NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Office of Aviation Safety
Washington, D.C. 20594

April 18, 2016

Maintenance Factual

CEN16MA036

A. ACCIDENT

Operator:	Execuflight, Inc.
Location:	Akron, OH
Date:	November 11, 2015
Time:	about 1452 Eastern Standard Time (EST)
Airplane:	Hawker 125B, Registration Number: N237WR (S/N NA-0252[1])

B. MAINTENANCE GROUP

Group Chairman:	Gregory Borsari National Transportation Safety Board Washington, DC
Member:	Dave Avery Federal Aviation Administration Miami, FL
Member:	Russ Maimone[2] Execuflight, Inc. Fort Lauderdale, FL

C. SUMMARY

On November 10, 2015, about 1452 Eastern Standard Time (EST), Execuflight flight 1526, a British Aerospace HS 125-700A, N237WR, departed controlled flight while on approach to land at the Akron Fulton International Airport (AKR) and impacted a 4-plex apartment building in Akron, Ohio. The pilot, co-pilot, and seven passengers were fatally injured; there were no reported ground injuries. The airplane was destroyed by impact and post impact fire. The airplane was registered to Rais Group International NC LLC., and operated by Execuflight, as a Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations Part 135 on-demand charter flight. Instrument meteorological conditions prevailed at the time of the accident, and the flight was operated on an instrument flight rules (IFR) flight plan. The flight originated from Dayton-Wright Brothers Airport (MGY), Dayton, Ohio, at 1413 EST and was destined for AKR.

[1] According TC A3EU NOTE 61, some aircraft were manufactured and delivered to the United States using only a North American (NA) reference number on the aircraft data plate. Service Bulletin SB.00-12 provides a cross reference listing of the North American (NA) reference numbers against serial numbers. Accident Aircraft original Hawker Siddeley S/N was 257072. Standard Airworthiness Certificate and Registration of the airplane is listed as NA-0252.

[2] Mr. Gregory Smith, Director of Maintenance has taken over the duties as a maintenance record group member as Russ Maimone is no longer with Execuflight.

D. DETAILS OF THE INVESTIGATION

1.0 Air Carrier Certificates

On May 24, 2004, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), South Region Flight Standards District Office (FSDO), issued Execuflight, Inc. of 1621 South Perimeter Road Hanger #35B, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33309, Certificate Number EXFA391K. The Certificate was reissued on August 11, 2008.

2.0 Operations Specifications (OpSpecs)[3]

Execuflight, Inc. was authorized to conduct 14 CFR Part 135 On Demand Operations under of the code of Federal Aviation Regulations, which includes the standards, terms, conditions, and limitations contained in the FAA approved Operations Specifications (Parts D and E).

a) Per Section D073 of the OpSpecs, Execuflight, Inc. was authorized to use an Approved Aircraft Inspection Program (AAIP) to maintain the Raytheon Hawker Aircraft Model 700 using Raytheon Hawker Aircraft model 700 Airworthiness Limitations Manual CJE-HPA-C-GEN-AW1667 as revised.

b) Per section D085 of the OpSpecs, Execuflight, Inc. has two Gulfstream GA-1159-A, two Hawker HS-125-700A, one Hawker 800XP and one Israeli Aircraft IA-1124-A.

c) Per section D092 of the OpSpecs, Execuflight, Inc. was authorized to use operations for Designated Reduced Vertical Separation Minimums (RVSM) Airspace.

d) According to Section D095 of the OpSpecs, Execuflight, Inc. was authorized to use an approved Minimum Equipment List (MEL).

e) According to D101 of the OpSpecs, Execuflight was to use the following to maintain the Engines:
   - N237WR Left Engine ONLY - Honeywell TFE-731-3L as revised, SB TFE-731-72-3106 as revised, and SB TFE731-72-3001 as revised
   - N237WR Right Engine ONLY - Honeywell TFE-731-3L as revised, SB TFE-731-72-3527 as revised, and SB TFE731-72-3001 as revised

f) OpSpecs D485 (Aging Airplane Inspection and Records Review) was issued to Execuflight, Inc. According to the Code of Federal Regulations, the Aging Airplane Inspection is not required for CFR Part 135 On-Demand Operations.

[3] Operations Specifications contains the authorizations, limitations, and certain procedures under which each kind of operation, if applicable, is to be conducted by the certificate holder.

g) Per section E096 of the OpSpecs, Execuflight, Inc. was authorized for a Weight and Balance Program per Execuflight, Inc. General Operations Manual (GOM) Section B-1. According to the document, the airplanes were to be individually weighed every 36 months.

3.0 Aircraft Information

The British Aerospace Inc. manufactured the airplane and a Certificate of Airworthiness was issued by the FAA on August 20, 1979 after export from UK. The current owner of the airplane is RAIS Group International LLC of Charlotte, NC. The airplane was put onto the Execuflight Operating Certificate on 11/8/2010.

According to the last available Flight Logs and information reviewed prior to the accident flight, the airplane had approximately 14,947.7 total hours and approximately 11,075 cycles. This includes the two flight cycles on the day of the accident and estimated 1.6 flight hours.

4.0 Approved Aircraft Inspection Program (AAIP)

Execuflight, Inc. aircraft that are type certificated with 9 or fewer passenger seats shall be maintained in accordance with FAR Parts 43, 91 and FAR 135.415, 135.417 and 135.421 or an Approved Aircraft Inspection Program under FAR 135.419.

The program provided for continuous aircraft inspections to ensure and/or allow greater availability for the aircraft without compromising the airworthiness standards and quality desired during inspection periods. The following material(s), in current form, was used as reference material in conjunction with the inspection program.

- Manufactures Maintenance Manuals
- Service Bulletins
- Service Letters
- Service Notes and/or Instructions
- Airworthiness Directives and
- Aircraft Specifications and/or Type Certificate Data Sheets for the Aircraft and Engines

The Scheduled Maintenance Checks are listed in the Electronic Beechcraft Maintenance Manual by a Minor, Routine, Structural, Out of Phase, Special Incident, Panel Location, Lubrication, Component Requirement and Mandatory Life Limitation inspections.

The following is a listing of previous inspections accomplished on airplane N237WR.

Table 1 - Maintenance Checks

CHECK	DATE	LOCATION	TOTAL TIME	TOTAL CYCLES
Inspection A (300 hours)	08/12/2015	FXE Execuflight Inc.	14,875.8	11,026
Inspection B (600 hours)	08/12/2015	FXE Execuflight Inc.	14,875.8	11,026
Inspection C (1200 hours)	08/12/2015	FXE Execuflight Inc.	14,875.8	11,026
Inspection D (2400 hours)	08/12/2015	FXE Execuflight Inc.	14,875.8	11,026
Inspection E (12 months)	08/12/2015	FXE Execuflight Inc.	14,875.8	11,026
Inspection F (24 months)	08/12/2015	FXE Execuflight Inc.	14,875.8	11,026
Inspection G (48 months)	08/12/2015	FXE Execuflight Inc.	14,875.8	11,026

The airplane was equipped with two Honeywell Engines and a Hamilton Sundstrand Auxiliary Power Unit (APU). Engine and APU times can be seen below:

Table 2 – Engine and APU Information

	No.1 Engine	No.2 Engine	APU
Manufacturer	Honeywell	Honeywell	Hamilton Sundstrand
Part Number	TFE731-3R-1H	TFE731-3DR-1H	T62-T40C
Manufacture Date	5/20/1987	4/3/1979	8/20/1987
Date Installed	4/28/2011	7/29/2008	2/9/2015
Serial Number	P-84521	P-84169	875506
Location of Engine/APU Installation	Dallas Airmotive	Duncan Aviation	FXE Execuflight
Total Engine/APU Time at Install	10,387.6	12,316.4	1,138.3
Total Engine/APU Cycles at Install	7,336	8,666	2,257
Total Time of Airframe during engine/APU installation (hours)	13,794.1	13,164.8	14,749.4
Total Cycles of Airframe during engine/APU installation	10,356	9,978	10,943
Time Since Major Periodic Inspection (hours)	1,153.6	1,782.9	Do not track

5.0 Supplemental Type Certificates (STC)[4]

Supplemental Type Certificates (STCs) supplied by air carrier and FAA were reviewed. There were approximately 11 STCs found in the maintenance records of both the FAA and Execuflight Inc.

6.0 Airworthiness Directive (AD)[5]

Execuflight, Inc. provided an AD summary (airplane, powerplants and appliances) for review. No discrepancies were found during the review of the listing.

7.0 Service Difficulty Reports (SDR)[6]

According to the FAA SDR Database, there were no SDRs against the accident airplane. Further, since acquiring the airplane Execuflight, Inc. has not reported an SDR to the FAA for the accident airplane.

8.0 Minimum Equipment List (MEL)[7]

Execuflight, Inc. was authorized to use an approved MEL on its Hawker HS-127-700A aircraft per its OpSpecs. At the time of the accident, there were no open MEL items.

9.0 Aircraft Flight Logs

Aircraft Flight Logs were reviewed from June 1, 2014 thru November 7, 2015. The subsequent aircraft flight logs were in the aircraft at the time of the accident and could not be reviewed.

The following work of note:

October 24, 2015 – Trip Number 273

Maintenance Discrepancy:
"Pilot Reports FMS does not track course."

