



NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Office of Aviation Safety

Washington, D.C. 20594

January 11, 2017

**Attachment 3: Excerpts from NTSB Email Correspondence with
Air Cargo Carriers**

HUMAN PERFORMANCE

DCA17FA109

From: [Steve Altnau](#)
To: [Silva, Sathya](#); [Luke McGrath](#)
Cc: [Mccarter Aaron](#); [Matt Mattison](#)
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information
Date: Friday, December 8, 2017 7:37:32 PM

Sathya,

I believe you received an answer from Matt on the second question.

To answer the first questions it is a regulation we train. 135.144. The only item approved for use is the iPad EFB.

Steve

From: Silva, Sathya [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2017 12:33 PM
To: Luke McGrath; Steve Altnau
Cc: Mccarter Aaron; Matt Mattison
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Hi All,

Just wanted to check on this information. Please respond when you get a chance. This is the only thing left before sending the HP factual out to parties for review. Thanks,

Sathya

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board
[REDACTED]

From: Silva, Sathya
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 10:54 AM
To: 'Luke McGrath' [REDACTED]; Steve Altnau [REDACTED]
Cc: Mccarter Aaron [REDACTED]; Matthew Mattison [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Hi Steve, Luke, and Matt,

Thanks for the information. I have just a few more follow up questions

- Do you have a policy on cell phone (personal electronic device) use in the cockpit? If so, how is it communicated to the pilots? I see the EFB details but anything outside of that documentation for personal devices?

- Matt, you mentioned in your interview that you discuss examples during CRM training. Can you please elaborate on what those examples are or what they look like?

Thanks,
Sathya

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board

From: Luke McGrath [redacted]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 5:28 PM
To: Silva, Sathya <[redacted]>; Steve Altnau <[redacted]>
Cc: Mccarter Aaron [redacted]; Matthew Mattison <[redacted]>
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Hello Sathya,

We combine that examination with our end of indoctrination "week 1" test. The test which I have attached for you, is a pass/fail exam. If they pass the test is corrected to 100% and they keep it to study from for their oral exam at the end of the course, if they fail (less than 70%) they are removed from the class and no longer continue with the company. We do not retain these tests as they are pass/fail and utilized for their own study references moving forward, we do not have a copy of the individual's test results.

Sincerely,

~Luke McGrath
Chief Pilot ACC LLC.

From: Silva, Sathya [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Tuesday, November 7, 2017 8:03 AM
To: Steve Altnau
Cc: Mccarter Aaron; Matthew Mattison; Luke McGrath
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Hi Steve,

I'm referring to Chapter 5, Page 3 of your pilot training manual. Section four states that there is an examination for "FARS 61, 91, and 135"

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator

National Transportation Safety Board

[REDACTED]

From: Steve Altnau [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, November 6, 2017 3:49 PM
To: Silva, Sathya <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Mccarter Aaron <[REDACTED]>; Matthew Mattison <[REDACTED]>; Luke McGrath <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Sathya,

Is the attached a copy of the evaluation you are speaking of? This is our ground training record and certificate Form 211.

Steve

From: Silva, Sathya [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2017 2:34 PM
To: Steve Altnau
Cc: Mccarter Aaron; Matthew Mattison; Luke McGrath
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Thanks Steve.

Is there any different slide deck or documentation you use for recurrent or upgrade CRM training compared to initial? If so, can you please provide a copy.

Can you also provide a copy of the evaluation for the ground modules on Far 61, 91, and 135, please? I thought I saw this in your training program, but let me know if I'm mistaken.

Thanks,
Sathya

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board

[REDACTED]

From: Steve Altnau [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 3, 2017 11:25 AM
To: Silva, Sathya <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Mccarter Aaron [REDACTED]; Matthew Mattison <[REDACTED]>; Luke McGrath <[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Sathya,

Hope this helps

1. The majority of CRM is conducted in initial, however it is reviewed during recurrent and during upgrade it is increased, almost to the initial level for the change in seat.
2. CRM is ongoing process through the class during the lecture phase. The lecture items are put to use and evaluated during the "chair flying, FTD session and finally in the simulator or aircraft as applicable. CRM is a continuing process while in ground school, hangar visits and anytime the trainees are together. We want the correct actions and teamwork at all times, not just in the cockpit.
3. Matt Mattson started with ACC 3/2012, Upgraded 7/2012, Ground instructor 1/2014, Sim check airman 4/2014, Aircraft check airman 4/2015 Director of Training 5/2015
4. When we added the first 2 pilot shorts SD3-30 to the certificate in 9/1994 was the start of CRM.

