or something like that,
- 13 and then as a result of the activity required after the
- 14 accident, Flight Operations went back to reporting
- directly to Bill Ayer.
- 16 MR. McGILL: And you reported then to Bill
- 17 Ayer?
- 18 MR. FOWLER: That's correct.
- 19 MR. McGILL: Did you -- let's take the higher
- 20 level. Did you speak with him daily or weekly or --
- 21 MR. FOWLER: It really depended on the level
- of activity. Bill Ayer has -- has staff meetings
- essentially once a week, as most of us do, except when

- 1 he's out of town or traveling or something like that.
- We also got together for an officer meeting
- 3 once a week. So, I certainly would see him at those,
- 4 and whenever there was other needs to speak with him,
- 5 yes, I'd say that -- that no less than three days a
- 6 week, I would speak with him and often multiple times
- 7 in the same day.
- 8 MR. McGILL: What kind of issues would you
- 9 speak to him about?
- 10 MR. FOWLER: Mostly operational-type issues.
- 11 If we had a number of aircraft out of service in
- 12 Maintenance, to brief him on, you know, what the status
- 13 was going on with the -- with the airline relative to
- 14 system operations, just in general, whether things
- impacted on the system, customer service or
- 16 maintenance.
- 17 If we had an aircraft that came back or
- 18 returned to the blocks that was likely -- it was maybe
- 19 not seen as straightforward, and I thought he might
- 20 have questions on it, I'd call him on those things,
- and then just, you know, just the general, you know,
- on-going nature of the business, and, you know, the way
- 23 things change, fleet and administration and stuff like

- 1 that.
- 2 MR. McGILL: What -- what about Mr. Kelly?
- 3 Did you always go through Mr. Ayer or --
- 4 MR. FOWLER: When -- when Bill Ayer was named
- 5 president, I dealt more with Bill Ayer than John.
- 6 Okay. I would -- I mean, I -- there's -- there's no
- 7 requirement, okay, for me to have to go through Bill to
- 8 talk to John, and in some cases, when Bill was not
- 9 around, I'd just go to John, and we'd discuss
- 10 something, and in cases when Bill was around, I
- 11 certainly involved him.
- 12 MR. McGILL: So, if somebody -- whatever
- 13 might have happened, then if somebody wanted an
- 14 explanation, higher up, they would come, and you would
- 15 either get that or you would know about it already, is
- 16 that correct?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: One or the other. That's
- 18 correct. That's explanation to. You said if they
- 19 wanted an explanation.
- 20 MR. McGILL: Yeah. If -- if -- you know,
- 21 what -- whatever event might be in the news currently.
- I think if I were CEO, I would say tell me what this
- is all about.

So, they would be coming probably to you	tc
--	----

- 2 get the explanation, is that correct?
- 3 MR. FOWLER: In most cases, yes.
- 4 MR. McGILL: Okay. I know we -- I need to
- 5 get this kind of -- we have talked about it so much,
- 6 but I wanted to very briefly go back to the MIG-4 or to
- 7 the C-5 check on 963 in 1997.
- I just want you to state again what the -- I
- 9 have asked you this, and I think I know it. I don't
- 10 know that Mr. Rodriguez ever got -- if he knows, but
- 11 did -- at that particular time, were you aware that --
- 12 that C -- that MIG-4 had been written with a planned
- 13 action of replacing that jack screw at that particular
- 14 time?
- 15 MR. FOWLER: Okay. I'm not sure what
- 16 particular time are you talking about, but it doesn't
- 17 make any difference. I was never aware of the presence
- 18 of that MIG-4.
- MR. McGILL: Okay. And, so, any -- after the
- 20 MIG-4, the planned action, was written down with --
- 21 there was a replacement for the jack screw. There was
- 22 several days in there.
- During that time frame, were you ever

- 1 notified that there could be a potential part that
- 2 needed to be sent to Oakland involving that jack screw?
- 3 MR. FOWLER: I was not.
- 4 MR. McGILL: So, really, after the airplane
- 5 had already been gone, and you didn't really know at
- 6 any time anything about that particular card, because
- 7 later, they rechecked the end plate check, and it was
- 8 within limits, and they didn't have to take these
- 9 actions.
- 10 So, you knew -- know anything -- that was the
- 11 end of that particular card, is that correct?
- MR. FOWLER: At the -- you're talking about
- 13 at the time of the C check?
- MR. McGILL: Yes.
- MR. FOWLER: I was not aware of any of it.
- 16 MR. McGILL: Do you know that in a C-6 check
- in 1999, was that end plate rechecked?
- MR. FOWLER: My -- I don't know for sure, but
- 19 my understanding is that that end plate check was
- 20 scheduled every other C check.
- 21 MR. McGILL: Yeah. That's correct. It was
- 22 scheduled every other C-2 check, but I was just
- 23 curious. I know that some of my past experiences,

- 1 sometimes when something is right there, close to the
- 2 max limit, that I might have put that card back into
- 3 the C check package, in the C-6.
- 4 MR. FOWLER: I'm not aware of that.
- 5 MR. McGILL: Okay. Let's talk just briefly,
- 6 John, about the -- about the lubrication change of
- 7 Mobil 28 to AeroShell 33.
- 8 Can you -- do you know anything about how
- 9 that was evolved? Did you make the initial request for
- 10 that change?
- 11 MR. FOWLER: Direct answer to your question
- is no. I only became aware of the change in briefs
- 13 here recently, as it was -- became an issue here in the
- 14 investigation.
- MR. McGILL: Okay. Do you think that Mr.
- 16 Weaver would have known that a change was made,
- 17 changing the lubrication?
- MR. FOWLER: He may have, but I don't know
- 19 whether he did or not.
- 20 MR. McGILL: Okay. But you don't -- you
- 21 didn't get involved in that decision-making?
- MR. FOWLER: I did not.
- 23 MR. McGILL: We've hit on several times the

- 1 escalation of different time intervals for different
- 2 checks.
- Were you involved in that process of
- 4 increasing intervals?
- 5 MR. FOWLER: When you say "involved in that
- 6 process", how do you mean "involved"?
- 7 MR. McGILL: Did you initiate -- let's just
- 8 take a simple check, like an A check. What did -- what
- 9 -- who initiates the first thing to move it, say, from
- an 125 hours to, say, a 150 hours, so forth? What is
- 11 that process?
- MR. FOWLER: I couldn't tell you what the
- 13 exact process is. Within the Engineering Department,
- 14 exactly what the process is, I couldn't tell you.
- MR. McGILL: Okay. So, that would be a role
- 16 for somebody like Mr. Davey that was Vice President of
- 17 Engineering?
- 18 MR. FOWLER: Or folks within his department,
- 19 yes.
- 20 MR. McGILL: Or folks within his department.
- 21 At what level did -- did your position of Senior Vice
- 22 President there, if I may call you that, were you --
- 23 were you briefed on some of these -- when you would

- 1 move from the time intervals to the C checks, say, from
- 2 13 months to 15 months, or did you ever get involved in
- 3 --
- 4 MR. FOWLER: Yes.
- 5 MR. McGILL: -- any of that?
- 6 MR. FOWLER: Yeah. All the changes that were
- 7 made to the -- to the Maintenance Program relative to
- 8 the intervals for C checks, I was briefed on them,
- 9 okay, and had the opportunity to veto before they did
- 10 it.
- 11 MR. McGILL: Okay. So, you evaluate -- you
- 12 looked at all the justifications that were presented
- with the checks?
- 14 MR. FOWLER: I didn't look at all the detail.
- 15 What I did is I had them review the process with me.
- 16 I had an opportunity to ask a whole bunch of questions.
- 17 I had them walk me through their thought process and -
- and brief me on what they had done. I didn't review
- 19 the detail personally.
- I asked them if they had reviewed it with the
- 21 FAA, and what the FAA's response and approvals were,
- 22 and having been satisfied that -- that the process was
- 23 complete, based on what they -- they briefed me on, I

- 1 allowed them to go ahead with the change.
- 2 MR. McGILL: There's been some discussion
- 3 that many of these checks are -- are performed on
- 4 calendar time periods.
- 5 How did the utilization of flight hours --
- 6 how was that taken into consideration when -- when an
- 7 aircraft was changed on a calendar period?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: I can't tell you specifically
- 9 because I'm not -- I'm not an expert on the process,
- 10 but I recall that there were discussions specifically
- 11 relative to our utilization and those escalations when
- 12 the FAA bought off on them.
- 13 MR. McGILL: Do you recall ever a time when
- 14 the FAA did not buy off anything you presented on the
- 15 checks?
- 16 MR. FOWLER: You mean relative to
- 17 escalations?
- 18 MR. McGILL: Yes, escalation checks.
- 19 MR. FOWLER: I can recall that there were
- 20 times when they may have asked for more information or
- 21 more detail. I cannot recall any times when
- 22 ultimately, we didn't come to agreement.
- MR. McGILL: From my time frame, when did you

- 1 -- when -- when was the period that you elected to --
- 2 to retire from the air -- how long ago was that?
- 3 MR. FOWLER: About a month ago.
- 4 MR. McGILL: About a month ago. I've asked
- 5 several people, and I was just curious. Around in
- 6 April, Boeing had issued a letter stating that all
- 7 operators of MD-80s, they wanted to review the tooling
- 8 that was used, specifically that restraint fixture,
- 9 that was used on the end plate check. Do you recall
- 10 ever seeing that?
- 11 MR. FOWLER: Are you talking about April?
- MR. McGILL: Yes.
- MR. FOWLER: No.
- 14 MR. McGILL: It was in April, yes. Who do
- these letters normally go to? I've asked several
- 16 people, and nobody's ever said that they've received or
- 17 seen them.
- 18 MR. FOWLER: I think the best answer I could
- 19 give you is they go into the Engineering Department
- 20 some place. Okay. Exactly who receives them and who
- 21 does the distribution, I couldn't tell you.
- MR. McGILL: Okay. Because I've asked Jim
- Davey about it, and he couldn't remember either, and I

- 1 was just curious because I've posed the question with
- 2 each operation looking to verify what was -- what was
- 3 happening, and I wanted to know, do you remember that
- 4 even if it got -- and we don't know the person, but was
- 5 anything -- do you remember seeing anything that Alaska
- 6 did to verify that they had the right tooling in that
- 7 particular time frame?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Are you talking about in April?
- 9 MR. McGILL: Yes.
- 10 MR. FOWLER: Keep in mind that I didn't say
- 11 that we did or we didn't get it. All I said is that
- 12 I'm not aware of it, --
- MR. McGILL: Okay.
- MR. FOWLER: -- and I'm -- I think it's --
- 15 it's -- it's safe to say that something like that, I
- 16 wouldn't be aware of, okay, but I can't help with what
- 17 the process is.
- 18 MR. McGILL: Okay. So, someone else would
- 19 have looked -- it just seemed like it was just the
- 20 other day that we've now found out that maybe you had
- 21 the wrong tools, and there was several months in there,
- it looked like, would have been lost if had one right
- away when they received a letter, maybe someone would

- 1 have said, hey, we need to -- to check these things.
- 2 MR. FOWLER: Well, you know, Frank, you have
- 3 the same question that we had, and right now, we're
- 4 investigating that.
- 5 MR. McGILL: The special investigation that
- 6 was done this year, the results were out. Have you
- 7 gone through those results that were issued?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: I have.
- 9 MR. McGILL: Is there any particular feeling
- 10 about any of those? Is it a fair assessment? Did you
- 11 -- were you surprised at anything in that assessment?
- MR. FOWLER: Relative to whether it's a fair
- 13 assessment or not, I'm not sure at this point I could
- 14 answer that question.
- 15 MR. McGILL: That's fair.
- 16 MR. FOWLER: The -- I mean, the whole -the
- 17 whole thing is -- it's a work-in-process, and we've
- 18 responded specifically to the FAA's findings. We've
- 19 provided our responses which in many cases we do not --
- 20 we do not agree that there's a violation, and even
- 21 though we have our differences, I'm not sure at this
- 22 point I could say it's fair or it's not fair until we
- see how it comes out, given our responses.