Corrective Action/Deferral:
"Ops check on ground by Superior Avionics. No defects noted, operates normal. Reference W.O. No. 25496"

[4] The FAA issues Supplement Type Certificates, which authorize a major change or alteration to an aircraft, engine or component that has been built under an approved Type Certificate.
[5] Airworthiness Directive (AD) is a regulatory notice sent out by the FAA informing the operator of an action that must be taken for the aircraft to maintain its airworthiness status.
[6] A Service Difficulty Report (SDR) is a report of the occurrence or detection of each failure, malfunctions, or defects as required by 14 CFR 135.415.
[7] The FAA approved Minimum Equipment List contains a list of equipment and instruments that may be inoperative on a specific aircraft for continuing flight beyond a terminal point.

July 6, 2015 – Trip Number 266

Maintenance Discrepancy:
1. "Right Side FMS INOP on NAV Mod No.2 Altimeter
2. "No.2 Altimeter reads 3912, should be 3012"

Corrective Action/Deferral: Execuflight W/O# 07052015N237WR
1. "Removed and replaced Co-pilot Altimeter P/N 822-1398-504, S/N ON: 1YB5R. Performed ADC check IAW MM 34-10-00-501"
2. "Air Data removed. Could not verify."
    a. Discrepancy notes: Reinstalled Air Data Computer. Serviceable tag attached from Tropic Radio Inc. Performed Pitot/Static stall warning system test per 34-15-00 and found satisfactory. Performed airspeed switch warning horn inhibit test and co-pilots ADC check after customer replaced ADC I/A/W MM 34-10-00-501 and FAR 91.413 Found satisfactory for continued operations in RVSM airspace.

10.0 Weight and Balance Summary

Per the Execuflight, Inc. OpSpecs, the airplanes were to be weighed every thirty-six (36) calendar months. The last actual weight and balance on the airplane was accomplished on May 30, 2014 in Fort Lauderdale, Florida by Aircraft Weighing Corporation. The figures for last weight and balance are shown below:

Basic Empty Weight:	13,815.0 pounds
Arm:	0.73 feet
Moment:	10,149.4 lb-ft

An amended weight and balance was found onboard the accident aircraft. The amended weight and balance, dated December 22, 2014 reduced the empty operating weight 300 pounds with the statement, APU removed. During the maintenance record review, no record of maintenance was identified that removed the APU associated with the amended weight and balance. The aircraft maintenance manual (AMM 49-09-41) includes a procedure for the removal of the APU and installation of a flight blanking kit. According to the records reviewed a replacement APU was installed on February 9, 2015.

11.0 Major Repairs and Alterations

According to the FAA Airworthiness Report and Execuflight Inc records, there were approximately 47 Major Repairs and Alterations on the accident airplane going back to March 7, 1980.

12.0 Time Limit Components

Time Limit Component status for the airplane and the two installed powerplants and the APU were reviewed.

13.0 Manuals

Execuflight, Inc. used the following manuals to maintain the airworthiness of its fleet and management of the maintenance department.

General Operations Manual (GOM) - The GOM contains policies, procedures and instructions for the performance of maintenance, preventive maintenance and alterations for Execuflight, Inc. operated aircraft that are type certified for a passenger seating configuration, excluding any pilot seat, of ten or more, as required by FAR 135.411(a)(2), and continuous airworthiness of the aircraft.

Approved Aircraft Inspection Program (AAIP) – Manual outlines the use of Beechcraft and Hawker Maintenance schedule to ensure the airplane are in an airworthy condition for safe flight.

Minimum Equipment List (MEL) – List of equipment and instruments that may be inoperative on a specific aircraft.

Weight and Balance Manual – Weight and balance procedures to be followed by maintenance and flight operations personnel on all aircraft operated by Execuflight, Inc.

Manufacture Supplied Manuals - Aircraft/Engine Maintenance Manuals, Structural Repair Manuals, Overhaul Manuals, Wiring Manuals, Fault Isolation Manuals, Illustrated Parts Catalog, Corrosion Program Manual, NDT Manual, Significant Structure Items Manual, Service Bulletins and Engine Manuals.

14.0 Method of Record Keeping

Per FAR Parts 43, 91 and 135, Execuflight, Inc., maintains records with the use of Aircraft Logs and the AAIP paperwork which includes the inspection program. Non routine work is recorded and kept for the inspection program along with other aircraft work.

Execuflight Inc. also uses an electronic program called AVTRAK to assist in tracking:

1. Scheduled maintenance
2. Aircraft Component/Equipment status
3. Airworthiness Directive status
4. Service Bulletin status
5. Life Limited Component status

Over 30 items in AVTRAK were found to be not reflective of the actual aircraft status. Records review showed the items were previously accomplished. AVTRAK does not provide service information, I.E. Service Bulletins referenced in Airworthiness Directives.

15.0 Interview Summaries

Mr. Michael Ohannesian, Principle Maintenance Inspector (FAA) was interviewed on January 12, 2016 in Miramar, Fl.

Mr. Gregory Smith, Director of Maintenance (Execuflight) was interviewed on January 12, 2016 in Miramar, Fl.

Mr. Daniel Cahoon, Principle Avionics Inspector (FAA) was interviewed on January 13, 2016 in Miramar, Fl.

Mr. Mark Fisher, Assistant Principle Maintenance Inspector (FAA) was interviewed on January 13, 2016 in Miramar, Fl.

Mr. Roger Vezina, previous Director of Maintenance (Execuflight) was interviewed on March 28, 2016 via phone.

See attachment 1 for further information

Submitted by: Gregory Borsari
Aviation Accident Investigator
Maintenance

Attachment 1

Interview Summaries

Principle Maintenance Inspector Interview Summary

Name: _Michael Ohannesian__
Date/Time: 12 January 2016 at _0840__ **EST**
Location: FAA Miramar, FL. FSDO
Representation: Yes __Brooke Lewis FAA via phone_____
Present: Greg Borsari, NTSB; Pocholo Cruz, NTSB; Bill Tuccio, NTSB (via phone)

Mr. Michael Ohannesian is the Principle Maintenance Inspector (PMI) that has the Execuflight certificate. He stated that he has an Airframe & Powerplant (A&P) certificate with an Inspection Authorization (IA) along with a private pilot certificate, but he has not flown in years.

When asked he said he has been a PMI for approximately seven years with about thirty certificates to manage. They include operators, repair stations, agriculture and extra lifts that he performs regulatory oversight of.

The PMI stated he has been with the FAA for almost 11 years. He was an aviation safety inspector before becoming a PMI. Prior to joining the FAA he worked as an A&P mechanic.

When asked about his workload, he stated that he was busy. He indicated that the workload was typical for each inspector. The PMI communicates with his supervisor on a regular basis when they are in the office, almost daily.

There is a quarterly performance review and he said he had no issues with the review process or his performance.

When asked about the FAA PMI work program, he explained the transition from PTRS to SAS and that this office has completed the transition. While the surveillance is the same, he stated the databases, tools and recording process has changed. There are more data collection tools available with SAS and the program is being modified as SAS is an evolving program.

The PMI stated, the new system is more risk based and that he has the availability to add items in areas that concern individual certificate holders.

Since the new fiscal year started on 1 October 2015 everything is now in SAS. All of the part 135 & 145 certificates are managed in SAS.

The PMI was asked if he utilized any geographical inspectors to assist with his surveillance and he indicated that only one time for a conformity inspection that was off site. He knows they are available, but other than the onetime he has not needed a remote inspection.

He was asked when he took over the Execuflight certificate and he stated that it occurred when he was promoted to a PMI. He also stated that he could not recall if he got a turnover or not at that time, but he had access to the historical files.

When asked who his primary contact at Execuflight is, he said it was Gregory Smith the Director of Maintenance (DOM). He said he communicates regularly with the DOM, one or two times a week on average. Communication with the DOM is by phone calls, e-mails and face to face meetings. He also stated that if he did not make prior arrangements to meet that more than likely the DOM would not be available if he just dropped by the facility. The PMI said he is currently working a project with the Execuflight DOM on the Gulfstream GIII (10 or more) maintenance program.

The PMI was asked if he was aware that the DOM also worked for another company and he stated yes. The DOM flies as a captain for a part 91 on a Gulfstream G-V. Asked if this was acceptable and he stated that there are no regulations against it and that he has seen DOM's work for multiple companies or as consultants.

When asked about the electronic tracking system Execuflight uses, he said that he was familiar with it. He believed it was AvTrak that provided the service. The manuals from Execuflight did have some information about the system, but not the details of how to input data. He said that either the DOM or Chief Inspector would add the data to AvTrak after a maintenance check was completed.

The PMI said that he did have concerns with the system in that it is only as good as the data that is entered (garbage in, garbage out). On a number of occasions he stated that he had to bring items entered incorrectly to their attention.

When asked about his relationship with the DOM he stated he was frustrated at times and that Execuflight challenges him on why they have to make changes that he recommends. When asked to elaborate, he said they were labor intensive and required more oversight then others. That they were not as compliant as others and required multiple follow ups in order to get something changed.

When asked about strengths and weaknesses of the company, The PMI could not think of any strength's off the top of his head. Weaknesses were that they were a higher risk, required extra work, which typically would happen with turn over from one DOM to another. That several times it was the same type of item having to be redone. He did state that Execuflight is in the middle of a complete rewrite of the general manuals. But not sure when that work would be completed or how far along they are with it as nothing had been submitted to the FAA as of yet.