Steve

From: Silva, Sathya [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 01, 2017 12:13 PM
To: Steve Altnau
Cc: Mccarter Aaron
Subject: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Hi Steve,

We're in the process of writing our reports on the Charleston accident, and I just need a bit more information:

1. What curriculum is CRM training a part of? (i.e. is it part of initial, recurrent, upgrade, multiples of these?)
2. Is there an evaluation of CRM principles following CRM training? If there's not a particular test for CRM alone, can you please provide a copy of the evaluation for the ground modules on Far 61, 91, and 135, please?
3. When did your director of training start in that position? And when did he join ACC? (I realized we forgot to ask for his background during the interview)
4. When did CRM training become incorporated into your pilot training program?

Thanks,
Sathya

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - THIS E-MAIL TRANSMISSION MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, PROPRIETARY, SUBJECT TO COPYRIGHT, AND/OR EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IT IS FOR THE USE OF INTENDED RECIPIENTS ONLY. If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the original sender immediately by forwarding what you received and then delete all copies of the correspondence and attachments from your computer system. Any use, distribution, or disclosure of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - THIS E-MAIL TRANSMISSION MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, PROPRIETARY, SUBJECT TO COPYRIGHT, AND/OR EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IT IS FOR THE USE OF INTENDED RECIPIENTS ONLY. If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the original sender immediately by forwarding what you received and then delete all copies of the correspondence and attachments from your computer system. Any use, distribution, or disclosure of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - THIS E-MAIL TRANSMISSION MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, PROPRIETARY, SUBJECT TO COPYRIGHT, AND/OR EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IT IS FOR THE USE OF INTENDED RECIPIENTS ONLY. If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the original sender immediately by forwarding what you received and then delete all copies of the correspondence and attachments from your computer system. Any use, distribution, or disclosure of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - THIS E-MAIL TRANSMISSION MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, PROPRIETARY, SUBJECT TO COPYRIGHT, AND/OR EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IT IS FOR THE USE OF INTENDED RECIPIENTS ONLY. If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the original sender immediately by forwarding what you received and then delete all copies of the correspondence and attachments from your computer system. Any use, distribution, or disclosure of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

From: [Matt Mattison](#)
To: [Silva, Sathya](#)
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information
Date: Thursday, December 7, 2017 5:21:01 PM

Sathya,

Sorry for the delay as I have been out of the office.

I can't say that I always use the same examples, but as we go through the PowerPoint presentation on CRM I will give personal stories about situations that have come up and how I used appropriate CRM to deal with those situations. Some stories are purely hypothetical, but I try to include as many real scenarios as possible, whether they are mine or someone has told me of a time where they used good CRM. Some stories have poor CRM practices and we discuss how things could have been handled differently and how the outcome may have changed if they were. Some stories have very good CRM and we discuss how things might have worked out differently if it weren't for the proper use of CRM.

Example: A fairly seasoned captain and a relatively new first officer landed safely at their destination. The first officer communicated with ATC and received taxi instructions that included "hold short" instructions. The captain assumed that they got the same taxi instructions that they got every day (due to the nature of our operation it is easy to follow habitual patterns) and did not discuss the taxi instructions with the first officer. The first officer assumed that the captain heard the instructions from ATC and never communicated it to the captain. As the aircraft taxied toward the runway in which they were to hold short the first officer started to become concerned about the speed of the airplane approaching the hold short line. The first officer is now realizing that the captain may not have heard the hold short instructions and tells the captain to stop the aircraft, they are not cleared across the runway. The airplane does come to a stop before crossing the hold short line, but if it weren't for an alert and assertive first officer there would likely have been a runway incursion.