1	You asked if there are things in there that
2	surprised us. There was one particular piece that
3	surprised me, and that was their you know, over the
4	last number of years, our GMM has not changed
5	substantially.
6	The regulations have not changed
7	substantially. We've had recent inspections from DoD
8	and from FAA, and it was kind of surprising to me to
9	have this inspection now from FAA with the regs not
10	having changed and with our manuals not having changed,
11	okay, with and have the level of the level of
12	concern that was there, okay, because the heavy check
13	process that we use, although there wasn't a comment
14	that that process was wrong, but that the process
15	wasn't in the manual, and I'm not sure at this point in
16	time that we could disagree that that's not an
17	appropriate thing and a good thing to do, which is why
18	we've marched off and done it along with a number of
19	other things.
20	But it was a surprise that I mean, in the
21	past, with the standards not changing, and now, okay,
22	it generated the amount of attention that it did. So,
23	in that regard that was a surprise

- 1 MR. McGILL: Which places me then back to my
- 2 next question along that -- those lines. In October of
- 3 '98, the FAA went under the surveillance system of
- 4 ATOS.
- 5 Prior -- let's take the period prior to the
- 6 Certificate Management Team process that's now in
- 7 place. How was your relationship -- how would you
- 8 define your relationship with the FAA? Were you
- 9 communicating? If there had been a problem like what
- 10 was put on this thing, would -- previously, wouldn't
- 11 somebody have already brought that to your attention,
- 12 and you would have discussed it?
- 13 MR. FOWLER: We've always had pretty
- 14 comprehensive communication between us and the FAA.
- 15 Now, let me clarify.
- 16 When I say "between us and the FAA", I'm only
- 17 talking about us and the Airworthiness side or the PMI
- 18 --
- 19 MR. McGILL: The Parts side. Okay.
- MR. FOWLER: Pardon me.
- MR. McGILL: Right there. PAI/PMI.
- MR. FOWLER: There's -- there's never been --
- there's never been a huge problem in communications.

- 1 Okay. There's -- I mean, -- and I mean that sincerely.
- I mean, we -- we didn't always agree on what we
- 3 communicated to each other. They have their job to do,
- 4 we have our job to do.
- 5 We were always able to work through the issue
- 6 one way or the other. Sometimes we ended up agreeing
- 7 to disagree and doing what we just needed to do. But
- 8 there's never been a lack of communication, if you
- 9 will, between us and the FAA.
- 10 So, -- and I didn't see any change in that,
- okay, in October 1998, relative to when the FAA said
- 12 that they were going to start implementing ATOS. I
- think that's when they said they were going to
- implement ATOS.
- MR. McGILL: So, from your perspective, at
- 16 your level, you didn't hardly see any change at all?
- 17 You still had the PMI and --
- 18 MR. FOWLER: You mean --
- 19 MR. McGILL: -- the PAI.
- 20 MR. FOWLER: Maybe you need to clarify.
- Okay. Asking me if I saw a change in what, okay,
- 22 relative to that cutover to ATOS?
- MR. McGILL: Oversight.

- 1 MR. FOWLER: I think you're making an
- 2 assumption, and you're asking me to make an assumption,
- 3 okay, and that is, that there actually was a cutover to
- 4 ATOS. I never saw a cutover to ATOS.
- It was announced by the FAA that that's when
- 6 it was going to be, but come October of 1998, I mean,
- 7 it was common within the industry as well as within the
- 8 FAA that it hadn't happened in October 1998.
- 9 As a matter of fact, to this day, it's not
- 10 happened. ATOS, I believe, conceptually, is a great
- 11 concept. I think it's really an opportunity, okay, to
- bring this entire industry to another level, but it
- 13 just hasn't gotten completely off the drawing board and
- 14 hasn't been well implemented.
- 15 MR. McGILL: Prior to October '98, what would
- 16 you -- how would you say the number of visits or number
- of times you communicated with the FAA, the frequency
- of their times that they were over here looking at your
- 19 operations? Was there a difference between that time
- and currently?
- MR. FOWLER: I'd be -- I -- I'd be hard-
- 22 pressed to say that there was any difference, okay, but
- 23 I need to clarify that by saying that we saw the FAA a

- 1 lot. The FAA essentially had -- our doors were open to
- 2 the FAA. I mean, unlike some airlines that -- that ask
- 3 the FAA to go through an FAA liaison whenever they come
- in and out of the building, we didn't have that.
- 5 The FAA inspectors on our certificate
- 6 frequently came in in the middle of the night, in the
- 7 middle of the afternoon, on the weekend. They had full
- 8 access to the building and that didn't change with
- 9 ATOS, and that's the way it was after ATOS.
- 10 MR. McGILL: Just to go back a little bit on
- 11 this -- this lubrication issue, where you've now
- 12 reverted back again to Mobil 28, at your level, how was
- 13 that -- how was that presented to you?
- 14 Someone below had to explain what happened
- 15 during this process. Who would have done that? How
- 16 was that -- how was that related?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: You're talking about the process
- 18 that occurred most recently --
- 19 MR. McGILL: Yes, most recently --
- 20 MR. FOWLER: -- to revert back --
- 21 MR. McGILL: -- reverting back to the Mobil.
- 22 MR. FOWLER: Actually, the -- I mean, the
- 23 decision itself and -- and going back to Mobil 28 per

4	me.
3	I mean, Engineering that was a request
4	that came from Engineering, and given what's going on
5	at the time, we certainly complied with it, and, I
6	mean, there was not an argument or a disagreement.
7	The way that I was briefed on that was to
8	just inform me that the FAA had come and said that they
9	wanted us to go back to Mobil 28 on the on the on
10	the MD-80, and that there was a phase-in period that we
11	agreed that they agreed to, had a schedule of when
12	we would do it. So, they briefed me on where that was.
13	The questions that I had relative to the

the FAA's request was not specifically discussed with

1

grease, although I have a ton of questions, and I have 14 a lot of concern with that, Frank, quite frankly, I 15 mean, you start to get into a point now where we draw a 16 17 line between, I mean, who's doing what investigation here, and I have a lot of concern, and we have a lot of 18 19 people that are working on information relative to the grease and Engineering, and I know that they're sharing 20 21 that information, okay, with you folks.

22 So, we've not tried to do -- you know, I've 23 not tried to do my own investigation of the grease, and

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 at this point, I just need to be satisfied that you
- 2 folks and everybody else are asking the same questions
- 3 that I would.
- 4 MR. McGILL: Okay. And was those same kind
- of questions asked to you from people higher than you,
- 6 Mr. Ayer or Mr. --
- 7 MR. FOWLER: No.
- 8 MR. McGILL: No one -- no one come down and
- 9 said, hey, this is in the paper, whatever happened, I
- 10 don't know what happened?
- MR. FOWLER: Well, no, not really. They --
- 12 they -- we all -- we all kind of knew it was in the
- paper at the same time, and we provided what
- information we wanted to provide to the paper, okay,
- 15 given the constraints, you know, with the investigation
- 16 and what we knew at that point in time, but I was not a
- 17 significant source of information because I just hadn't
- 18 been involved with it.
- 19 MR. McGILL: Okay. What about the -- the
- 20 tools that were -- the ground -- I don't know what it
- 21 was. 17-18 airplanes. How was that presented to you?
- 22 MR. FOWLER: You're talking about current
- 23 times, not --

- 1 MR. McGILL: Current times.
- 2 MR. FOWLER: -- at the time of the accident
- 3 or in April?
- 4 MR. McGILL: Yes.
- 5 MR. FOWLER: I found out about that the
- 6 Wednesday before last, which was the day before, okay,
- 7 we went and told the FAA that our Engineering Group,
- 8 you know, had this concern.
- 9 So, I didn't know about it before that, and -
- and, quite frankly, my immediate response at that
- time was not in getting a whole bunch of answers.
- 12 My immediate response at that point was to listen to
- 13 what -- to what Engineering's concerns were and make a
- determination of what we needed to do to ensure, okay,
- our confidence in the safety of the fleet, and that's
- 16 what consumed me for two days.
- 17 So, I didn't ask a lot of questions about the
- 18 tool at that time, except to understand, okay, why
- 19 Engineering, you know, had their differences, and then
- 20 I launched off to make sure that we did the right thing
- 21 with the fleet.
- MR. McGILL: And was there some sort of a
- team put together or a group that looked into this?

- 1 You might have had a tool that was not --
- 2 MR. FOWLER: It's actually on-going at this
- 3 point. Okay. When you say "a team", naturally,
- 4 Engineering is looking at the differences in the tools
- 5 themselves, and -- and whether or not they're concerned
- 6 about the -- it's lack of conformity, okay, actually is
- 7 a problem or is not a problem, they're -- they're
- 8 looking at that now.
- 9 Relative to having a tool that was not in
- 10 conformity, I think we're still -- I know we're still
- investigating that, and we're not at the bottom of that
- 12 yet.
- 13 MR. McGILL: Did you review the Maintenance
- 14 and Engineering Assessment that was done by Jack
- 15 Enders, Bill Hendricks, Gary Pro and that bunch?
- 16 MR. FOWLER: I did.
- 17 MR. McGILL: What -- how were your feelings
- 18 about that? Was that a fair assessment?
- 19 MR. FOWLER: Given that what we asked them to
- 20 do was to not look at, okay, just whether or not we
- 21 were in compliance or not, okay, but where there were
- 22 opportunities to change practices, to become best
- 23 practices, I think it served its purpose.

1	MR. McGILL: Are some of these changes being
2	implemented right now?
3	MR. FOWLER: What we've done is we've
4	prioritized them. Okay. The first order of business
5	naturally is that we've committed to the FAA, okay,
6	certain items in an action plan that we put together
7	for the FAA.
8	Okay. That is Priority 1 because we've
9	committed to them that we're going to do that.
10	Okay. Now, there are a number of the
11	suggestions from the independent audit team, okay, that
12	either coincide with that or will be addressed, okay,
13	at the same time that we action the items from the FAA
14	So, to the extent that they coincide or to
15	the extent that they were things that we need, we were
16	doing anyway, organizational changes and stuff like
17	that, would actually in that list, but they're
18	prioritized along with the FAA items which have first
19	priority.
20	At last count, I think that out of the total
21	number of independent audit items, some 40 percent of
22	them have already been addressed.

MR. McGILL: I think I'm going to let Malcolm

23

- 1 ask you some questions.
- DR. BRENNER: You mentioned that there were
- 3 different areas of disagreement with the FAA that were
- 4 resolved. Can you -- can you describe some of the
- 5 areas from the time you started until the action?
- 6 MR. FOWLER: There weren't a lot. There were
- 7 -- it's not a lot that I became aware of. I was
- 8 keeping in mind that -- that the FAA was -- was most
- 9 routinely involved with Jim Trimberger, okay, and his
- 10 crew. I would only get involved with issues that --
- 11 that appeared as though they were really going to be a
- 12 problem or -- or -- or just general briefing sessions
- with the PMI to bring him up to speed with those things
- we were doing.
- 15 Issues that we had disagreement on, there was
- 16 -- I guess the two that I -- that come to mind are
- 17 having to do with de-icing procedures, and one having
- to do with the installation of a stretcher on the
- 19 airplane.
- DR. BRENNER: Would you talk about that?
- 21 MR. FOWLER: The -- Alaska Airlines uses
- 22 stretcher installations quite frequently, mostly in the
- 23 State of Alaska, for Medivacs and so on, in communities

- 1 where they have limited medical care.
- 2 We have always had stretcher installations
- 3 that had been approved by the FAA and had all of their
- 4 necessary data, structural engineering and so on.
- 5 Essentially, what the stretcher installation
- 6 entails is you fold down a seat, you lay three blankets
- 7 across the top of the seat, put the stretcher on the
- 8 top, and you strap it down. That's what we've always
- 9 done. There may be more details to it than that, but
- 10 that's the way I understand it.
- 11 Not too long ago, our PMI said that he
- believed that that was a major alteration to the
- airplane, okay, and therefore had to be documented in
- 14 the maintenance record, the log book. We didn't agree
- 15 with that.
- 16 We worked it through with them. We asked if
- 17 we could send it to Washington for them to take a look
- 18 at it, and which he agreed to, okay, which they did,
- 19 and they said, well, in the strictest letter of the
- 20 law, yes, it is a major alteration. So, we changed our
- 21 procedures.
- DR. BRENNER: When did that happen?
- MR. FOWLER: I'm going to guess three years