The PMI did state that Gregory Smith was the DOM years ago, left the company and then came back about six months ago. He has had to work with about five different DOM from the time Mr. Smith left until the time he returned.

He also stated that it was like trying to re-invent the wheel each time an issue was raised with Execuflight. There was always pushback on why this had to be done. He would try to work with them to keep them in compliance.

Lastly, The PMI was asked if there was anything else he wanted to add. He did not have anything else to add except to recap that they are a challenge, but he is working with them. He cited the example of the G-III maintenance program that he is working with the DOM.

Interview concluded at 1028 EST

Director of Maintenance Interview Summary

Name: _Gregory Smith__
Date/Time: 12 January 2016 at _1320__ **EST**
Location: FAA Miramar, FL. FSDO
Representation: Yes __Christopher J. Jahr_____
Present: Greg Borsari, NTSB; Pocholo Cruz, NTSB; Dave Avery, FAA

Mr. Gregory Smith stated he has an Airframe & Powerplant (A&P), Airline Transport Pilot (ATP) and Flight Engineer (FE) certificates and that he is the Director of Maintenance (DOM) for Execuflight. This is his second time around as the DOM for Execuflight. He said he has been employed by Execuflight for about the last six months. He had left the company about 4.5 years ago to pursue other career opportunities.

When asked about his background, the DOM stated that he first got started in Aviation when he entered the Air Force. He was a mechanic and worked up to being a crew chief. He was in the Air Force for 10 years with the last five being a flight engineer on the C141.

When he left the military, he proceeded to get his pilot ratings by joining various aero clubs. He said he would work as a mechanic while seeking opportunities to further his flying career. He said the first time he met the owner of Execuflight (Danny) was when he was interviewed and hired to be a copilot / mechanic on a Westwind aircraft that Danny was the captain on.

With regard to his current duties as the DOM he stated he is responsible for all maintenance on both of the 10 or more aircraft as well as the nine or less. He added the 10 or more are under a Continuous Airplane Maintenance Program (CAMP) while the nine or less are under an Approved Airplane Inspection Program (AAIP).

When asked about changes within the company the last five years he reminded us that he has only been employed for the last six months and could not speak to before then. No recent changes within the organizational structure since he returned.

The DOM was asked about his responsibilities and he stated he is responsible for the maintenance sections of the general manuals, AAIP and CAMP. He also stated that there was a project already in progress to do a complete rewrite of the manuals when he returned. This has been contracted to Airline Certification whom specializes in this type of work.

When asked what airplanes he was responsible for, he stated the two Gulfstream G-III, the Westwind and the Hawker 700 and 800.

With regards to facilities according to the DOM, they lease a large hangar that can fit two aircraft plus a tooling area and parts storage room.

Asked if the company experienced any previous accidents or violations he stated no, not that he was aware of.

The DOM responded that the company did not receive any awards or commendations when asked.

The DOM stated he has a good working relationship with the owner. He is comfortable talking to him about changes and/or the need to do maintenance on an aircraft. He added that he had no worries if he has to ground an aircraft.

As an example the DOM said that when he first returned he was not happy with the condition of the facilities and that they needed to be cleaned up and better organized. He got the work done. The DOM said he has between five and six regular mechanics that work for him depending on workload. Most of the training is on the job and he does maintain records once they can prove proficiency at each task that requires training. The only recurrent training is on the policy and procedures manual and if he feels one of the mechanics needs additional training in a certain area.

Mechanics are selected and hired by the DOM with input from the Chief Inspector. Payroll is handled by the owner. The DOM said he will do background checks by talking to previous employers and other mechanics that they have worked with. The work force is stable in his view. When asked about vendors, he spoke of the approved vendor list of companies that he uses. Specifically with regards to Avionics there are three companies he uses on a regular basis. Regarding contract maintenance the engines are sent out as well as the avionics for the heavier type of work.

Since the accident, the DOM stated that he is concerned with the avionics work as the NTSB has been talking to him about the cockpit voice recorder in particular. He is considering sending them to an Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) facility instead of a third party provider. The DOM did state that he would also like to move the nine or less aircraft away from the AAIP and revert to the manufactures recommended program. He feels that the manufacturer would have better data on all their aircraft and that Execuflight could benefit from it.

When asked how he learned of industry trends he said that he has subscriptions to FAA FAST, AOPA and other industry organizational newsletters.

The DOM stated that he also subscribes to the FAA Airworthiness Directive (AD) notification system and he reviews those whenever one is issued. He will have the AD placed into the electronic tracking system when issued.

When asked about his relationship with the pilots, he stated it was good. When asked, he said he does not accept verbal log entries. He will insist that a logbook entry be created. Take a picture of it and e-mail it to him. He said he has no issues or concerns with pilots raising an issue with an airplane.

The DOM said they utilize a subscription service for electronic tracking called AvTrak. It is a yearly subscription and that at one time it was part of the Gulfstream CMP program. He thought that the companies split into two separate entities.

For manufacturers service bulletins He said they subscribe directly with Hawker and also Gulfstream. He likes the web based tools that are available as he no longer has to be in the office in order to conduct a review. He said he can do this work online at any location.

When asked if there were any issues with the electronic tracking system and if audits were conducted? He said that AvTrak used to have an analyst that would audit periodically but that service is not currently being provided. He is working to get it re-established with the owners okay. The DOM added that it is a financial consideration to have the analyst function added to the yearly subscription.

The only time he audited the system as the DOM was when the aircraft were first placed on the certificate and the data initiated in AvTrak. Again, he stated he was working to get the analyst function re-instated.

Asked about tracking repetitive items, he stated they keep the last five to ten logbook pages with the aircraft so the pilots can see what has been worked and if the item has occurred before. According to the DOM, there are currently three people authorized to enter data. The DOM, the Chief Inspector and the Parts person can enter data. He added that the parts person does a number of administrative tasks for the DOM.

When asked if he ever had to deal with a time limit overrun he stated no, he has not. When further asked about any self-disclosures the DOM stated yes, one time for the Hawker MEL being used when it was not authorized. He is working to get that corrected. Until then, no items can be placed on MEL for the Hawker 800.

When asked how often the MEL was utilized he stated on average of one to two times per month.

When asked, the DOM stated that he was familiar with the service difficulty reporting system. The DOM was asked about the portable scale that is carried in the aircraft and what it was used for. He said Execuflight is not authorized to use average weights that they must weigh each person and all baggage. The scale is tracked by the airplane maintenance program and each scale has its own serial number.

When asked how often the FAA came around he said about once a week and for about four hours at a time. He indicated that he felt he could contact an inspector to get information or help in certain areas when needed and that they were responsive.

When asked about the work schedule for the DOM he stated he was in the office two to three days a week. He further added he was available by phone or e-mail if an issue came up and that the Chief Inspector could act on his behalf if he was not available.

There was a follow up question on the six mechanics working for Execuflight on their qualifications when they were hired. The DOM stated that they were already employed when he came back. Asked how he would go about hiring and he said he would want to see a resume, any

previous training records and talk to previous employers and other mechanics they have worked with.

The DOM was questioned on the tooling calibration process including personally owned tools by mechanics. He said that Execuflight has the tooling calibration done, including mechanics personal tools that require calibration. He added that the tooling is tracked on a spreadsheet and each mechanic must check the date on the sticker on each tool to ensure it is not due for calibration prior to use.

The last major check on the accident airplane also cleared all lower checks even though they were not due. When asked why, the DOM stated it was more for convenience than anything else. He added that you are in the area and you have it opened up, just do the extra work and take credit for it.

When asked if there was something in the Execuflight manuals about being able to delegate the DOM function to someone else if he was not available, the DOM said he would have to get back to us. He felt there was something there, but could not specifically answer the question without researching it first. The DOM did follow up with an e-mail on how the manuals do require that procedures be followed regardless if the DOM is physically there or not.

When asked if there was anything else he would like to tell us, he responded no, nothing else.

Interview ended at 1528 EST

Principle Avionics Inspector Interview Summary

Name: _Daniel Cahoon__
Date/Time: 13 January 2016 at _0905__ **EST**
Location: FAA Miramar, FL. FSDO
Representation: No
Present: Greg Borsari, NTSB; Pocholo Cruz, NTSB; Bill Tuccio, NTSB (via phone)

Mr. Daniel Cahoon is the Principle Avionics Inspector (PAI) that has the Execuflight certificate. Mr. Cahoon stated he has an Airframe & Powerplant along with a Private Pilot with Rotocraft certification. He has been the PAI with the Execuflight certificate for less than two years. Prior to that, he was the assistant PAI with the Execuflight certificate. The PAI said he has been with the FAA for about 10 years. Prior to joining the FAA, he stated he was self-employed with his own avionics workshop. He said he has been in aviation his entire adult life first working for his father who owned a full service FBO and engine repair facility. He said he worked for a couple of avionics manufacturers as a radio technician prior to starting his own repair facility.

The PAI said that the current certificates that he manages is roughly 30 with 40% being repair stations, 40% operators and the remaining are for part 91.

In his current duties the PAI told us he is also the SAS coordinator for the FSDO. Asked if this was burdensome and he responded, not really. It is a learning curve but in the long run it will be better.