Then we discuss as outlined above.

From: Silva, Sathya [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Thursday, December 7, 2017 12:33 PM
To: Luke McGrath; Steve Altnau
Cc: Mccarter Aaron; Matt Mattison
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Hi All,

Just wanted to check on this information. Please respond when you get a chance. This is the only thing left before sending the HP factual out to parties for review. Thanks,

Sathya

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board

[REDACTED]

From: Silva, Sathya
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 10:54 AM
To: 'Luke McGrath' <[REDACTED]>; Steve Altnau <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Mccarter Aaron <[REDACTED]>; Matthew Mattison <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Investigation Follow- Up Information

Hi Steve, Luke, and Matt,

Thanks for the information. I have just a few more follow up questions

- Do you have a policy on cell phone (personal electronic device) use in the cockpit? If so, how is it communicated to the pilots? I see the EFB details but anything outside of that documentation for personal devices?
- Matt, you mentioned in your interview that you discuss examples during CRM training. Can you please elaborate on what those examples are or what they look like?

Thanks,
Sathya

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board

[REDACTED]

From: [Luke McGrath](#)
To: [Silva, Sathya](#); [Steve Altnau](#)
Cc: [Mccarter Aaron](#)
Subject: RE: DCA17FA109 - HP Draft Factual Report for Party Review
Date: Thursday, December 28, 2017 6:48:50 PM

Hello Sathya,

My apologies on the late reply to this. Steve is correct in the following:

1. I stated we do have a CRM program, not having one is incorrect.
2. I stated we do not have specific (in flight) scenarios we put the crews through. The crews typically during training events cause their own CRM scenario that get discussed.
3. I am not a check airman - only a simulator instructor.

If you could please find these corrections made in the report I would appreciate that.

Respectfully,

~Luke McGrath
Chief Pilot ACC LLC.

-----Original Message-----

From: Silva, Sathya [[mailto: \[REDACTED\]](#)]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 10:15 AM
To: Steve Altnau
Cc: Mccarter Aaron; Luke McGrath
Subject: RE: DCA17FA109 - HP Draft Factual Report for Party Review

Oh ok got it.

Yes, you as a group member were requested to review the factual. If anything needs to be changed in Luke's interview summary however, that has to come from him.

Beginning of the year is fine on this when Luke gets a chance. We'll get this moving along then.

Thanks,
Sathya

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Altnau [[mailto: \[REDACTED\]](#)]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 10:49 AM
To: Silva, Sathya <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>
Cc: Mccarter Aaron <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>; Luke McGrath <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>
Subject: Re: DCA17FA109 - HP Draft Factual Report for Party Review

Sathya,

I thought you wanted the response from me as it was directed to me. Luke is on vacation for a few days. He was

never a check airman and currently is not a check airman. However I will have him write you.

Luke,

When you return can you send the info you told me to send & send to Sathya.

S

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 21, 2017, at 08:02, Silva, Sathya [REDACTED] <[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])> wrote:

Thanks Steve,

Please have Luke send us an email clarifying his comments and we can refer to this email clarification per our processes in the report.

For (3) was there a specific place in the factual I stated he wasn't a check airman? I have it documented in the field notes that he was a check airman and thought I reflected that in the factual. (If it's tense that's the issue – we write the reports in past tense so this isn't necessarily a reflection of his current status as a check airman)

Sathya S. Silva, Ph.D.
Human Performance Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board

[REDACTED]

From: Steve Altnau [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 8:10 PM
To: Silva, Sathya <sathya.silva@ntsb.gov>
Cc: Mccarter Aaron <aaron.mccarter@ntsb.gov>; Luke McGrath <luke.mcgrath@aircar.com>; Steve Altnau <steve.altнау@aircar.com>
Subject: RE: DCA17FA109 - HP Draft Factual Report for Party Review

Sathya,

The only item we notice was in error is in Luke McGrath's statement details.

1. He stated we do have a CRM program, not having one is incorrect.
2. He stated we do not have specific (in flight) scenarios we put the crews through. The crews typically during training events cause their own CRM scenario that get discussed.
3. He is not a check airman

Steve