- 1 ago.
- DR. BRENNER: What about the de-ice
- 3 procedures?
- 4 MR. FOWLER: We started using Type 2 De-Icing
- 5 Fluid about -- also about three years ago, as I recall,
- 6 and the early experience that we had with Type 2 De-
- 7 Icing Fluid, we had an MD-80 that took off, and it came
- 8 back. I'm not sure whether it came back, but they
- 9 experienced some problems not too long after take-off,
- okay, where the Type 2 De-Icing Fluid had -- had
- 11 sheered back across the windshield, created some
- visibility problems, and it also evidently sheered back
- across the static ports on the side of the airplane,
- 14 causing the crew to have to use alternate source of
- 15 static.
- We had obviously a lot of concerns about
- 17 that. We immediately halted the use of Type 2 until we
- 18 could understand it.
- 19 As we began to understand it more, okay, we
- 20 realized that a lot of airlines were only applying Type
- 21 2 De-Icing Fluid to the wings, okay, and the tail and
- the control surfaces, and we went to our PMI and said
- we want to do that. We don't want to apply it forward

- of the L-1 door or the forward-entry door, and we don't
- 2 want to apply it to the whole crown, okay, because we
- 3 learned that as the fluid congeals around the static
- 4 ports, as the static ports are heated, it can -- it
- 5 cane solidify or cause a dust or whatever.
- 6 He wouldn't agree with that. He said, "No,
- 7 you have to apply it to the entire crown, okay, and the
- 8 entire fuselage". We still -- I'm not sure if that's
- 9 resolved because I left direct involvement with the
- 10 division a number of years ago, but at that time, we --
- 11 we decided until we got some agreement on this, we were
- only going to use Type 2 Fluid on overnight airplanes
- 13 to protect them from freezing rain or stuff and then
- 14 rinse it all off in the morning.
- We weren't going to go ahead and use Type 2
- 16 Fluid based on what the PMI wanted because we didn't
- 17 think that it was as controllable as we'd like for
- 18 safety.
- 19 DR. BRENNER: What time period was that?
- 20 MR. FOWLER: Again, I think that was three
- 21 years ago.
- DR. BRENNER: And this is John Hubbard you
- 23 were dealing with?

- 1 MR. FOWLER: Yes.
- DR. BRENNER: Who did you deal with on the
- 3 FAA side?
- 4 MR. FOWLER: With -- for Maintenance and
- 5 Engineering issues, every once in awhile, I may have
- 6 had conversations with their inspectors or whatever,
- 7 but by and large, it was John Hubbard.
- 8 DR. BRENNER: How was John Hubbard to work
- 9 with?
- 10 MR. FOWLER: Sometimes a challenge.
- DR. BRENNER: Did you think he was too
- 12 strict?
- 13 MR. FOWLER: I think that, as I said before,
- 14 you know, FAA's got their job to do, and we have our
- job to do, and John -- he's just very strong-willed and
- 16 very strong-minded. I think he's more of a challenge
- to work with than other people we work with.
- DR. BRENNER: What were his strengths as a
- 19 PMI?
- 20 MR. FOWLER: I think he knows his stuff. I
- 21 think that he knows the regs.
- 22 DR. BRENNER: Possible comment could be made
- 23 that the FAA managers did not encourage strict

- 1 enforcement in the case of Alaska Airlines. Can you
- 2 help us evaluate that? Any -- any thoughts on that?
- MR. FOWLER: Well, as I just said, based on
- 4 our relationship with our PMI, I didn't see that, not
- on the M&E side and not on the Airworthiness side.
- DR. BRENNER: And a possible comment could be
- 7 made on the FAA as a possible criticism that they
- 8 rotated their senior managers; they would rotate them
- 9 rather than bring in fresh thoughts or other
- 10 alternatives. Any thoughts on that?
- 11 MR. FOWLER: On them rotating their senior
- 12 managers?
- DR. BRENNER: Yes.
- 14 MR. FOWLER: I didn't see anything where I
- 15 could say pro or con about that.
- DR. BRENNER: And Mary Rose Diffenderfer, who
- 17 had been on the Operations side, any -- any perspective
- 18 that can help us evaluate that whole --
- 19 MR. FOWLER: I was not personally involved in
- any of those issues.
- 21 DR. BRENNER: The Oakland facility, in 1997
- time frame, how was morale? What was the mindset?
- MR. FOWLER: You know, Oakland has always

- 1 been a work group that has essentially had very
- 2 positive morale, and they really had a team effort.
- I think there was only one time that I can
- 4 recall in the history of Oakland, okay, where morale
- 5 waned a little bit, and that was because they were
- 6 having difficulty with attrition.
- 7 DR. BRENNER: What's that?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Turnover.
- 9 DR. BRENNER: Just so I understand, what time
- 10 period?
- 11 MR. FOWLER: I don't know the exact time
- 12 period, quite frankly. I'm not -- don't recall.
- 13 DR. BRENNER: How about their -- their on-
- 14 time performance, completing C checks, '97 period? How
- 15 was that?
- 16 MR. FOWLER: I don't recall the '97 period.
- 17 It's varied. I mean, it's gone from -- from good to
- 18 excellent to good, and sometimes been on the rough
- 19 side.
- 20 DR. BRENNER: Any sense what time periods
- 21 were on the rough side?
- MR. FOWLER: No.
- DR. BRENNER: Any idea why it was rough

- 1 compared to other times?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: I think the reasons varied. I
- 3 think that the period of time when we were having large
- 4 turnover, I think, contributed to that. The period of
- 5 time when the work scope was growing on aircraft and
- 6 requiring more work, and the plan didn't necessarily
- 7 identify all of that. I think that that was -- that
- 8 was a challenge with on-time performance, and just
- 9 opportunities to find out, you know, how you improve
- 10 it.
- DR. BRENNER: What time period was that work
- 12 scope expanding?
- 13 MR. FOWLER: Actually, the work scope, I
- 14 think, is something that changes over a period of time.
- 15 It doesn't change overnight.
- DR. BRENNER: So, was there a specific time
- 17 that -- that -- that we can address?
- 18 MR. FOWLER: I -- I can't tell you exactly,
- okay, when, okay, because I don't recall. I'd have to
- 20 go back and look at the data. I just can't tell you
- 21 exactly, okay, when they had their best on-time type
- 22 performance versus when they had their challenges in
- 23 on-time performance.

1	DR. BRENNER: To what extent did you monitor
2	the on-time performance or were you aware of it or
3	advised of it?
4	MR. FOWLER: I monitored it very closely.
5	DR. BRENNER: On a daily basis?
6	MR. FOWLER: Well, on a daily basis, for the
7	dynamic portion of the operation for line maintenance.
8	On a longer-scale basis, weeks or months apart for
9	heavy maintenance, and the reason for that is because
10	there's there's different there's different ways
11	to improve, and there's different ways to effect the
12	performance in a line maintenance organization on a
13	day-to-day level, and on a heavy maintenance level,
14	it's something that has to be looked at over a period
15	of time.
16	DR. BRENNER: And on a day-to-day basis, what
17	kind of things can you do to effect the line
18	maintenance?
19	MR. FOWLER: We we instituted many years
20	ago a briefing in the morning of the of the delays
21	that occurred the prior day, okay, and just analyzed it
22	and saw where there were opportunities, and if there
23	were opportunities to improve okay you'd communicate

- 1 that, and where it's the nature of our business, then
- 2 that's the way it is.
- 3 DR. BRENNER: And how about the longer-term
- 4 maintenance? What kind of things could you do?
- 5 MR. FOWLER: It really depended on where the
- 6 problem was. Overall, in a heavy maintenance
- 7 operation, you always expect that some airplane's going
- 8 to come out late, another airplane's going to come out
- 9 earlier.
- There's going to be some level of a balance,
- and depending on how -- on how accurate your plan
- matches the amount of time it actually takes, you may
- 13 have to make adjustments. Those adjustments may be to
- 14 expand the time in service for later airplanes, to
- 15 contract an airplane out, add overtime, change the work
- 16 scope.
- 17 There's varying things that you could do to
- 18 effect it.
- DR. BRENNER: I think during your tenure,
- 20 there was a change at Oakland from a five-day work week
- 21 to a seven-day work week, is that correct?
- MR. FOWLER: There was, and there was the
- 23 same change in Seattle.

1 DR. BRENNER: And did you make that o	decision
--	----------

- 2 MR. FOWLER: It was a collective decision.
- 3 It was a recommendation from, as I recall, the
- 4 Maintenance folks at that time and the Planning folks.
- DR. BRENNER: How well did it work out?
- 6 MR. FOWLER: It -- it's always something that
- 7 -- it's always something that needs to be addressed,
- 8 okay, with a lot of communications with the workforce
- 9 because it's not always received positively.
- DR. BRENNER: How was it received at that
- 11 time?
- 12 MR. FOWLER: In Oakland, it was received
- actually pretty well because they understood that there
- 14 was a desire to want to grow the base and the amount of
- 15 work that was done there.
- DR. BRENNER: How often did you visit Oakland
- 17 yourself during that period?
- 18 MR. FOWLER: I probably made two trips a year
- 19 to Oakland since I've been here.
- 20 DR. BRENNER: Did you hear any complaints
- 21 from the -- from the line, from Oakland, during that
- 22 time period?
- MR. FOWLER: No.

- DR. BRENNER: Directly or, I guess, through
- 2 the -- the Evaluation Board?
- 3 MR. FOWLER: No.
- 4 DR. BRENNER: Possible comment that Alaska
- 5 Airlines grew too fast during this period. Can you
- 6 help us evaluate that?
- 7 MR. FOWLER: I don't know how you mean "grew
- 8 too fast".
- 9 DR. BRENNER: Oh, in terms of -- I think in
- 10 the FAA Evaluation, there were some comments about
- 11 that. The size of the -- the relative size of the
- 12 fleet over time, how fast it was growing, the ability
- 13 to -- the number of training personnel, number of signs
- on that, the workload compared to the workforce,
- 15 turnover.
- 16 Do you have a sense that that's true/not true
- 17 or --
- MR. FOWLER: I wouldn't agree with it, and I
- 19 don't think it's fair to lump that all into one -- one
- 20 discussion because it's -- we can't use the global
- 21 number and the total numbers to assess whether or not,
- 22 you know, one thing kept up with another. So, I
- 23 wouldn't agree that we grew too fast.

1	DR. BRENNER: Okay. Thank you. Jim
2	Trimberger. Tell me about Jim Trimberger.
3	MR. FOWLER: Tell you about Jim Trimberger?
4	DR. BRENNER: His strengths as a manager.
5	MR. FOWLER: I think he's Mr. Integrity.
6	He's he's very objective. He's very level-headed.
7	He tends to look at things very objectively and deal
8	with the issue and not the personality. He knows his
9	job. He's very accountable. I think the world of Jim.
10	DR. BRENNER: How about Gerald Summers?
11	MR. FOWLER: I know less directly about
12	Gerald Summers because I didn't have an opportunity to
13	work directly with him that often. I'm not sure it'd
14	be fair to give you an opinion of Gerald.
15	DR. BRENNER: Bill Weaver?
16	MR. FOWLER: Bill is I've known Bill since
17	he came here in '96. As a matter of fact, I hired him.
18	He's he's got a very good grasp for the way the
19	Maintenance and Engineering organization works, the
20	inter-relationships, the interfaces within the
21	organization. He's been very accountable, and he's got
22	a lot of good ideas.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

DR. BRENNER: Bill Ayer?