He responded that his point of contact with Execuflight is the Director of Maintenance (DOM) Greg Smith. He informed us that he visits their facilities about four to five times per year. When asked when was the last time he did a ramp inspection on an Execuflight aircraft, he responded about two months prior to the accident. He also did a ramp inspection on the accident aircraft about four months prior to the accident but power was not on the aircraft when he did the ramp inspection.

The PAI was asked if he ever witnesses the cockpit voice recorder (CVR) test during a ramp inspection. He responded yes, if power is on the aircraft and maintenance is available to run through the test. He added that he is aware of how poor the quality can be of the tape based CVR. The PAI explained the test procedure and seemed knowledgeable on the CVR test and what the results should be. He noted there are some tests that just check the line replaceable unit (LRU), but that he likes to hear the recording by plugging into the CVR headset jack (when power is available).

When asked if he was familiar with the Avionics vendors that Execuflight contracted with, he responded yes that he is familiar with both Superior Avionics and Tropic Radios. The current

DOM is contracting with Superior Avionics. He added that the company has good facilities and equipment and is capable of on-wing installations and testing as well as component level maintenance.

The PAI told us the previous DOM contracted the avionics work to Tropic Radio which is also a good company that would come to the customer hangar to perform on wing avionics testing such as the 12 month avionics checks and/or RVSM checks. He added that the Tropic Radio owner has a shop and a truck he can work from at the customer hangar. The down side being that if something fails that requires component level bench work it would either have to be replaced and/or removed for shop rework and then returned.

Asked if Execuflight was considered a high risk prior to the accident, he stated that he would get pushback from the company on why they had to do certain things. He further said they were watching their pennies when making decisions on who performed the work, what the work scope was and if there was a less expensive option available.

When asked if he had any previous experience with the current DOM? He said that only when he was originally with the company and helped to get the AAIP approved and airplanes on the Execuflight certificate. He also added now that the current DOM is back he is working with him on several items, such as the complete manual re-write. He works with the PMI (Mr. Ohannesian) on these items.

The PAI was asked if he knew why the current DOM was not going to use Tropic Radio and he responded that the DOM was more comfortable working with Superior Avionics who are also located at the same airport.

He was asked about the functional test requirements in the AAIP and what he would expect to be performed. He indicated that functional testing typically required bench level work and not on wing testing. On wing testing would not uncover hidden failure modes. The PAI stated that technicians approached it more as a go, no-go test when performing on-wing functional test requirements. He further elaborated that his expectations would be to follow the manufacturer's manuals and requirements.

The PAI provided that he has been talking with the PMI about Execuflight transitioning their nine or less aircraft away from AAIP and to the manufacturer's recommended inspection program.

Asked if he witnessed an Avionics 12 month inspection at Execuflight and he responded no, that he had not witnessed an inspection. He did add that it would take about sixteen man hours to perform correctly based on his prior experience.

When asked what he felt a functional check would encompass as compared to an operational test, the PAI responded that the functional check would be more like a post installation verification rather than just an operational test. Each functional requirement would be check.

When asked if he had any areas of concern he responded that generally the avionics work has been pretty good, but there record keeping or ability to provide the records is lacking. We discussed the RVSM testing as an example and one comment the PAI made that sometimes the altitude hold test can be done by the flight crew. An example is the flight crew would set the autopilot during a trip with altitude hold selected and monitor for 20 minutes. Every three minutes they should record the altitude and provide the form to maintenance to determine if the system is within required limits. This is one area where the PAI has asked to see the documentation and they have not been able to provide the data other than to say it had passed.

When asked if he was familiar with their electronic tracking system, he stated he knew about it, but only observed the chief inspector trying to find information he had requested. The PAI said he watched as the Chief Inspector pulled the records up for him to view.

When asked about the CVR test he stated he felt the on-wing test was an operational test to verify that sound was being recorded but not a complete channel by channel test. The PAI said the CVR test is usually a “go/no-go” type of operational check performed similar to how the flight crew would check the CVR, rather than an in-depth check that follows the component maintenance manual (CMM).

The PAI stated he did a ramp check on the accident aircraft about four months prior to the accident. No CVR check was done at that time because power was not available to the aircraft during the ramp check.

He was asked about the SAS program and he stated he was the office coordinator for SAS so yes he knows the new system and believes in the long run it will be better than the old. The office completed the switch over last October to SAS.

Based on a risk assessment would you ever consider the CVR to be anything other than a low risk item? The PAI stated that basically it would not get to a higher risk assessment if you compare it to say an APU tail fire that occurred several times with no non good fix in place. That would get a higher risk assessment as you could end up with an inflight fire that could spread beyond the APU tail pipe. He added that the CVR would not cause a catastrophic failure.

The PAI did add that the PAI can always add additional surveillance requirements if he sees an area of deficiency.

Asked if he ever considered doing the CVR test with the engines running? He stated no, that they were not supposed to create additional work that added expense or a level of risk. Most likely the airplane would have to be moved, engine run qualified mechanics would have to be available along with the expense of the fuel used. The PAI agreed it would be a better test, but not practical to accomplish either during a ramp check by the FAA or by maintenance personnel

The PAI was asked about the AAIP maintenance item of a Fairchild "G-1000" CVR. He attributed the AAIP entry to a typographical error.

Asked if he ever found a CVR not acceptable? He stated that when we know the CVR or other equipment is not functional we have to let maintenance and/or the flight crews know what we know. They then have to create the logbook entry and have the discrepancy either placed on the MEL or repaired prior to flight.

Asked if he has seen any items signed off as "could not duplicate"? No, he stated we would be there to show what they had found and to witness was corrected. He also said we always do an in-brief and follow up with written correspondence with a request for written response within a specified timeline, that being within 10 days.

When asked about the age of the aircraft and the multiple major alterations and modifications incorporated how does an inspector know that the instructions for continued airworthiness (ICA) have been updated? The PAI described how the STC or 337 form would have to provide the instructions for continued airworthiness and as an inspector in the avionics area it was his practice to sit in the flight deck and compare the operator's manuals to what equipment was actually installed. That way if he saw equipment such as GPS installed instead of an older Omega Navigation display he knew to look for those instructions. He stated it was a bit easier to spot the differences with avionics then say some other area like a thrust reverser modification.

The PAI also stated that Execuflight was going through a review of all major alterations to ensure the ICA's were incorporated. They had a commitment not to fly the 10 or more aircraft until this review was completed.

When asked if a AAIP or manufacturers inspection program (MIP) was better, he said there are advantages to both. The MIP would specify which manuals to use but you could also build that into the AAIP. The PAI added, do you rely on the manufacturer to take care of it or place the burden on the operator? If something is driven by an airworthiness directive it is one thing, but manufactures mandatory and recommended items are areas of concern to him. He added that especially when it comes to software where the owner/operator is responsible. In his experience

he said that you can add software requirements to the AAIP but most times software will not be updated unless the component is removed and sent to a shop.

When asked if he has seen how Execuflight contracts out the avionics work. He stated he has seen where the avionics vendor has done the on-wing test and let the operator know what failed. The operator then has to make a decision either to replace the faulted unit or remove and send the unit out for repair. Either way once the system has been restored to normal it must be retested by the avionics vendor. He feels this done to save money and is a business decision. Otherwise just let the avionics vendor perform the required bench level test and repair.

When asked about the sister ship to the accident airplane that is currently in for maintenance if he was aware that the CVR failed the test? He stated they would need to ether have that CVR repaired or replaced and that either one would come with an 8130 tag indicating that it was a serviceable unit. It would have to be installed and tested on wing as well per the instructions.

There was a discussion on the tape drive CVR regarding tape life limits. The original tape is no longer available and the replacement tape has about 50% of the expected life of the original tape. The PAI said this works out to about 1500 flight hours. He stated that the CVR is removed and replaced without actually tracking the flight hours making it difficult to determine if the 1500 hour limit is good or not. He was aware of the difference between overhauling the 10-year thermal capsule versus overhauling the CVR and the tape in the CVR. The PAI pointed out the difficulty of tracking CVR time-in-service when CVRs were swapped out between aircraft.

The PAI expressed a concern that as older aircraft retired (for example, those that won't meet current noise limits), the tape-based recorders from these aircraft may be returned to service.

Asked if there was anything else he would like to discuss with regard to Execuflight and he responded no, we covered everything.

Interview concluded at 1120 EST

Assistant Principle Maintenance Inspector Interview Summary

Name: _Mark Fisher__
Date/Time: 13 January 2016 at _1330__ **EST**
Location: FAA Miramar, FL. FSDO
Representation: Yes _Brooke Lewis vis phone___
Present: Greg Borsari, NTSB; Pocholo Cruz, NTSB

Mr. Mark Fisher is the Assistant Principle Maintenance Inspector (APMI) that assists the PMI on the Execuflight certificate. Mr. Fisher stated he has an A&P certificate as well as a Commercial Pilot License, Instrument Rating and Multi Engine. He has been the APMI since about eight months ago and been with the FAA since February 2014.

Asked to describe his professional background with regard to aviation prior to joining the FAA he said he started out as a pilot in 1987 and also worked in maintenance. He became a Director of Maintenance (DOM) in 1990 and has worked part 135 operations, air ambulance, on demand and scheduled operations.