23

1	MR. FOWLER: Now you're asking me to talk
2	about my boss?
3	DR. BRENNER: Sure.
4	MR. FOWLER: Bill is Bill's a very bright
5	guy. As a matter of fact, he may be one of the
6	brightest guys I've probably ever worked for, and he's
7	it's amazing to me that for somebody that bright,
8	and his has so large a scope of responsibility in
9	the in the entire organization, that he'll also take
10	the time to to care about what the individual needs
11	are.
12	DR. BRENNER: John Kelly?
13	MR. FOWLER: John's also a very bright guy,
14	very capable, very charismatic, and I think he's done a
15	wonderful job with the company and and morale and
16	people, and I think most notably, over the past number
17	of years, he's really pushing ahead very quickly to
18	worked very hard to bring resolution to the many labor
19	contracts that we had open.
20	DR. BRENNER: How have relations been with
21	Maintenance?
22	MR. FOWLER: I'm sorry?

DR. BRENNER: How have relations been between

23

- 1 the company and the Union on the Maintenance side?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: I guess you'd have to talk about
- 3 time frame. I mean, from time to time, they've been
- 4 strained. Most recently, I think they're probably
- 5 stronger and more positive than I've ever seen them
- 6 before.
- 7 Years before that, there were some various
- 8 periods of tension.
- 9 DR. BRENNER: What would be the most recent
- 10 period of tension?
- MR. FOWLER: Oh, April-May 1999, which were
- the last days of negotiating of the AMFA contract.
- 13 DR. BRENNER: What were -- what were the
- 14 difficulties of that?
- 15 MR. FOWLER: Some work disruption,
- 16 distraction, lack of productivity.
- 17 DR. BRENNER: And prior to that period, was
- 18 there another period of disagreement?
- MR. FOWLER: You're just talking about
- 20 mechanics?
- DR. BRENNER: Yes.
- MR. FOWLER: Prior to that period, I'm not
- 23 sure I would call it disagreement. I think I would

- 1 again call it distraction, and that was early in the
- 2 prior year, when there was a split between IEM and
- 3 AMFA.
- 4 Okay. IEM was the original parent bargaining
- 5 unit, okay, and AMFA was elected as the new bargaining
- 6 unit. There was some tension. I'm not sure there was
- 7 a lot in the workplace, but there was also a lot of
- 8 distraction and things to talk about, other than
- 9 focusing a hundred percent on not talking about it.
- DR. BRENNER: And you mentioned that things
- 11 have recently gotten very positive. Why is that?
- MR. FOWLER: Well, I think that the
- 13 relationship with the -- without getting into the
- 14 governance and everything between, you know, the two
- 15 Unions, I think that the -- the interaction and the
- working together that I've seen between AMFA and Bill
- 17 Weaver, okay, is more positive than anything I've seen
- in a number of years, and I think that -- I think that
- 19 credit goes to the -- the folks that represented people
- 20 that really represented their interests and were going
- 21 to work together and find a way to just get -- get past
- 22 some things.
- DR. BRENNER: And as a manager, can you

- 1 evaluate yourself? What are some of your strengths?
- What do you like to emphasize to your folks?
- 3 MR. FOWLER: Safety, accountability and some
- 4 sound business logic behind the decisions we make are
- 5 our strengths, I think.
- DR. BRENNER: And safety? How do you
- 7 emphasize that?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Probably not a day goes by or
- 9 not a day went by that there wasn't a conversation that
- 10 I had with somebody, either in a conference call or
- individually, and stressing to them that there's only
- one day -- one way to do the job, and that is to do it
- 13 right. If you think the airplane's not fixed, the
- 14 airplane's not going to fly.
- DR. BRENNER: And business logic? How do you
- 16 assess that?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: There's -- that's probably been
- 18 the more -- the more difficulties, and that is that,
- 19 you know, we all have -- we all have responsibilities.
- 20 We're all being paid to do a job, and we should -- we
- 21 should be here to do it, and if we're going to -- if
- 22 we're going to talk about a change in the way we do our
- business or a change in the way we spend money, there

- 1 needs to be some logic behind it and some -- some
- 2 analysis that says that the change that we're about to
- 3 make it the right one.
- DR. BRENNER: For example, the change between
- 5 the two greases, did that -- did that come up to your
- 6 level for some kind of review or approval?
- 7 MR. FOWLER: It did not.
- DR. BRENNER: Should it have?
- 9 MR. FOWLER: I do not believe so.
- 10 DR. BRENNER: How's this company different
- 11 from other companies?
- 12 MR. FOWLER: I can only compare it against
- one company because I don't have inside knowledge with
- 14 other companies.
- One of the things that I was really amazed by
- 16 when I first came here, having had the opportunity to
- 17 work for another company, was how much Alaska Airlines
- tries to do for its employees, and various award
- 19 programs, recognition programs, and things like that.
- I think that Alaska really spends a lot of
- 21 time and effort in trying to figure out what's --
- what's a nice thing to do for employees.
- DR. BRENNER: Thank you.

1	MR. McGllL: Dean?
2	MR. HAMILTON: I'll pass right now.
3	MR. LASLEY: I'll pass. Thank you.
4	MR. PAPE: John, just one question. You were
5	BPF Maintenance and Engineering. There was an
6	authorization to where you could come out and inspect.
7	Was there any any any time that that exercise
8	was that you had that authority was exercised?
9	MR. FOWLER: Not only did I never countermand
10	an inspector, I never countermanded an inspector or a
11	maintenance supervisor or mechanic in what they wanted
12	to do to the airplane.
13	MR. PAPE: How would you assess the
14	relationship between QC, QA and and Production in
15	their in their jobs and duties?
16	MR. FOWLER: I think it's appropriate. I
17	mean, sometimes, I think there's some tension in there
18	because you have the QA Department, which a lot of
19	people see as the black-hatted policemen, and they have
20	they have a tough job sometimes in order to remain
21	independent and objective, but I think they do an
22	excellent job in doing that.
23	MR PAPE: That's all I have at this time

1	MR. McGllL: Lance?
2	MR. SEYER: I have a question in regard to
3	spending authority and amounts each department had.
4	For example, the manager of Line Maintenance has
5	authority to spend X amount of dollars before he needs
6	a next-higher authority.
7	Could you tell me who would have the
8	authority to purchase, let's say, a jack screw for one
9	of the C checks if one of them were required?
10	MR. FOWLER: That really it if you're
11	talking about you're talking about a jack screw for
12	the airplane that is out of service and needs it?
13	MR. SEYER: Right.
14	MR. FOWLER: Okay. In the practical sense,
15	what would happen is whoever needed the jack screw
16	would go and order it, and Purchasing would do whatever
17	they needed to get it.
18	MR. SEYER: Okay. Is there a certain at a
19	certain dollar level, does it have to be signed by a
20	director, a vice president, to authorize Purchasing to
21	go out and buy that?
22	MR. FOWLER: For an AOG airplane, parts that
23	are needed to get an airplane back on service, those

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

- 1 are typically signed -- those were typically signed
- 2 after the fact.
- 3 MR. SEYER: So, Purchasing would just go out
- 4 and acquire one regardless of cost?
- 5 MR. FOWLER: Yes.
- 6 MR. SEYER: And then, you would worry about
- 7 paying for it later?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Yes. Well, you wouldn't worry
- 9 about paying for it later. If Purchasing went out and
- ordered it, I mean, we've committed to paying for it.
- 11 The only thing that we ever did -- I'm not exactly sure
- 12 how it is now, I've been away from the division for a
- 13 few years.
- The only thing that we ever did pre-approvals
- on, where Purchasing couldn't purchase it before they
- 16 had a signature, is that they were buying for inventory
- or if they were buying rotables.
- 18 MR. SEYER: Okay. You said you had some
- dealings with the ex-FAA PMI, Mr. Hubbard.
- 20 Can you explain the difference between the
- 21 FAA accepting something and approving something?
- MR. FOWLER: No.
- MR. SEYER: You don't know how that process

- 1 works?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: I -- I don't. I can't
- 3 explain the difference between them accepting something
- 4 and approving something.
- 5 MR. SEYER: Are you a member of the MRB?
- 6 MR. FOWLER: I am not.
- 7 MR. SEYER: Do you know who would have the
- 8 final authority to accept or reject the extension of
- 9 lube intervals?
- 10 MR. FOWLER: The best I could give you is
- 11 something within the Engineering Department.
- MR. SEYER: And I believe you stated that you
- 13 said you had no knowledge of the switch to AeroShell 33
- 14 approximately in 1998?
- 15 MR. FOWLER: I did not.
- MR. SEYER: So, you obviously did not okay
- 17 the switch then?
- 18 MR. FOWLER: I was not aware of it.
- 19 MR. SEYER: That's all I have.
- MR. McGILL: Kristen?
- 21 MS. VON KLEINSMID: First of all, I'd like to
- 22 say it's refreshing to talk to someone who has got some
- answers to some questions. It's a nice change, and we

- 1 asked others about you as a person, and everyone said
- 2 very knowledgeable, and that was the opinion, and I
- 3 think that that's accurate based on my observations so
- 4 far.
- 5 A couple questions. We talked a little bit
- 6 about the IEB Board, and you had mentioned something
- 7 about Customer Service issues and talked about an
- 8 automated weight and balance system, that those were
- 9 one of the things that you were involved in, and I know
- 10 that came up in the team that you guys hired as to not
- 11 having an automated weight and balance system, and I
- 12 guess my -- one of my questions is, when was the time
- 13 frame and your involvement in trying to go towards that
- 14 direction, and how come it's not there yet?
- 15 MR. FOWLER: I don't think it's fair to say
- 16 it's not there yet. Okay. Actually, I think it's --
- 17 it's either there or it's damn close, and if it's not
- 18 there, it's just not there because all of the stations
- 19 aren't using it.
- 20 But the move toward automated weight and
- 21 balance systems is something that I'd say probably was
- initiated two to three years ago.
- 23 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And what stations are

- 1 using that?
- MR. FOWLER: I don't know that.
- 3 MS. VON KLEINSMID: I just know that Los
- 4 Angeles isn't one of them, and I think Anchorage is
- one, and do you know if Seattle --
- 6 MR. FOWLER: I don't know for sure. I know
- 7 that -- I know that the system is up. It's been beta-
- 8 tested. There were some issues with the PMI, which is
- 9 the point which I got involved. There were some issues
- 10 with the PMI, where he was interested in back-up data
- and the ability to go back to paper and so on, which,
- 12 at the last time that I was involved with it, okay, I
- 13 believe it had been resolved, and where they actually
- 14 are in implementation, I'm not certain.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. But that's still,
- to your knowledge, a goal of the company?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: Absolutely.
- 18 MS. VON KLEINSMID: To go in that direction?
- 0 Okay. And then, in talking about safety, we've posed
- 20 the safety question to a number of different
- 21 individuals in the past two days and got what I would
- 22 say are very limited responses.
- You've reeled off all the stuff, but you kept

- 1 saying we, we, we, we. Who is always in terms of --
- who are the other managers under you that participated
- and had as much knowledge regarding the safety, the
- 4 IEB, you talked about all employee reports, crew safety
- 5 meetings that are monthly, the -- okay.
- 6 Who are -- who are these individuals that
- 7 participate with you in developing the safety program?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Talking about the IEB?
- 9 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Sure.
- 10 MR. FOWLER: Okay. The IEB was developed by
- 11 -- actually, I kind of facilitated the process, and
- what was used as a model for the IEB was an advisory
- 13 circular, which the FAA published some number of years
- ago, that gave a number of different models for IEBs,
- and I facilitated the process, I guess, probably five
- 16 years ago, something like that, and the folks that were
- 17 part of it at that time were Jim Winkleman, Ed
- 18 Dochnowski from Flight Operations, Jim Trimberger from
- 19 Maintenance and Engineering, Bob Hanley from Customer
- 20 Service, Martha Mintner from In-Flight.
- 21 I hope I'm not leaving anybody out, but
- 22 that's all I can recall at this point.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay.

- 1 MR. FOWLER: Relative to the quarterly safety
 2 meeting within Maintenance and Engineering, myself,
- meeting wrenth nathreenance and bigineering, myserr,

Bill Weaver, Jim Trimberger, Bob Henman, Art

- 4 Fitzpatrick. I want to say others, but I'm not exactly
- 5 sure -- 100 percent sure. So, I won't. But at least
- 6 them.