When asked about his current workload he indicated that it was steady. That he assists the PMI with data collection, work scopes, surveillance activities as well as front desk duties and accidents as assigned by the supervisor. He further added that about 30 – 40% of his workload was related to certificate management.

Asked how often he had visited Execuflight he responded about 10 – 15 times. He said his relationship with Execuflight is professional and he interacts with the DOM or Chief Inspector when the DOM is not available. He felt that they were overall cooperative.

When asked, he said that he has done surveillance both alone and with the PMI.

When asked how responsive Execuflight was in responding, he said he felt it was a little slow. That the DOM is not always available and that things seemed to take a bit longer than they should.

He was asked if he was familiar with the tracking systems used at Execuflight and he responded that he was familiar with the Gulfstream CMP system but not the other system they used for the Hawker or Westwind aircraft.

He responded that he did not know the mechanics that performed the work.

When asked about the Execuflight facilities, he said they were about average.

He said he was aware of the complete manual rewrite that Execuflight had hired a vendor to do, but that it had not been submitted yet for approval so he could not comment.

Asked if he had any concerns with Execuflight he said that he has attended the CASS meetings for the 10 or more aircraft. That he felt there was a lack of audits that should be conducted and he would like to see more of them completed. He also stated that the staffing level could be expanded, but he understood that that is a business decision and not a regulatory decision.

Asked if was the APMI for any others in the office and he said no, just the PMI for Execuflight.

When asked, when was the last time he visited Execuflight he said about three to four weeks ago?

At this time he indicated they were performing the same level of surveillance as to prior to the accident. He indicated that the DOM is not always on sight and he felt that that is an area of concern. When the DOM is not there he speaks with the Chief Inspector who is not as knowledgeable at finding historical data. He said the Chief Inspector would have to call the DOM and then he could retrieve what was needed.

When asked if the Chief Inspector understood the maintenance program he said he was good with the actual maintenance being performed, but not always able to provide the information he had requested without first calling the DOM.

Asked if Execuflight responds in a reasonable amount of time, he indicated it seemed to take longer than it should. He added that this was must likely due to the lack of manpower.

Asked if he worked with the previous DOM and what that relationship was like? He said it was cordial and that he was always in the office when we went there.

He stated he has not seen any changes yet with the new DOM other than there is a complete rewrite in process, but it has not been submitted, so no changes yet.

Asked about areas of concern and he responded with a concern with the tracking system and that auditing could be improved.

He was asked about site visits and he said he would do an in-brief as to the purpose of the inspection and then provide an out-brief. He stated he would follow up with written correspondence with a request for response within a certain time-line. Once the response was back he would follow up with another site visit to ensure the area of concern was corrected.

Asked how his relationship with the owner is and he stated he has no conflicts with the owner. He added that the owner allows the DOM to perform his duties.

When asked about the desire to switch from a AAIP to a MIP for the nine or less he said it's not hard. Just write the letter and do the bridging tasks as required.

When asked to describe strengths and weaknesses of the Execuflight maintenance he said he wouldn't know what strengths they had. He then clarified to say that they do care about the maintenance so that would be considered a strength. For weaknesses, he said it would be lack of timely follow up with the FAA and with their tracking system.

He expressed some frustration that it does not have to be this way. The back and forth with the letter writing and the time it takes to respond. That Execuflight is not missing much and it would not take much effort to change in his opinion. He stated that the CASS meetings are not as good as he would like to see. Although he did say even though the nine or less are not part of the CASS program that he has heard them discuss those airplanes as well.

He wrapped up with that Execuflight treats both the nine or less and ten or more aircraft the same. They are on different programs, but treated the same.

Interview concluded at 1410 EST

Previous DOM Interview Summary

Name: _Roger Vezina__
Date/Time: 28 March 2016 at _09:15 – 10:05__ **EDT**
Location: Via Phone
Representation: Yes __Christopher J. Jahr_____
Present: Greg Borsari, NTSB; Pocholo Cruz, NTSB; David Lawrence, NTSB

The interview was conducted via phone and recorded. The recording was professionally transcribed and attached (see next page). The following notes are to clarify phonetics and industry spellings.

1. Page 3, line 12 – A&D should be A&P (Airframe & Powerplant)
2. Page 5, line 16 and 22 – CMT and Abtrack should be CMP and AVTRAK
3. Page 9, line 4 – Hennison should be Ohannesian
4. Page 16, lines 1, 2 and 20 - Abtrack should be AVTRAK
5. Page 17, line 18 – NRGMM should be in our GMM
6. Page 18, line 14 – Maymullen should be Maimone
7. Page 19, line 25 – Abtrack should be AVTRAK
8. Page 20, line 6 – back to Abtrack and CMB should be back to AVTRAK and CMP
9. Page 20, line 13 – CMB and Abtrack should be CMP and AVTRAK
10. Page 20, line 25 – Abtrack and CMB should be AVTRAK and CMP
11. Page 27, line 2 – your relationship should be owner and your relationship
12. Page 30, line 3 – underlying should be under ten
13. Page 30, line 13 and 14 – any light ups should be any write ups
14. Page 32, line 2 – Abtrack should be AVTRAK
15. Page 37, line 9 – NEL should be MEL

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

IN RE:	
THE EXECUFLIGHT HAWKER ACCIDENT THAT OCCURRED IN AKRON, OHIO ON NOVEMBER 10, 2015	NTSB Accident No. CEN16MA036

INTERVIEW OF: ROGER VEZINA

Monday,
March 28, 2016

Fort Lauderdale, Florida

BEFORE:

GREG BORSARI, Investigator, NTSB
POCHOLO CRUZ, NTSB
DAVE LAWRENCE, NTSB

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Interviewee:

CHRISTOPHER JAHR, ESQUIRE
Wicker, Smith, O'Hara, McCoy & Ford P.A.
SunTrust Center
515 East Las Olas Boulevard
Suite 1400
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
954-[redacted]

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

4:54 p.m.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: So to get started, Roger, could you give us your full name.

MR. VEZINA: It's Roger Guy Vezina.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Thank you. Date of birth.

MR. VEZINA: [redacted]

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: And certificates or ratings that you have.

MR. VEZINA: I have a Canadian AME license. I have a Jamaican AME license, and I have an FAA A&D license.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, and when you were with Execuflight, what was title or your position?

MR. VEZINA: Initially I was hired as the Chief Inspector, and after about a year, the Director of Maintenance left, so I kind of fell into that position by attrition.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay.

MR. VEZINA: So I left there as a Director of Maintenance.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: All right. How long were you the Director of Maintenance?

MR. VEZINA: I guess about a year. I think

I was about - yes, I was there two years, and I did one year in each position roughly.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: All right, so two years with the company. Do you know approximately when you started and when you left?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, actually I started I believe it was the first of June of 2013, and I left the end of June of 2015.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Oh, okay, so just over two years.

MR. VEZINA: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Could you kind of - be kind of hard to do, but briefly describe your professional background.

MR. VEZINA: Sure. I started in aviation in Canada in 1968. I worked around Northern Canada for a few years, and I joined the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Air Services in 1973. I did six years with them, a couple of years with the Canadian Coast Guard, and then I moved into Transport Canada. I was an Aviation Safety Inspector, sort of equivalent to your FAA inspectors.

I spent 14 years doing that, and then they sent me down on a (inaudible) to Jamaica in 1997 when Jamaica was undergoing - they were in Category 2 by the

FAA, and they wanted to get back to Category 1. The Canadian Government was giving them their new regs, so I was part of the team that went down there to help them, and then I kind of liked it there, so I stayed and went to Air Jamaica for a few years as the Chief Inspector, Director of Quality Assurance, and then I worked around other small operators in Jamaica until 2013 when I ended up at Execuflight.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. Could you talk about the history, your history, with the company at Execuflight.

MR. VEZINA: Yes, when I first got there, the company was trying to transition into a new computer program with something they bought out of Canada. I can't even remember the name of it now, and they were giving up on CMT and Abtrack (phonetic) and so I spent about seven or eight months just trying to get all the airplanes transferred onto this program, and it didn't work out.

It was not a very good program, and so they finally decided to make the position to go back to see CMT for the gulfstreams and to Abtrack for the hawkers (phonetic), and just about that time - the transition back was kind of difficult because there was a lot of records to update, and just about the time I finished

doing that is when the Director of Maintenance left and then I became the Director of Maintenance.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, so that was occurring while you were the Chief Inspector?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, that's right.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, so while on the job, were there any incidents with you or your mechanics, anybody get hurt?

MR. VEZINA: In what sense?

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Did anybody get hurt on the job?

MR. VEZINA: No, I don't recall any serious injuries. I don't believe - no, I don't think so.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. How did you get along with the company owner?

MR. VEZINA: Pretty good. He's a hard guy to work with, but if you stand your ground with him, he'll respect you and we had kind of a respectable working relationship.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. Did the owner - I take it you reported directly to the owner.

MR. VEZINA: No, actually I reported to the General Manager who was Bob Adamo, Robert Adamo, who left shortly before I did, but he was the General Manager, and he's the one I reported to.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: All right. How was he to work with?

MR. VEZINA: He was good. I knew - I've known Bob for years, and we friends from - he's the one who hired me there, so him and I got along well.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. Any issues or unrealistic expectations from either the GM or the owner?

MR. VEZINA: Nothing excessive. I mean sometimes they expect you to do things, you know, pull out a miracle to get the airplane flying, but I stood my ground and did what I had to do.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay.

MR. VEZINA: There was never any undue pressure that I can remember.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. Good. Have you ever raised an issue with regard to safety with either the General Manager or the owner?

MR. VEZINA: Our biggest concern was that we had a lack of space in terms of storage and record-keeping. It wasn't so much a safety issue as a conveniencing which I could have led to one, so we were constantly looking for more space, and eventually they moved out to another office area, the whole operations thing did, and that kind of resolved itself.

Other than that, it's just normal routine for a 135 operation.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. When you left, did you think there was any open issues with regard to safety?

MR. VEZINA: No, no, I just decided to retire. I'm 69 years old, and I was tired. That 135 operation is a seven-day-a-week operation, and I was just tired of it, so my wife was in Jamaica, my home was in Jamaica, and I just decided it was time to go home.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Oh, okay, so that's the reason you left is you retired.

MR. VEZINA: Yes, yes, I just decided it was time to retire.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. Well, congratulations on your retirement.

MR. VEZINA: Well, thank you. Now I'm in Barbados here just - I'm just doing a little holidaying but a little consulting on the side, so there's never any end to it, but at least it's on my terms. It's enjoyable.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Good, so as a Director of Maintenance, were you responsible for the AAIP and the GOM?

MR. VEZINA: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. Did you ever - as a DOM, did you ever review and/or update the AAIP?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, our PMI, Michael Hennison (phonetic) was quite stringent on that, and he used to come by fairly regularly and we were always looking at it. We were looking at ways to improve it, so I seem to recall making two or three changes to it. I'm not particularly remember what they are now, but it was a living document definitely.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, so you mentioned the FAA, how was your relationship with the FAA?

MR. VEZINA: It was good. It was good.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Were there any areas of concern that the FAA wanted you or Execuflight to address?

MR. VEZINA: We - not that I can remember. We had a normal, sometimes controversial - confrontational relationship at times which is normal between the regulatory body and that, but other than that, it was pretty straightforward.

He'd drop in from time to time and look and things and then go.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: So was there any area

in particular that they were wanting to see improved or changed?

MR. VEZINA: We had a little bit of a problem with RIIs on a gulf stream one time that it was - you know, it didn't work out the way it should have, and so we did some work with Mike there and we did some training, and we got that sorted out, but other than that, I don't recall anything major.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. All right. So one area that we have questions on is with regard to the accident airplane is the APU, and it looks like at the end - towards the end of 2014 there was quite a bit of history with the APU. Can you talk about that at all?

MR. VEZINA: I remember that we had two airplanes with problems at the same time there, and I know we did change a couple of APUs, and on this one, I think we had had some problems with it and the guys had worked on it, and I think it reached a stage where we decided that it was best to take it out for overhaul which we did which would account for that amended weight and balance, and then in the early part of the year, we replaced it, reinstalled it, and part of the procedure would be as we finished it and did the log entry that I would ask somebody to take that amendment

out of the airplane and either I forgot to ask them or somebody I asked didn't do it.

At any rate, that should have been removed.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, so you're kind of getting the hint of my questions. I appreciate that. We -

MR. VEZINA: Oh, sorry.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: No, no, no, that's fine, so I had given Christopher a copy of the amended weight and balance that was found on the airplane and you have seen that, correct? Did he show it to you or send it to you?

MR. VEZINA: I thought it came from you guys actually. I got an email from you or somebody and it was at the bottom, so I thought it came from you.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: It did. It did. I'm sure I copied you. I want to make sure that you saw it.

MR. VEZINA: Right. Yes, I did.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: All right. Good, so the APU - was the APU removed from the airplane and the airplane flew without the APU?

MR. VEZINA: That's correct.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: And what -

MR. VEZINA: That's what accounts for the

amended weights and balance.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. What procedure was used to remove and prep the airplane for flight without an APU? Do you recall?

MR. VEZINA: We would have used the procedure in the maintenance manual for removal and capping off and repairing the airplane. It's pretty well standard procedure. I know a lot of people do it.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Could you kind of describe what's involved in it.

MR. VEZINA: You know, I didn't do it myself. Of course I had guys doing it, but it's basically it's removing the APU and then capping off the fuel lines and capping off all the electrical connections and placarding the controls in the cockpit to make sure that they understand that's not in, and making a logbook entry and making a weight and balance amendment. That would be about it.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: All right. So the change to the weight and balance, the amendment to the weight and balance, the operating weight there, empty operating weight, the 300 pounds, where did that number come from? Do you know?

MR. VEZINA: Right out of the equipment list. The manufacturer's equipment list would list the

APU and the arm, the (inaudible) arm and the weight.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. About how long was the airplane without the APU?

MR. VEZINA: I'm going to guess three to four weeks. I think it's about right. I can't remember exactly when it went back in, but I would say it was probably in January of the following year.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. All right. Actually the records show that it was replaced on February 9th, just - so you're in the ballpark.

MR. VEZINA: Oh, okay, close.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: So while the airplane was flying around without the APU, what was done with the old APU, the removed unit?

MR. VEZINA: I think it was sent for overhaul. Now I know we replaced one, we bought another one to replace it, and we overhauled one. I'm not sure which one this was, whether it was the replacement or the overhaul.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, so when the APU was installed, the new APU installed, and the weight and balance should have been updated -

MR. VEZINA: Well you would just revert to the old one. By removing that amendment, it would just go back to the original status where the APU is now

back in and the original weight and balance applies again.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: All right, so on the operational side, how would they know the change has taken place? Was there anything else besides the AAIP?

MR. VEZINA: There would be entry in the technical log stating that the APU was reinstalled and tested and is now operational and that would clue the pilots to the fact that they are not able - they are now back to the original status.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: All right. The reason I'm asking is I understand that Execuflight also uses some weight and balance software besides doing the hand calculations.

MR. VEZINA: I don't think they were approved for use when I was there. I think they were in the process of it, but I don't know that they were approved at the time. I don't recall them.

MR. JAHR: Hey, Roger, it's Chris. Please let Greg finish his question before you answer just so the record is clear.

MR. VEZINA: Yes, my apologies.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Thank you, Chris. Yes, I, no, you actually answered that. Okay, so at the time you weren't aware that - or at the time they

were not approved to you knowledge to use the software for weight and balance.

MR. VEZINA: That's right. I don't know that they were using it at the time.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. All right, so you said earlier that it appears to you that whether you told somebody to go take the amended form out or for whatever reason, it just didn't occur. It didn't happen. Is that correct?

MR. VEZINA: That's correct.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, so some of my last questions are going to be around when the APU was removed and the blank - I'm going to call it a blanking kit because that's what it's called in the maintenance manual, now was the airplane was prepped to fly without the APU, where would I find that in the records?

MR. VEZINA: There would be a work order in or around the date that's on the amended weight and balance which would cover the removal of the APU, so it would be - our system was where we would use the date which would have been month 12, in or around the 14th, 2015, sorry 2014, and the registration of the airplane, 237 which we (inaudible), so there would be a weight a - there would be a work order, and that work order would be possibly - I would suspect would be copies

onto Abtrack (phonetic) as well. I usually scan them on the Abtrack.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. What about the aircraft log book, would there be anything in the logbook?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, there would be an entry on the date when - I'm assuming that the pilots would have snagged it in the logbooks, so we would have had to clear that snag and that would have been APU removed in accordance with blah, blah, blah, whatever procedure, weight and balance amendment created or something like that, an aircraft service book, and then three or four weeks later, whatever, we would have then made another entry in the logbook stating APU reinstalled.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. All right, so that's all the questions that I have at the moment. Pocholo, are you ready?

MR. CRUZ: Yes, I've got a couple. I guess let me start by - are you the only one that updated Abtrack at the time that you were there?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, I was the only one doing it, yes.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and then based off of that, let me ask this question. Are you the only one - who signs off the technical logs on the aircraft? Is it

just you or the mechanics?

MR. VEZINA: It was the mechanic. Yes, we had several mechanics with signing authority, and one of them would have signed it off probably.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. Do they have -

MR. VEZINA: They would have signed off the work order - sorry.

MR. CRUZ: Do they have a air-worthiness release or authority, or is only you that has that?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, no, no. They had air-worthiness release authority.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. All right, and were there procedures in place in Execuflight as far as how the paperwork was supposed to be routed or - routed meaning if there was a discrepancy on there perhaps and paperwork needed to be generated, basically how that paperwork would go through the system itself?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, it was NRGMM. I would look at the logbooks every morning, and if there was a defect, I would then write up a work order and give it to the Chief Inspector who would review it, and he would in turn delegate one of the mechanics or two or more whatever, depending on it to inspect and repair and do whatever they needed to do before the aircraft got released.

Once that was done, the paperwork would come back to my desk, and I would review it and then I would usually get the mechanic to make a log entry signing off whatever he did.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and - go ahead, go ahead. Fishing up.

MR. VEZINA: I was just going to say, and then the work order would be filed in the aircraft's file.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. I believe you mentioned that you were - you were kind were the default DOM at the time that you left. When you took that job over, did you - who took over the inspector job?

MR. VEZINA: Russ Maymullen (phonetic) was made Chief Inspector.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. Was he there previous to you - he was just a regular mechanic?