3

- What else did you have there, Kristen?
- 8 MS. VON KLEINSMID: There was the monthly
- 9 crew safety meetings.
- 10 MR. FOWLER: Monthly crew safety meetings was
- 11 a -- an objective or a requirement, if you will, a
- 12 performance objective that was given to all our first-
- 13 line supervisors, okay, that through their -- their
- 14 respective managers, okay, that required them to have
- meetings with their crews, okay, once a month, I mean,
- 16 with whoever was in and was available and so on, and
- 17 provide that forum for both communications of safety
- issues as well as any other concerns that the employees
- 19 may have had.
- 20 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And did you get feedback
- as to whether or not they were complying? The managers
- were complying?
- MR. FOWLER: For a number of years, I

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 requested feedback on the compliance with them, and --
- and I received that information, and actually in the
- 3 beginning, on a number of occasions, I asked them for
- 4 their schedules of their meetings so that I could show
- 5 up every once in awhile.
- 6 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Which, I'm assuming, you
- 7 did?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: A couple times.
- 9 MS. VON KLEINSMID: We've talked a little bit
- 10 about escalation in terms of the time intervals on the
- 11 -- on the checks, and I know that one change was --
- 12 I'll just take the lubing, for example. I think that
- 13 was done on every 8-A check, and then it went to an
- 14 eight-month time period.
- 15 Did you have any knowledge or any input as to
- 16 that change?
- MR. FOWLER: No.
- 18 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And then, on the change
- 19 from the 13 months to 15 months?
- 20 MR. FOWLER: As I explained before -- you're
- 21 talking about the 13-month to the 15-month, not lube?
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: No. The C check.
- MR. FOWLER: The C check. As I explained

- 1 before, my involvement with that was to review the
- 2 process, okay, after they had -- they had done it, gave
- 3 myself an opportunity to ask questions.
- 4 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And your response, I
- 5 think, to the question as to who initiated this was you
- 6 believed it was someone within the Engineering
- 7 Department?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Yes.
- 9 MS. VON KLEINSMID: No corporate level
- 10 instigation -- is that something that -- that top-level
- 11 management within Alaska Airlines would be concerned
- about or look at in terms of a potential cost savings
- to the company on maintenance, and there's no
- 14 initiation at your level or one level below or above as
- to discussion in terms of, you know, bringing up this
- 16 idea and getting it going?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: Not that I had.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: And regarding the tooling
- 19 issue on the recent grounding of the 17 aircraft
- 20 because of the suspect tools, you made a statement that
- 21 Alaska Airlines is currently investigating this.
- But the question came out that I have, and
- 23 maybe you can't answer it or you can, I'm not sure, but

- 1 at any time since the crash -- I mean, the incident
- 2 occurred, we have an AD that comes out on February
- 3 11th, superseded, I believe, on the -- I don't know
- 4 what date it was, within a couple days.
- 5 You have a letter from Boeing requesting all
- 6 operators check the tooling, and that's in April, and
- 7 it wasn't until August that Alaska realizes that
- 8 there's a potential problem with -- with tooling.
- 9 Do you have any idea what spurred on the --
- 10 the August date for -- for realizing this?
- 11 MR. FOWLER: I can -- as I said, I became
- aware of it the week before last, when it was -- when
- it was an issue. What's spurring on the August date is
- that Engineering saw some differences in tools or
- 15 identified that it didn't conform to the Boeing
- drawing, okay, and they therefore had some questions
- 17 about its suitability.
- So, I believe that's what's spurring on the August
- 19 -- the August activity.
- 20 As to what transpired between any time
- 21 earlier than that, I -- I can't tell you at this point
- 22 because I don't know.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: So, are you -- was

- 1 Engineering a part of the -- during the AD inspections?
- Were they out as part of -- with mechanics doing any
- 3 in-flight checks or any -- there must have been
- 4 communication between Engineering and the -- the
- 5 analysis of the AD, and was that strictly a maintenance
- 6 issue?
- 7 MR. FOWLER: I -- I would not have expected
- 8 that there would have been any engineers out there with
- 9 mechanics doing this because the initial Airworthiness
- 10 Directive used the existing instructions in the
- 11 Maintenance Manual to comply with the AD.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: I just wanted to clarify
- 13 this. I think you answered it, but I'm going to make
- 14 you answer it again.
- 15 The change back on the -- on the grease from
- 16 AeroShell 33 to Mobil 28, was that initiated on the
- 17 part of Alaska Airlines before communication came from
- the FAA that they weren't going to allow AeroShell 33
- 19 or after?
- 20 MR. FOWLER: I can't tell you for sure, and I
- 21 realize that that contradicts earlier testimony, that I
- 22 said that they reacted to what the FAA asked them to
- do, but since you asked the question that way, I'm not

- 1 sure I know for sure.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: The only reason I brought
- 3 that up is I was under the impression -- I've been with
- 4 the team since February, and I wasn't quite sure, but I
- 5 thought there had already been some action to go back
- 6 to Mobil 28 before the end of March.
- 7 MR. FOWLER: My understanding was what I
- 8 testified to earlier, and that was, it was reaction to
- 9 the FAA, but now that you've asked the question, I have
- 10 some doubts. I'm not sure whether we initiated it or
- 11 whether we reacted.
- 12 MS. VON KLEINSMID: You stated that --
- 13 regarding the grease, that you hadn't any questions
- 14 about the differences in the grease and applications,
- 15 compatibility.
- 16 The statement that you shared with the NTSB,
- 17 your concerns, I guess I need a little bit more --
- 18 MR. FOWLER: Okay.
- 19 MS. VON KLEINSMID: I wasn't quite sure --
- 20 MR. FOWLER: I never -- I never said that I
- 21 had concerns about applicability or compatibility or
- 22 anything. Okay. What I said was, okay, or what I
- 23 meant to say is that I know that this is the subject of

- investigation on the part of the NTSB, and we've been
- 2 providing them information as they have requested it to
- 3 continue their investigation. Okay.
- 4 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And regarding -- going
- 5 back to tools -- I'm sorry. This is the order that I
- 6 have them in my notes.
- 7 You said that there was some concern in the
- 8 Engineering Group regarding the tools, and these are
- 9 the tools that would be used on the fixture for the in-
- 10 flight check.
- 11 Who in Engineering addressed to you the
- 12 concerns regarding the tool?
- 13 MR. FOWLER: Gerardo.
- 14 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Can you give us his first
- 15 name?
- 16 MR. FOWLER: That is his first name.
- 17 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Oh, Gerardo. Last name?
- 18 MR. FOWLER: Hueto, H-U-E-T-O.
- 19 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And he came directly to
- 20 you?
- 21 MR. FOWLER: No. He -- he, together with
- 22 Scott Patterson, okay, briefed me, and I believe Bill
- 23 Weaver and Jim Trimberger all at the same time via

- 1 conference call.
- 2 MS. VON KLEINSMID: And approximately what
- 3 time frame was this?
- 4 MR. FOWLER: That was Wednesday before last,
- 5 as I said, which would have made it August 2nd, and as
- 6 I recall, I took the conference call from home. So, it
- 7 was about 6 in the evening.
- 8 MS. VON KLEINSMID: When the question was
- 9 raised, and I'm going to the Oakland facility in
- 10 particular, regarding the availability to complete C
- 11 checks on time, and I think you made the statement that
- 12 sometimes it was good, sometimes it was excellent,
- 13 sometimes it was rough, and then you went on to say
- that there's many reasons for that, turnover, work
- scope increasing, the plan not encompassing what work
- 16 had to be done.
- 17 But you didn't mention the fact that the plan
- 18 -- any change in the plan from a five-day work week to
- 19 a seven-day work week, and I'm sort of wondering if
- 20 that also could have had an impact. That's my first
- 21 question.
- 22 My second question being, have you ever spent
- 23 any time analyzing that?

1	MR. FOWLER: Let me ask let me answer the
2	first question first.
3	Whether or not the change from a five-day to
4	a seven-day work week would have impacted that? I
5	don't believe so because when we changed from five to
6	seven days, we also added the commensurate number of
7	staff to provide the number of man hours that were
8	needed each day. I mean, approximately 30 percent
9	increase in labor for the increase of the additional
10	two days a week.
11	And your second question was?
12	MS. VON KLEINSMID: I've forgotten. Have you
13	analyzed that that overall impact on the plan as to
14	maybe being a reason why there's been more than often
15	aircraft being late out of C check, as being that
16	might have some potential impact to that.
17	MR. FOWLER: I'm still not sure I'm I
18	understand what you're asking.
19	MS. VON KLEINSMID: Let me rephrase it. Have
20	you done any analyses on productivity, breaking it

the number of days the airplane is planned in there,

MR. FOWLER: We have done comparisons between

down, say, by days of the week?

20

21

22

23

- 1 the number of days that it's required out, balanced
- 2 that against the number of man hours that are required
- 3 into the airplane, to validate whether or not the
- 4 staffing was there or whether or not we under-estimated
- 5 the work or over-estimated the work or whether or not
- 6 it was just something that was unexpected that came up
- 7 during the check, and the -- I mean, the findings are -
- 8 are various.
- 9 I mean, there's -- there's no one silver
- 10 bullet that you can say it will -- will solve any
- individual problem. I don't think you're ever going to
- have a time ever where every single heavy check
- airplane comes out on time or early.
- 14 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. Has there been any
- analysis, particularly analyzing -- I know that records
- are maintained in terms of an open item for, and, you
- 17 know, the number of changes as you go through the
- shifts in terms of completing the non-routine items and
- 19 the regular routine items.
- 20 Any analysis or any plans, any thoughts,
- 21 anyone came up to you and asked you, has anyone looked
- 22 at whether or not Saturday and Sundays are -- are
- productive work days compared to Monday through Friday?

- 1 MR. FOWLER: I don't think we've done that
- 2 analysis.
- 3 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Has that question ever
- 4 come across in your mind?
- 5 MR. FOWLER: Actually, quite frankly, no, it
- 6 hasn't, because if you look at the industry norm, the
- 7 industry norm is that heavy maintenance operations
- 8 operate seven days a week. It's really a matter of
- 9 asset utilization.
- 10 Why would you have an airplane sitting on the
- ground for two days a week, okay, or have an airplane
- 12 sitting on the ground for 14 days if you could have the
- 13 airplane back in service in 10?
- 14 MS. VON KLEINSMID: The only problem being
- that you're assuming that every single day of the week
- is a -- is an equitable number in terms of
- 17 productivity, and that's a big key to that.
- 18 MR. FOWLER: Maybe I'm dating myself, but,
- 19 you know, when you sign on in this industry, you accept
- 20 that it's a 24-hour-a-day/7-day-a-week job, and I think
- 21 that the majority of the folks out there understand
- 22 that.
- 23 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. Is Oakland

- 1 currently in the C check scheduled to seven days?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: The -- Oakland is currently
- 3 working seven days a week.
- 4 MS. VON KLEINSMID: What about Seattle?
- 5 MR. FOWLER: Seattle, last I was directly
- 6 involved, was working seven days a week. I believe it
- 7 is, also.
- 8 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Are you a participant in
- 9 the 8 a.m. meeting? I think this is the meeting where
- 10 you talked about being involved with the delays, and
- when we addressed line maintenance, you said you're a
- daily -- usually daily sort of get involved in that.
- Is that the 8 a.m. meeting?
- MR. FOWLER: Let's clarify. Okay. When I
- was directly -- when I had full responsibility for M&E
- 16 as the division officer, then I was not involved with
- 17 the 8:00 meeting. Okay. What I would do is meet with
- my staff at 7:30 in the morning, okay, on various
- 19 issues. Okay. I would review the previous day's
- 20 operations.
- The 8:00 meeting would have been run by the
- 22 Assistant Vice President of Maintenance. Okay. I may
- or may not have listened in on that meeting but

- 1 typically was not a participant.
- 2 Since I left M&E, when I say "left M&E", I
- 3 was no longer directly their division officer, I have
- 4 not plugged into the 8:00 meeting.
- 5 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Conference call. Okay.
- 6 Have you ever been involved in -- you mentioned the
- 7 AOG, aircraft on ground situation. Say an aircraft has
- 8 got a mechanical failure, and it's not going anywhere.
- 9 It's not carrying passengers.
- 10 Have you ever been directly involved in any
- capacity where you've made phone calls to mechanics
- working on the aircraft or made a phone call to a pilot
- 13 who might have written up the maintenance log or
- 14 refused to fly the aircraft?
- MR. FOWLER: My involvement with issues of
- 16 that nature would have been through Maintenance
- 17 Control.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: So, you're stating that
- 19 you've never personally made any phone calls directly
- 20 to -- to a mechanic working on the aircraft or a pilot?
- MR. FOWLER: That's what I'm saying.
- 22 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. And you're
- familiar with the MIG-4 card on the non-routine

- following C check?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: Generally.
- 3 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. Can you -- can --
- 4 you're familiar with the -- first of all, the MIG-4 and
- 5 the procedures, the different --
- 6 MR. FOWLER: That was a number of questions.
- 7 Ask me again.
- 8 MS. VON KLEINSMID: The different blocks on
- 9 the MIG-4, are you --
- MR. FOWLER: Okay.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: The supervisor, when they
- 12 sign off -- take a look at it. Is -- it is our
- understanding, my understanding that the approved
- 14 action to replace the jack screw was signed off by a
- 15 supervisor, Ross Belfour, and then, three days later,
- on the 30th, that decision was overridden by a lead
- 17 mechanic, Ron Hansil.
- 18 What authority does a lead mechanic have to
- 19 override the supervisor?
- 20 MR. FOWLER: I -- I'm not -- I am not
- 21 personally familiar with every block in here and who
- 22 signs it and who does what. So, I'm not sure I can
- answer your question, but I would offer that whether

- 1 it's a mechanic or whether it's a supervisor, whether
- 2 it's a lead, okay, if an employee has an issue with an
- 3 airplane and says that something different needs to be
- 4 done, okay, that employee certainly has the right to
- 5 make that known.
- 6 MS. VON KLEINSMID: But you're not aware in
- 7 terms of either procedure written in your manuals as to
- 8 -- to signature authority or overriding authority?
- 9 MR. FOWLER: I am not.
- 10 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Any -- any idea of who
- 11 may be aware or have that information to be able to
- answer that question within your organization?
- 13 MR. FOWLER: Well, I think that the -- that
- 14 the people to ask would be the people that are directly
- involved with the process, and I'm not directly
- 16 involved with this process.
- 17 MS. VON KLEINSMID: I think that's all the
- 18 questions I have right now. Thanks.
- 19 MR. McGILL: Dave?
- DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. Mr. Fowler, are you
- 21 familiar with the O53 form that pilots use?
- MR. FOWLER: I've seen it.
- DR. CRAWLEY: So, do you know what that form

- 1 is used for?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: My understanding is that it's a
- 3 form for pilots to fill out to communicate either
- 4 irregular operations, I suspect there's probably
- 5 certain specific times when the pilot's required to
- 6 fill it out, okay, or for just general communication or
- 7 input.
- 8 DR. CRAWLEY: Are you -- do you know whether
- 9 there's any tracking of those or computerized databases
- 10 maintained for those?
- 11 MR. FOWLER: I don't know.
- DR. CRAWLEY: You don't know what happens to
- 13 them after they're filled out then?
- MR. FOWLER: No.
- DR. CRAWLEY: You don't know if there's any
- 16 procedure for following up on them?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: You'd have to ask somebody in
- 18 Flight Operations. I don't know that.
- 19 DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. Maybe that wasn't a fair
- 20 question to ask somebody in Maintenance.
- 21 Did -- did you try to familiarize yourself
- with the contents of the Emergency AD that came out on
- 23 February 11th from the FAA regarding the inspections of

1	the jack screws?
2	MR. FOWLER: Yes.
3	DR. CRAWLEY: Did you also familiarize
4	yourself with the process of how the the actual
5	procedures for completing these checks to some degree?
6	MR. FOWLER: I'm not sure what you're asking.
7	DR. CRAWLEY: Did you try to familiarize
8	yourself with what was meant by a "visual" inspection
9	and what was meant by an "in-flight" check?
10	MR. FOWLER: Yes.
11	DR. CRAWLEY: How how did you familiarize
12	yourself with those things?
13	MR. FOWLER: I had Engineering come over and
14	review the AD with me, the Airworthiness Directive with
15	me, and as I recall specifically, you'll remember that
16	we launched off and started doing our own inspection,
17	okay, not in-flight, okay, but visual inspection, okay,
18	in advance of the Airworthiness Directive.
19	So, when the Airworthiness Directive came
20	out, I asked Engineering to come over, okay, and review
21	with me what the Airworthiness Directive said, what the

differences were between it and the inspection that we

had initiated on our own and then walk me through how

22

23

- 1 it was actually done.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Did -- did Mr. Weaver help to
- 3 keep you apprised of what was going on there?
- 4 MR. FOWLER: You know, as I -- I'm not sure.
- 5 As I recall, I think Weaver was still in Oxnard.
- 6 DR. CRAWLEY: I see. Did -- did Mr. Ayer or
- 7 Mr. Kelly get involved or concerned about these being
- 8 done properly, and did -- did you brief them on what
- 9 was going on as far as these checks went?
- 10 MR. FOWLER: That was a number of questions.
- 11 Maybe you could ask one at a time.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Did -- did you brief Mr. Ayer
- or Mr. Kelly about the progress of these -- the
- 14 requirements of the progress of these checks?
- 15 MR. FOWLER: I don't recall where Mr. Kelly
- 16 was at that time. I'm not sure if he was back from Los
- 17 Angeles or whether he wasn't, but I was communicating
- 18 with Bill Ayer on a daily basis relative to what the --
- 19 the mandate was, what was required, and what our
- findings were, what our schedule was, and -- and so on.
- 21 DR. CRAWLEY: Did any of the three of you or
- 22 Mr. Weaver or anyone in Engineering have any concerns
- about just making sure that the procedure was complying

- 1 totally with the Emergency AD? Assuring Quality
- 2 Control and Quality Assurance, I suppose.
- MR. FOWLER: When you say "any concerns" that
- 4 we were complying with the AD, I'm not sure what you're
- 5 -- the AD required -- what the AD did, okay, is it
- 6 provided a specific time frame, okay, for which to do a
- 7 task that was already articulated in the Maintenance
- 8 Manual. So, it was not a new task, it was a new
- 9 frequency for the task, a new frequency for the
- 10 inspection and so on.
- So, I'm not sure that that -- you know, just
- 12 changing the frequency and how often we did an
- inspection would have generated concern of anybody for
- 14 compliance with the AD.
- 15 DR. CRAWLEY: Was there consideration of any
- 16 special training for the people who were going to be
- 17 doing these checks and considering the fact that this
- is normally a check that is done during a major C
- 19 check?
- 20 MR. FOWLER: Not that I'm aware of.
- 21 DR. CRAWLEY: Let me ask a couple questions
- 22 on this change to the grease. You mentioned that you
- 23 didn't become aware of that till after the crash and --

- 1 and the NTSB became interested in that.
- 2 Do you know who actually initiated the change
- 3 in the grease?
- 4 MR. FOWLER: No, I don't.
- 5 DR. CRAWLEY: Has there been any kind of
- 6 internal investigation within Alaska to pursue that?
- 7 MR. FOWLER: Relative to who initiated it?
- 8 DR. CRAWLEY: Yes.
- 9 MR. FOWLER: Not past what the NTSB is doing.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Have you reviewed this MEO-1
- 11 process at all, where the -- effects a change to the
- 12 Maintenance Program?
- 13 MR. FOWLER: That's part of the whole
- 14 investigation.
- DR. CRAWLEY: So, as it stands right now, the
- 16 same MEO-1 form and the process for making a change to
- 17 our Maintenance Manual would still be in place at this
- 18 time?
- 19 MR. FOWLER: It is.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Are you familiar with the MEO-1
- 21 form?
- MR. FOWLER: Generally.
- DR. CRAWLEY: Who approves the form, and --

- and to finally approve the process when it's finished?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: I'm generally aware of the form.
- 3 I'm not intimately aware of the procedure. I'd have
- 4 to check the GMM.
- 5 DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. Has there been any
- 6 change to the General Maintenance Manual for evaluating
- 7 a jammed stabilizer since the crash of Flight 261?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Not that I'm aware of.
- 9 DR. CRAWLEY: Has there been any concern at
- 10 your level or have you been aware of any concern about
- 11 possibly changing the troubleshooting procedures for a
- jammed stabilizer?
- 13 MR. FOWLER: I'm not familiar with exactly
- 14 what's in the Maintenance Manual now for trouble-
- 15 shooting procedures. There is a great deal of
- 16 awareness out there among all mechanics and Maintenance
- 17 Control, okay, with where we've been on stabilizers
- 18 right now, and I am very confident that if there is any
- 19 -- any indication at all in the discrepancy that's
- 20 reported on an airplane, okay, they're going to
- 21 investigate the jack screw.
- 22 DR. CRAWLEY: You're saying that they -- even
- if it involved going beyond this troubleshooting that's

- 1 in the General Maintenance Manual?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: I don't know what -- I don't
- 3 think the General Maintenance Manual includes trouble-
- 4 shooting.
- 5 DR. CRAWLEY: Okay. I think that's all the
- 6 questions I have.
- 7 MR. McGILL: John, let's take a few minutes
- 8 here.
- 9 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
- 10 MR. McGILL: Dick?
- 11 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. I apologize, I didn't
- 12 realize that I was the last one to question. I could
- have told you we didn't need the break.
- John, would you know if your -- internally,
- if you could have made any decisions about changing the
- 16 standard by which you would accept or reject an end
- 17 plate measurement on the jack screws, other than what
- 18 is in the manual?
- 19 MR. FOWLER: Changing the standard by which
- we would accept or reject?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, sir. Lowering the
- 40,000ths tolerance.
- MR. FOWLER: On a number of occasions lately,

- okay, we've changed jack screws that were less than
- 2 40,000ths, and the reason why we have is because we had
- 3 two airplanes out there, maybe, and I think there were
- 4 34, okay, which is obviously well within the limits,
- 5 but the presence of that deferred item in the log book,
- and the pilot's reading that it was at 34,000ths of an
- 7 inch, okay, and -- and saying that's too close, too
- 8 much or whatever, we just figured that right now, with
- 9 all the anxiety that everybody's going through, why
- 10 create something else, okay, for people to be concerned
- 11 or worried about.
- So, we haven't changed the standard. I mean,
- 13 the manufacturer's limits, I mean, are still what we
- 14 use for go or no-go, but we've made some subjective
- decisions in some cases for the reasons that I just
- 16 mentioned.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: And with respect to a similar
- 18 situation, it appears if you tracked the investigation
- and the pre-investigation stuff, such as the '97 C-5
- 20 check for 963, there is a measure of variability in the
- 21 end plate readings that are achieved on -- on the
- checks.
- Would you agree with that statement?