MR. VEZINA: That's correct.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. All right. What type of relationship did you have with the Ops personnel as far as the pilots who were flying the airplane, obviously more specific to the nine or less, but in general, I'm assuming knew the pilots working both the (inaudible). Is that right?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, I knew them all. They

were very good. I have to say I did not know the crew on this airplane. They must have been hired after I left.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, but at the time that you were there, were there issues that you had with the pilots as far as writing stuff up on the aircraft or not wanting to take the aircraft because of a discrepancy or anything like that?

MR. VEZINA: No, I had a good working relationship with the pilots, and I always explained to them what we were doing and what we had with the aircraft, what the condition of the aircraft was and I think they respected me for that.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and since obviously at the time specifically when the APU was removed, were there any issues with the pilots taking the airplanes?

MR. VEZINA: You mean once it was removed?

MR. CRUZ: Yes.

MR. VEZINA: No, no, I don't recall any issue.

MR. CRUZ: No issues, okay.

MR. VEZINA: No.

MR. CRUZ: And at the time that you basically took over and you mentioned about putting Abtrack online for Execuflight, what type of

coordination was done with the FAA?

MR. VEZINA: Actually our PMI was quite involved because he was talking to me and he basically got the understanding from me that the new system wasn't working, so he more or less insisted that we go back to Abtrack and CMB, so Mike was instrumental in us doing that.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. When you say going back to the old system, I'm a little bit confused. Could you further explain that.

MR. VEZINA: Yes, before I started there, the company had already decided to take the aircraft off of CMB and Abtrack and go to a different computer program, and I basically became the data entry person trying to get everything transferred over to this new program, but it just wasn't working out.

It didn't have the capabilities to handle these types of aircraft, and so after a few months of trying to get it to work and in the meantime we were just - it was just a struggle.

I was talking with Mike and Mr. Atlantison (phonetic) from the FAA, and I told him that I didn't think it would work, so he basically talked to management and got them to agree them to go back to the Abtrack and CMB.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. All right. Specific to the writing of or changing the weight and balance to remove the APU out of the weight and balance for the airplane, is there a procedure in place within Execuflight that tells us how that's to be done specifically?

I guess not just specific to - I mean the paperwork issue with regards to what it involves with flight ops of paperwork that's critical?

MR. VEZINA: You know, not that I can recall. Just from my personal experience, I always created the weight and balance amendment just to make sure that the flight crew were aware of the change. Even though it was a very, very minor change, I still wanted them to know about it.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, so when you generate an amendment to the weight and balance, does the original weight and balance come off the airplane or does it -

MR. VEZINA: No, no. It was probably right behind that page that's in the picture I would say is where it should be, the original bill of weight, and then behind that would be the actual weighing record.

MR. CRUZ: Okay.

MR. VEZINA: The basic operat weight, sorry.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and I know this has been

awhile, if you recall, when you asked to put that on and when you guys reinstalled the APU, was that basically - a mechanic would have had to do that? You instructed a mechanic to do that? Is that correct? Isn't that what you said?

MR. VEZINA: That's correct, yes. That would have been my normal procedure. Occasionally I might have done it myself, but normally I would just ask somebody to take it out for me probably when they were doing the pre-flight or something.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and then they would sign off the logbook as removed and replaced, installed original?

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: And, Pocholo, are you referring to the APU in that question? Remove and replace the APU, install original? What item are you referring to remove and replace?

MR. CRUZ: I'm actually referring to the actual job of reinstalling the APU and removing the paperwork that basically says that this thing did not have an APU.

MR. VEZINA: No, I don't think anybody would sign for that. That was just a procedural thing that we would have done.

The fact that we made the entry stating that

the APU was installed and serviceable would be an indication to the crew that the weight and balance would have been now the original one with the APU.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, so the procedure in the company, correct me if I'm wrong, is that if there was a change in the weight and balance of the aircraft, the amended - the original would stay on the aircraft and the amended would be on top of that.

MR. VEZINA: That was my procedure. I can't tell you that there was a written procedure for that in our manual. I'm not recalling one, but that is how I always did it.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. All right, that's all I got for now, Greg. Thanks.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, Pocholo. Dave Lawrence, you will on?

MR. LAWRENCE: I am. Thanks, and I do have a couple of questions for Roger.

I want to make sure I understand the process here. In May of 2014 we had a basic operating weight that included the APU on there, and then it was removed and a new weight and balance in the basic operation weight without the APU was generated in December, and I think you said it was just about three or four weeks or whatever that it was operating without the APU, and

then it was reinstalled, and the process is simply to pull the December and weight and balance or what should have occurred that the December weight and balance should have been pulled off the airplane, and you simply revert to that and there's a logbook entry that accounts for that, correct?

MR. VEZINA: That's correct, sir.

MR. LAWRENCE: Okay. When you were at the - Director of Maintenance, who was responsible for doing the weight and balance on each of the flights? Did they have like a dispatch or anything like that or are the pilots responsible?

MR. VEZINA: That - I believe it was the pilots. I'm not sure, but I think that the pilots did their own weight and balances.

MR. LAWRENCE: Okay, so how would the pilot know what the most current weight and balance of the aircraft or the basic operating weight of the airplane would be? How would they know when they walk out to the airplane what the exact weight and balance of the aircraft, basic operating weight I should say?

MR. VEZINA: Okay. Each aircraft had a document folder, and it there were several sections - insurance, registration and all that stuff.

One section was called weight and balance,

and in it would be the weight and balance basic operating weight documentation.

MR. LAWRENCE: Okay, so when the pilots on this particular flight went out and if that old basic operating weight without the APU was still on the aircraft, they would be seeing a basic operating rate without the APU even though the APU was still installed, correct?

MR. VEZINA: That's correct. If they didn't look at the thing and read it, obviously they would miss that, yes.

MR. LAWRENCE: Okay. On the logbook entry that you said that once the APU was reinstalled like I believe it was February and the page should have been brought out of that maintenance documentation, when the APU was reinstalled, the logbook entry tell the pilots that the new weight and balance or the new basic operating weight had reverted to the May 2014 value?

MR. VEZINA: I don't remember, sir. I don't recall.

MR. LAWRENCE: Okay. I'm just wondering if there's anything other than looking at the maintenance document, the logbook, is there anything else that tells the pilots that the new basic operating weight has increased by 300 pounds and reverts to the May 2014

value?

MR. VEZINA: It would have to come down - you broke up there, sir.

MR. LAWRENCE: Anyplace else - if the logbook doesn't say what the new basic operating weight is, is there any other means that the pilot would know the actual basic operating weight of the aircraft with the equipment installed?

MR. VEZINA: Not to my knowledge, no.

MR. LAWRENCE: Okay. When the logbook entry is made, the APU has been reinstalled, you're supposed to pull that old one out and you revert back to the May 2014 that shows the basic operating weight with the APU reinstalled, is there any procedure or process that you inform anybody from flight operations that the basic operating weight of the aircraft has changed?

MR. VEZINA: I don't believe there's a written procedure, no. It's more of a common sense thing. We talk to the pilots all the time, and we tell them, hey, your APU is back in now, so you guys can use it, so I guess that we would expect that they would think well if it's back in again, obviously we've got to change to the weight and balance, but I don't think there's a procedure.

MR. LAWRENCE: Okay, and just one final

question. Early on Greg had asked you about the (inaudible) your relationship and you had just made a comment that he was a hard guy to work with and I want you to expand upon that. What do mean that he was a hard guy to work for?

MR. VEZINA: Well he's a businessman. He wants his airplanes on the line, and if I say to him I need three days, he's going to say, well, can you get it out any sooner, and, you know, I just have to stand my ground and say, look, no, I need this for safety, and if that's the case then he would comply and he was good that way, but they're always trying to keep these airplanes flying, but he was never - never expected me to do anything unsafe.

MR. LAWRENCE: Thanks, Roger. Greg, that's all I have. I appreciate it.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. I just -

MR. VEZINA: You're welcome, sir.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: I just have a couple of follow-up questions, Roger. When you were there as the Director of Maintenance, how many mechanics were working for you?

MR. VEZINA: Let me see, it varied because guys and came and left, but usually we had around six or seven.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: And were they full time?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, they would come on and hire on as full-time mechanics. We also had two or three helpers that were unlicensed, but I guess you call them mechanics. I'm thinking of licensed people. I had about six or seven usually.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, and you talked earlier quite a bit about either using the aircraft logbook or generating a work order, so you got mechanics working on the airplane. They're working to this work order let's say to remove the APU and install the blanking kit for lack of a better term, what did the mechanics do to kind of document where they were in the process?

MR. VEZINA: We usually - what my procedure was - myself or Russ - once we issued the work order, we would go to the maintenance manual, find the relevant section, and print it and attach it to the work order to give them guidance on what to do, and as they work on it, they just initial - they should be initialing after they've done a step, just initial that they've done it, so that by the time they reach the end, there's clear accountability for everything that was done.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: And when the job was complete, what did they do - what did you do with the AMM with the initials on it?

MR. VEZINA: That all became part of the work order and was filed in a file. Each work order had its own file under the aircraft registration. All those documents including a copy of that weight and balance amendment would have been on the work order.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. All right, so you would expect to see here's the work order to remove the APU, install a blanking kit. Here's the AMM and there would be signatures as they went along.

MR. VEZINA: That's correct.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. That's all I had. Pocholo, do you got any more follow-up questions?

MR. CRUZ: Yes, I do, Greg. I do. Sorry, I was having technical issues.

Okay, Roger, a couple of questions from me. Is the removal of an APU or install of APU an R double I item or is that (inaudible)?

MR. VEZINA: I can't recall if it's on the R double I list, but I would specifically ask that we have an extra guy go and have a look at it. That would be normal procedure for our guys would be call somebody and do an R double I inspection even if it wasn't

signed off as one.

In fact, our R double I doesn't apply to the underlying (inaudible) anyway, only to the ten or more.

MR. CRUZ: Only to the ten or more, okay.

MR. VEZINA: But my experience is that it never hurts. I've spent a lot of time on helicopters, and it's just so easy to have somebody come and look at your work. It saves you a lot grief, so I kind of instill that in my guys that, you know, when you do something, get somebody else to check it.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. I know this is looking way back, once the APU installed in February, do you recall any issues with that particular APU as far as any light ups (phonetic) from the crew or mechanic after the fact?

MR. VEZINA: No.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and you mentioned that you typically - you ask the mechanic to - typical procedure is for a mechanic to remove the amended weight and balance sheet when the APU has been reinstalled. Is that correct?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, that would have been my procedure. Normally I would ask. Sometimes I might even do it myself, but typically I would say, hey, while you're in there, take that one out of there.

MR. CRUZ: Do you recall specifically telling a mechanic to remove the amended weight and balance sheet?

MR. VEZINA: No, that was a long time ago. I don't.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and based off of - who does the QA for all the work that's being done on the aircraft?

MR. VEZINA: The Chief Inspector.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, so - and the Chief Inspector at the time that you were to deal with them was again who?

MR. VEZINA: Russ (inaudible)

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and as part of his QA duties as a Chief Inspector, what does he physically do with the paperwork?

MR. VEZINA: He would review it after it was done, make sure it was signed off properly, that all the tasks were accounted for, and then when he was happy with it, he would give it to me and then I would file it.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. When you say file it, that means file it in the computer, paperwork-wise, or what's the procedure when you say file it?

MR. VEZINA: It would be - my normal

procedure was to scan the worksheets, at least the cover page of the work order and put it on Abtrack and then put the whole work order together in a file identified with the work order number, and put in the drawer for that particular aircraft, and the FAA were quite often coming in and looking at them.

MR. CRUZ: All right. Is there a quality assurance for the logbooks as well as far as making sure that they were signed off properly?

MR. VEZINA: That would have been part of the thing, yes. Before the aircraft was released, the QA would look at the logbooks and at the work order, and then I would do a final check on them.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and then typically how big is the logbook in a nine or less?

MR. VEZINA: It's the same logbook as the one we use in the ten or more. It's an eight and a half by 11 sheet I guess with - standard logbook and four copies and the crew - the white one stays in the logbook. It's the permanent record.

MR. CRUZ: And what happens to the logbook once you get to the end of the pages?

MR. VEZINA: It then gets filed in a file. They're kept for the life of the aircraft, so the pink pages - I'm trying to remember - sorry?

MR. CRUZ: No, go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. VEZINA: The logbook itself with the white pages, once it's finished, gets filed and kept. They're numbered and each time we start a new logbook we go to the next numerical one, you know, 16, 17, 18, whatever, and then the 50 pages are gone, and then you go to the next one but you keep all of those logbooks. Those white pages are kept as long as you have the aircraft.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, so basically we should be able to go back to Execuflight and actually look at the logbooks around that time. Is that correct?

MR. VEZINA: Sure. That's right.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and you're saying - I mean I just want to make sure I understand that before an aircraft leaves, the Chief Inspector checks to make sure that all the write ups or work orders have been accomplished. Is that correct?

MR. VEZINA: That's correct, yes. That's part of the release of the aircraft is that all the paperwork is checked before the aircraft is finally released to service.

MR. CRUZ: All right. Do you recall - and I'm asking this question because I don't know. Do you recall where that APU was removed and replaced?

MR. VEZINA: Right in the hangar there at Fort Lauderdale Executive.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, so it was removed in a place - it was removed back in December in Fort Lauderdale and it was reinstalled in Fort Lauderdale as well, right?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, sir.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, so what happens if the airplane breaks somewhere else? How does the Chief Inspector ensure that all the work orders have been done?

MR. VEZINA: We have quite a procedure in our GMM again that required us to first locate an appropriately-rated company, maintenance company, wherever the aircraft is and then get copies of the documentation for the - the FAR-145 approvals and so on.

If copies of the licenses of the people who are going to work on the aircraft and then send them a letter of approval. It was a very stringent procedure before they ever got to work on our airplane.

MR. CRUZ: Okay, and before the airplane leaves, your Chief Inspector would do the QA of all the paperwork?

MR. VEZINA: Yes, they would send us all the

paperwork and we would have to approve it. Russ and I would have looked at it, and then once it was completed and we were satisfied with it, then we would authorize them to release the aircraft on our behalf, and then we were required to inspect it again when that arrived back in Fort Lauderdale.

MR. CRUZ: All right. This says the Chief Inspector. Can you do their release of that or the QA for that for the paperwork?

MR. VEZINA: Are you talking to me?

MR. CRUZ: Yes.

MR. VEZINA: Can I do it in lieu of the Chief Inspector? I could if he wasn't available, yes.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. All right. Were there any other people besides the Chief Inspector and yourself that can release that aircraft? If both of you were not there or not able to take a look at the physical paperwork or maybe copies or scanned copies of that paperwork from an outlying station or a 145 repair station, who else could release that aircraft?

MR. VEZINA: We had a Crew Chief, Bill Orr (phonetic) who was authorized to do that as well. I don't think it ever happened, but he would have been able to as well if the two of us were unavailable.

MR. CRUZ: So, correct me if I'm wrong, I'm

hearing three people can release the aircraft from an outlying station.

MR. VEZINA: Yes, if either myself or the Chief Inspector weren't available, then the senior mechanic was also - we had him authorized as able to do that as well if it came to that. I don't recall it ever happening, but it would have been possible.

MR. CRUZ: All right. Can the chief mechanic also do the QA for all the paperwork? Is that part of his duty?

MR. VEZINA: He would be responsible - well, he's responsible for making sure the paperwork is all good before it goes to QA, so he would - if the QA wasn't there, he would bring it right to me, and between the two of us, we would review it and release the airplane.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. Another question for you, when work were done an airplane, specifically on nine or less, are there procedures in place with Execuflight to coordinate that information with the pilots who are going to take that airplane.

As an example, if you're taking an APU off, would the mechanic physically go to the crew that's taking the airplane to fly out and say, hey, your APU is not there? Obviously that's an example, but what

I'm getting at is is there any coordination between maintenance and ops with regards to any deferred items specifically or any equipment that was removed that they should be made aware of prior to taking -

MR. VEZINA: Definitely the logbook was the coordination between the two. Anything like that would be entered in the logbook on the new page where the release is so that the crew would see it.

If it was an -NEL item, it would be listed and it would also be re-carded in the deferred defect log at the back which they are required to check every morning when they accept the aircraft, and it would list all - any deferred defects.

Also we always had a maintenance crew standing by the airplane before departure to - you know, to make sure everything was okay and to talk to the crew and generally they got a briefing on whatever maintenance had been done, and they would usually see that recorded in the logbook anyway.

MR. CRUZ: Do you recall at the time that the APU was removed any conversation or concerns between ops and maintenance with regard to the removed APU?

MR. VEZINA: Not specifically, but I'm sure it was discussed. They would have certainly been aware

that it was removed for overhaul.

MR. CRUZ: Okay.

MR. VEZINA: And just as an added point, normally when they go on the airplane, the first thing they do is go over to the APU control and turn it on. Well they would get there and see a great big sticker saying APU inoperative or removed or something to that effect, so that would be a good clue right there.

MR. CRUZ: All right. Do you recall - it was mentioned in passing that the owner was reluctant on having pilots use the APU at all? Do you recall any type of conversation that -

MR. VEZINA: I was unaware of that.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. I was just curious.

MR. VEZINA: I'm not aware of that at all. That must have been something between the pilots and the owner.

MR. CRUZ: Okay. That's all I got, Greg. Thank you.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. Thank you, Pocholo. Dave, Dave Lawrence, you got anything?

MR. LAWRENCE: No, I'm good. Thanks.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay, and it doesn't look live Dave Avery ever joined, so, Roger, that pretty much wraps up our interview.

We certainly appreciate your time. We learned a few things, so that's a good thing.

MR. VEZINA: You're very welcome.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: And any questions for us before we call it a day?

MR. VEZINA: No, no, sir.

INVESTIGATOR BORSARI: Okay. Thank you everybody. This will conclude the interview. Good bye.

(Whereupon the above-entitled matter was concluded at 5:44 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

MATTER: Execuflight Hawker Accident
November 10, 2015
Accident No. CEN16MA036
Interview of Roger Vezina

DATE: 03-28-16

I hereby certify that the attached transcription of page 1 to 78 inclusive are to the best of my professional ability a true, accurate, and complete record of the above referenced proceedings as contained on the provided audio recording; further that I am neither counsel for, nor related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which this proceeding has taken place; and further that I am not financially nor otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.