- 1 MR. FOWLER: I've never done the check
- 2 myself.
- 3 MR. RODRIQUEZ: No. But, I mean, information
- 4 that comes to you and the feedback that you're getting,
- 5 do you recognize that there's, I don't want to say
- 6 "significant", but I'll let you use the words, that
- 7 there is variability in the end plate checks that your
- 8 company is getting on jack screws?
- 9 MR. FOWLER: Generally, yes.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Is there any concern in your
- mind or was there before you applied for whatever you
- 12 call it, make known your impending retirement?
- 13 Was there any concern for a need to go out
- 14 and train or ensure that mechanics were doing the end
- 15 plate check accurately or correctly?
- 16 MR. FOWLER: You're talking about current
- 17 times?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, sir.
- 19 MR. FOWLER: I believe we've essentially
- 20 already done that. What we've done is we've -- we've
- 21 tried -- we've done our best to relegate all of the end
- 22 plate checks to Oakland, okay, where they're using the
- 23 same people to check it, to check them every time they

- 1 get checked, and we've done that, quite frankly, Dick,
- I mean, for exactly the reasons you said, and that is,
- 3 we've seen some variability, and we wanted to make sure
- 4 that -- that we took out whatever variable there was.
- 5 So, we've -- we've used the same mechanics in
- 6 Oakland. As a matter of fact, this most recent
- 7 exercise that we went through, when there was a
- 8 question of the tools, okay, in order to use our best
- 9 efforts and get the fleet back in the air as quickly as
- 10 possible, if we had relegated all of those inspections
- 11 to Oakland, we would have had the 17 airplanes on the
- 12 ground much longer.
- So, instead, what we did was we did the
- 14 airplanes in Oakland. We did two airplanes in San
- 15 Francisco, but we did them with mechanics from Oakland,
- 16 okay, that had already had a great deal of experience
- in doing the check.
- 18 We did those checks in Phoenix, and we sent
- 19 Andy Lieber down there to observe the readings on all
- 20 the first two checks in Phoenix, and in Seattle, all of
- 21 the checks that were done in Seattle were done and
- 22 witnessed by Gerardo.
- So, we've essentially done what you've

- 1 suggested, and again, quite frankly, it's because we
- 2 have seen the same variability, and, quite frankly,
- 3 there still are some questions, you know, relative to
- 4 that -- that end plate measurement itself as -- I mean,
- 5 let's face it, the procedure's already been changed at
- 6 least once that I'm aware of in the Maintenance Manual
- 7 from what was in effect during the -- at the time of
- 8 the accident, and I think that there's probably a lot
- 9 more to learn about it.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, I guess the question I
- 11 would ask is, did Andy or Gerardo, other than
- 12 observing, did they do any instruction of the mechanics
- 13 involved?
- MR. FOWLER: We earlier had sent Andy down to
- 15 -- down to Phoenix to provide an OJT session, if you
- 16 will, on-the-job training session, for folks that were
- in Phoenix that were doing our end plate checks.
- So, I know that that had formally happened in
- 19 Phoenix. Relative to the most recent visit of Andy to
- 20 -- to Phoenix for these most recent end plate
- 21 measurements, I couldn't tell you whether or not he did
- 22 any additional training past his involvement with the
- 23 measurements at that time.

1	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Is is Phoenix a pressure
2	relief valve Oakland facility? If the programming of
3	checks produces a glut of of needed checks, the
4	overflow goes to Phoenix or or what?
5	MR. FOWLER: We have two substantial
6	maintenance vendors that we use on the outside. One is
7	Phoenix, and one is B.F. Goodrich, okay, up in Everett
8	at Payne Field.
9	The amount of heavy maintenance that we have
10	that we're doing right now, okay, because it's one of
11	the peaks because we have a number of airplanes that
12	were acquired six-seven years ago, they're coming up on
13	their first D check or 30k check or whatever, okay, and
14	our in-house capacity couldn't handle all them at the
15	same time.
16	So, we have two substantial maintenance
17	vendors on our ops spec that we send those airplanes to
18	on the outside. So, they're actually they're
19	handling, I mean, on a steady diet, okay, a certain
20	portion of our heavy maintenance work.
21	So, there are already vendors that are doing
22	the work on the airplanes.

Now, to your question, whether or not they're

23

- 1 a relief valve, if there's a need to send another
- 2 airplane outside, okay, we may do that with either B.F.
- 3 Goodrich in Everett or AMS in Phoenix, and if it's an
- 4 MD-80, more than likely, right now, in today's
- 5 environment, yes, it would go to Phoenix, but it
- 6 wouldn't be fair to characterize them as existing or
- 7 our business relationship existing only to take
- 8 overflow work out of Oakland.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Well, I guess the
- 10 reason for my question is, are you confident of the
- 11 capabilities of those mechanics to perform to the
- 12 standards that Alaska expects?
- MR. FOWLER: Absolutely.
- 14 MR. RODRIQUEZ: I apologize. I don't have
- 15 this source, but I'm -- I -- I was informed by someone
- 16 that apparently some mechanics at Phoenix facility were
- 17 unable to -- to do the end plate check based on
- 18 examination of the task card that was presented to
- 19 them. Are you familiar with that at all?
- MR. FOWLER: No, I'm not.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you -- and you may have
- 22 said, but let me just clarify it. Do you know, do you
- 23 have a specific list of mechanics that are authorized

- 1 to do an end plate check at Phoenix?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: I don't know the answer to that.
- 3 I certainly don't have that list personally. Whether
- 4 that list exists or not, I -- I don't know.
- 5 MR. RODRIQUEZ: The training -- the decision
- 6 to send Andy and Gerardo out, who made that?
- 7 MR. FOWLER: I did.
- 8 MR. RODRIQUEZ: You did. Was there any input
- 9 from your subordinates reference that action?
- 10 MR. FOWLER: Not that I recall, but the --
- 11 the -- the forum within which we made that decision,
- okay, or I made that decision, okay, was more one of
- 13 collaboration.
- 14 We had -- I was there. Line Maintenance
- 15 director was there. Base Maintenance director was
- 16 there. We had Line Maintenance Planning there, various
- 17 other folks, as we worked through this planning process
- of how we were going to address the inspection process
- 19 as well.
- 20 So, there were four or five of us sitting
- 21 around. Okay. We -- we put this plan together, so
- 22 that we could put -- get Operations Control into action
- with rerouting airplanes and so on and so on.

1	So, it wasn't like I mean, it was my
2	suggestion. I mean, it just came as part of the normal
3	discussion, you know. Well, what are we going to do
4	with checks? Well, we've been doing them in Oakland.
5	How about if we also do them here and here?
6	Okay. We provide additional people as well
7	because when you have an airplane in like, take for
8	instance, Phoenix, we hadn't been doing the end plate
9	checks in Seattle. We hadn't been doing those end
10	plate checks obviously in San Francisco.
11	So, we certainly didn't want to put airplanes
12	there, okay, where people were going to do them that
13	hadn't done them before, and relative to Phoenix, we
14	were going to be having them do end plate checks
15	essentially around the clock, and we knew that the
16	people that did the end plate checks on the airplanes
17	that were in there for 30k or whatever, if they had two
18	or three people that had done it before, that might be
19	fine for an airplane that's there for six weeks because
20	they can always schedule around those people being
21	there, but for airplanes being there around the clock,
22	it seemed like the best way for us to provide
23	assurance, okay, that we had a good accurate reading

- 1 was just to control it that way. So, that's what we
- 2 did.
- 3 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Can you tell me who is
- 4 heading up your investigation internally on the tools?
- 5 MR. FOWLER: It's a joint effort between an
- 6 outside lawyer that we have, who's been working with us
- 7 this whole time, and Jim Trimberger and Ken
- 8 Blankenship, for that matter, our Director of Quality
- 9 Assurance.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And the lawyer?
- 11 MR. FOWLER: I believe his name is Jeff Judd.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Apologies to Dean, but may I
- 13 ask, --
- MR. FOWLER: You certainly may, and -- and I
- 15 expected you to, and I was going to offer it if you
- 16 didn't.
- I think it goes without saying, okay, whether
- we in Maintenance like it or not, okay, it goes without
- 19 saying that right now, everything that Maintenance does
- 20 is under a microscope. Okay. There's some level of at
- least question, okay, as to, you know, the process that
- is used and things like tools and stuff like that, and
- 23 we thought that in order to make sure that -- at least

- 1 to assure ourselves that we had the most objective
- 2 investigation possible, that we not just have it done
- 3 internally by our own people, we also involved somebody
- 4 from the outside.
- 5 So, we decided to have them do that because
- 6 this individual had also -- you know, he's been working
- 7 with us for guite some time. That's the reason why
- 8 he's involved.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. And as far as
- 10 initiation of the investigation, could you give us a
- 11 date when --
- 12 MR. FOWLER: When it was initiated?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yeah.
- MR. FOWLER: Well, this all transpired on --
- between August 2nd, 3rd and 4th, and I discussed with
- 16 -- with Bill Ayer and some others just before I left on
- 17 August 4th to take a few days off. So, it was
- 18 initiated on the 4th.
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And a little bit about how
- they're going about it, since we passed Mr. Trimberger,
- and he didn't seem to know anything about it or we
- 22 couldn't get anything out of him, and I haven't seen
- 23 Mr. Blankenship yet.

- 1 How are they operating? What's their MO?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: I -- I -- that's not one of
- 3 those things I got a vote in.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: I see.
- 5 MR. FOWLER: And I have not been directly
- 6 involved, and I have not gotten briefed.
- 7 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. And you don't know, so
- 8 you don't know what the status is?
- 9 MR. FOWLER: I don't know.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you still have enough pull
- 11 within the company to give us an update on it?
- MR. FOWLER: Well, I'm not sure --
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: By request or should we make
- the request of Mr. Trimberger?
- MR. FOWLER: I think it would be appropriate
- 16 for you to make the request.
- 17 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Would you do that,
- 18 Frank?
- MR. McGILL: Okay.
- 20 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Good. I -- I at least have
- 21 been intrigued by the -- the continuing problem of the
- grease as well, and we've been similarly unsuccessful
- in getting information about where this came from, and

- 1 I'm just wondering if, in coordination within the
- 2 company internally, in any capacity, way, shape or
- 3 form, you would have knowledge of where the idea to
- 4 switch to AeroShell 33 originated?
- 5 MR. FOWLER: As to an individual?
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes.
- 7 MR. FOWLER: I don't know.
- 8 MR. RODRIQUEZ: And as to the source of the
- 9 AeroShell 33?
- MR. FOWLER: You mean the supplier?
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm.
- MR. FOWLER: Oh, I wouldn't know the
- 13 supplier. I mean, I would suspect AeroShell or their
- 14 distributor.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: We've talked about the -- the
- 16 MIG-4 card on the C-5 check for 963 in September '97,
- 17 and I realize you were not privy to the activity at the
- 18 time, but as a manager subsequent and becoming aware of
- 19 the activity, I -- would you -- would you be concerned
- that you nearly bought a jack screw unnecessarily in
- 21 any capacity? Were you ever -- would something of that
- level ever surface as a problem within the company,
- that, hey, we almost wasted \$60,000 or something like

- 1 that?
- 2 MR. FOWLER: I think it would be an
- 3 opportunity to go back to those involved and explain to
- 4 them, you know, how the limits are used, and what the
- 5 limits mean, okay, and to let them know that the jack
- 6 screw was within limits, and it didn't need to be
- 7 changed.
- 8 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm. But apparently that
- 9 never took place?
- 10 MR. FOWLER: I couldn't tell you what took
- 11 place, Dick, because I don't know.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. I'm not big on
- 13 newspapers.
- MR. FOWLER: Thank you.
- 15 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Who is -- who is your
- 16 replacement?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: I'm not sure it's fair to say
- 18 that it's my replacement because the person that is
- 19 coming in will not end up with all the responsibilities
- 20 that I've had.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: I see.
- MR. FOWLER: But the person that's coming in
- 23 relative to Maintenance and Engineering, okay, his name

- 1 is Mickey Cohen.
- 2 MR. RODRIOUEZ: C-O-H-E-N?
- MR. FOWLER: That's correct.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, without getting too
- 5 involved or pre-judging activity, are there other
- 6 hirings anticipated in this -- at this level or in this
- 7 general management structure?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Well, as you know, there's --
- 9 there's a number of positions that recently, in
- 10 identifying a reorganization in Maintenance and
- 11 Engineering, that are being added. Relative to this
- 12 level, not that I'm aware of.
- 13 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Is any of this activity in
- 14 any way related to the FAA -- the resolution of the
- 15 FAA's suggestion that they would withdraw your
- 16 maintenance authority?
- MR. FOWLER: Any of what?
- 18 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, any of the additional
- 19 people that are being --
- 20 MR. FOWLER: We talked about two things. We
- 21 talked about the person that's "replacing" me, and then
- 22 we talked about some other additions as well. So, I'm
- 23 not sure which piece you were talking about.

1	MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, I just assumed that
2	since no one person's going to replace you, there will
3	be some adjustment
4	MR. FOWLER: Thanks.
5	MR. RODRIQUEZ: No one person is going to
6	replace you. There will be adjustments in duties,
7	responsibilities and organizational structure or wiring
8	diagrams.
9	MR. FOWLER: From my other responsibilities?
10	MR. RODRIQUEZ: In your absence, there's
11	going to be some adjustments, and I don't need to know
12	who and what their titles will be. I just was curious.
13	Is any of that activity in any way related
14	directly to the FAA indictment of the Maintenance
15	Program or whatever you want to call it?
16	MR. FOWLER: Okay. None of the
17	organizational changes related to me, okay, or the new
18	person that comes in to "replace" me or the
19	reassignment of the other functions that currently
20	report to me are in any way related to the FAA
21	inspection findings.
22	MP PODPIONET Obey May I ack what you

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

23 anticipate doing?

- 1 MR. FOWLER: Well, I'm going to --
- 2 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Do you have a position that
- 3 you're going to?
- 4 MR. FOWLER: I'm going to play a lot of golf
- 5 and ski a lot and ride my motorcycle.
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: So, at this point, it is in
- 7 fact a retirement of sorts?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Take some time to see if I'm
- 9 mentally ready to do that, but that's the intention.
- 10 MR. RODRIQUEZ: All right, sir. In your
- 11 earlier testimony, you indicated that you had discussed
- 12 utilization versus calendar intervals or standards with
- 13 FAA.
- 14 MR. FOWLER: I didn't personally.
- 15 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Oh. But people working for
- 16 you have?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: Related to me, okay, when we
- 18 reviewed the -- the escalation of the C check to 15
- 19 months, --
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Hm-hmm.
- MR. FOWLER: -- okay, I recall in that
- conversation, okay, discussion, okay, about the
- 23 utilization of the airplane versus the 15 months and

- 1 their communication with the FAA.
- I didn't have that communication myself, and
- 3 I don't remember the details of it.
- 4 MR. RODRIQUEZ: All right. Do you remember
- 5 who was involved in the FAA? Was it Hubbard?
- 6 MR. FOWLER: I would speculate that it was,
- 7 but I don't know, and my lawyer's going to kick me for
- 8 speculating.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: That's okay. I've gotten
- 10 other speculation out of the previous witnesses.
- 11 Also, you made some reference to the fact
- that you had done or that the company had done no
- independent study of grease or not doing any
- independent activity, but I got correspondence with Mr.
- 15 Clark indicating that the company had contracted
- independently for a study with respect to AeroShell 33
- 17 and copper. Are you familiar with that?
- 18 MR. FOWLER: No, I'm not.
- 19 MR. RODRIQUEZ: You're not. What was the --
- 20 what was the objection of Mr. Hubbard to Type 2 -- a
- 21 mixture of fluids on the aircraft de-icing activity?
- 22 Do you know?
- MR. FOWLER: He -- he had no objection to the

- 1 mixture of de-icing fluids on the airplane. His
- 2 objection was that he believed that it needed to be
- 3 applied to the entire airplane, and our position was
- 4 that to apply Type 2 fluid to the entire airplane was
- 5 actually less safe than only applying it to the wings
- 6 and the control surfaces because of the -- of the other
- 7 issues associated with it streaming across windows and
- 8 running down across static flows.
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Was it your intention or was
- it your proposition to de-ice with Type 1 on all but
- 11 the wings and control surfaces and use Type 2 there?
- 12 MR. FOWLER: Yes. Type 2 is not a -- not a
- 13 de-icer. It's an anti-icer.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, sir.
- 15 MR. FOWLER: So, you would -- you would use
- 16 Type 1 first.
- 17 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, I thought perhaps you
- were suggesting not to de-ice the rest of the aircraft
- 19 --
- MR. FOWLER: No.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: -- at all.
- MR. FOWLER: No, no. We were not suggesting
- 23 to dispatch the airplane with frost or ice on the

- 1 airplane.
- 2 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Well, winter's coming,
- 3 and you have a new PMI. Have you broached this -- I
- 4 guess you have. Do you know if the company has
- 5 broached the subject again?
- 6 MR. FOWLER: I do not know.
- 7 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. I was wondering if you
- 8 would have in your mind any correlation between the
- 9 utilization of aircraft hours per day and the non-
- 10 routine work items that would be required as it entered
- 11 C check?
- MR. FOWLER: Correlation between? I'm not
- 13 sure what you're asking me.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Well, you are running your C
- 15 checks on a calendar basis. Information that has been
- 16 provided to us indicates that your utilization has
- 17 increased in the same time period that your calendar
- intervals have increased, and that you are not guided
- 19 by hours in the interval of C checks, and I'm just
- 20 wondering if, where your utilization is going up
- 21 between the C checks, if you have noticed any increase
- in non-routine items that are -- that accompany the
- 23 aircraft into the C check?

1	MR. FOWLER: That's not something that I
2	would track the non-routine items that accompany the
3	airplane into the C check, but, more importantly, I'm
4	not sure that I would agree that utilization has
5	increased since the calendar time escalation.
6	I've forgotten I don't know exactly the
7	date of the calendar time escalation. If somebody has
8	it, they can tell me. I'm not sure when it went to 15
9	months.
10	Okay. If that's the case, okay, if you look
11	at our utilization, utilization of our fleet, what
12	you'll see is that the major increases in utilization
13	occurred between 1993 and 1995, and in 1993, fleet
14	utilization was somewhere in the nine and a half to 10
15	hour range. By 1995, that had gone up to solidly the
16	10-10 and a half hour range.
17	In 1996, utilization was 11. something, 11.2
18	or .3, and utilization has not substantively changed
19	since 1996. Okay. As a matter of fact, over the last
20	three years, it's gone down, and if you track that to
21	the whole fleet, that's the case, utilization is
22	essentially flat. If anything, it's down since 1996,

and for the MD-80 separately, you'll note that the

23

- 1 utilization is exactly the same, and that is, it's
- 2 either flat or down since '96.
- 3 So, therefore, I couldn't agree that -- that
- 4 since the calendar time escalation to 15 months, the
- 5 utilization of the fleet has increased.
- 6 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Who would have that
- 7 information within the company?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Which information is that?
- 9 MR. RODRIQUEZ: What you just said.
- 10 MR. FOWLER: On utilization?
- 11 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Yes.
- MR. FOWLER: The Planning Department would
- 13 have it. If you just make the request, we can get the
- 14 information.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: Frank, make the request.
- MR. McGILL: Well, I probably got that for
- 17 you.
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: I got a document here, and I
- 19 have no idea.
- 20 MR. McGILL: I had the utilization for
- 21 certain months, specific for that segment, but for
- 22 general times, I have that. I've already --
- MR. RODRIQUEZ: For the MD-80 fleet?

1 MR. McGILL: For the MD-80 fleet, and I've 2 already requested that, and I've already received it. 3 MR. RODRIQUEZ: Okay. Good. Then that really was my last question. Thank you very much. 4 5 MR. FOWLER: Thank you. 6 MR. McGILL: Mike? 7 MR. LASLEY: I don't know if I got the last name straight. Was it Andy Lieber and Gerardo Huerto? 8 9 MR. FOWLER: Hueto. 10 MR. LASLEY: Hueto? Are they -- in what 11 organization are they? 12 MR. FOWLER: Frankly, I couldn't tell you. MR. LASLEY: What organization are they from? 13 MR. FOWLER: Gerardo is a structural 14 engineer. As a matter of fact, I believe he's our new 15 Manager of Structural Engineering, and Andy Lieber is 16 17 from Tech Services, and he's been working on the 18 Systems Working Group. 19 MR. LASLEY: How was it confirmed that they -20 - they're a source of -- of how to do this end plate 21 check or they've gone around making sure it's all being

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

done correctly? How was it confirmed that they know,

that they properly understand how to accomplish it?

22

23

- 1 MR. FOWLER: They've been the focal points in
- 2 all of the work that's being done -- being done with
- 3 the NTSB and with Boeing on the -- I suspect with
- 4 Boeing on the checks.
- 5 MR. LASLEY: Okay. Thank you.
- 6 MR. McGILL: Any more questions?
- 7 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Yeah. I have some. Just
- 8 a couple.
- 9 I'm going to tee off with the Andy and
- 10 Gerardo issue. Were they given any training or were
- 11 specific mechanics in Oakland or -- and/or mechanics or
- inspectors in Oakland given any particular training on
- 13 end plates within the last, say, six months?
- MR. FOWLER: I can't answer that.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: And you had made a
- 16 statement that you replaced a couple jack screws that
- 17 were not at 40,000. They were below. I think you gave
- 18 the number of 34,000ths.
- 19 How does that come about? Who makes the
- 20 decision or is -- is there anything in writing or
- 21 what's the magic number or --
- MR. FOWLER: There's nothing in writing.
- 23 Typically, the magic number is anything above the mid

- 1 30s.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: So, is a call placed to
- 3 someone?
- 4 MR. FOWLER: Maintenance Control and
- 5 Maintenance Planning maintain a record of the end plate
- 6 intervals, and if they see one that's in that range,
- 7 then they call for it to be changed.
- 8 MS. VON KLEINSMID: Call who for it to be
- 9 changed?
- 10 MR. FOWLER: Well, they arrange it with
- 11 Maintenance Planning, Maintenance Control. They
- 12 arrange for it.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: So, a call would come in
- 14 from, let's assume, Oakland to Maintenance Control, and
- that's -- that's who they would call, Maintenance
- 16 Control?
- 17 MR. FOWLER: Well, they would report what
- they found in the readings to the Maintenance Planning
- 19 Organization, and that would -- I'm not exactly sure
- 20 how the communication gets to Maintenance Control,
- 21 whether they call them directly or whether they get it
- 22 from Maintenance Planning.
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: And regarding this

- 1 meeting that -- when the decision was made how to
- 2 handle the 17 aircraft and the recheck required, you
- 3 mentioned that you made a decision in a meeting where
- 4 your Director of Line Maintenance, Director of Base
- 5 Maintenance, Line Maintenance and Planning.
- 6 Anyone from Engineering, besides yourself,
- 7 present?
- 8 MR. FOWLER: Not that I recall. Bill Weaver
- 9 was back with family. His father-in-law was very ill,
- 10 and Brian Hershman just had a new baby and was back in
- 11 Minneapolis. So, --
- MS. VON KLEINSMID: Okay. You've answered my
- 13 question. That's all I have.
- DR. CRAWLEY: I've got one.
- MR. McGILL: Go ahead.
- 16 DR. CRAWLEY: Is there any process right now
- 17 that tracks rates of wear on the jack screw, say, on a
- database comparing end plate measurements?
- 19 MR. FOWLER: There's not anything that --
- 20 that tracks it relative to any particular analysis, but
- 21 the database that Maintenance Planning maintains, okay,
- 22 has all of the readings, okay, the subsequent readings
- 23 on the jack screw.

1	So, we can see how it's changing or not
2	changing, for that matter.
3	DR. CRAWLEY: Is there any kind of an
4	analysis of that data or planned analysis of that data
5	as far as you know, as far as, I guess, something that
6	would would pick up a suddenly-accelerated rate or
7	something like that?
8	MR. FOWLER: I think we still have a lot to
9	learn from from the jack screw measurements and what
10	they mean and how they change. Our confidence should
11	be derived from the fact that even if they are
12	changing, they're still well within the manufacturer's
13	limits in order for the airplane to be released.
14	But more importantly than that, the the
15	amount that we've decreased the interval and increased
16	the rate of inspections on the airplanes also should
17	should provide a great deal of confidence.
18	So, in answer to your question, I think that
19	that's an issue that we as an industry need to get to,
20	and that is, you know, what are these what are the
21	wear patterns? What do they mean?
22	Okay. We're tracking the data, but I'm not
23	sure we're smart enough based on the things that are

1	still being done in this investigation to say exactly
2	what should be done.
3	DR. CRAWLEY: Thank you.
4	MR. McGILL: Okay, John.
5	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
6	(Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned, to
7	reconvene tomorrow morning, Wednesday, August 16th,
8	2000, at 9:00 a.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064