

# **Aviation Investigation Final Report**

Location:	Seattle, Washington	Incident Number:	SEA04IA045
Date & Time:	February 24, 2004, 09:30 Local	Registration:	N368SW
Aircraft:	Boeing 737-300	Aircraft Damage:	None
Defining Event:		Injuries:	94 None
Flight Conducted Under:	Part 121: Air carrier - Scheduled		

# Analysis

While west of the airport, the flight crew was cleared for the Bay Visual Approach to Runway 16 Right. The First Officer, who was flying at the time, made a right turn over Elliott Bay and lined up on what he believed to be Runway 16 Right, but was in fact Taxiway Tango. When the aircraft was about one mile from the end of the taxiway, the first officer noticed a yellow X located just off the northern end of the surface he intended to land on. Upon realizing he was lined up on the wrong surface, he initiated a sidestep to Runway 16 Right. He subsequently completed an uneventful landing on Runway 16 Right, and taxied to the gate for a normal deplanement of the passengers. According to recorded radar tracking data, at the time of the turn to initiate the sidestep, the aircraft was approximately 600 feet above the ground (AGL). The size and shape of the taxiway made it look very much like a runway to the First Officer, and although he was eventually able to see the Runway 16 Right identification markings, because of the glare on the wet surfaces, he never did clearly see any markings that indicated Taxiway Tango was a taxiway. Although the Captain had correctly identified the runway surface when the aircraft first rolled out on final, flight deck distractions kept him from realizing that the first Officer was lined up on the taxiway until the sidestep maneuver was initiated.

### **Probable Cause and Findings**

The National Transportation Safety Board determines the probable cause(s) of this incident to be: The First Officer's misidentification of the parallel taxiway as the active runway, resulting in the need for a sidestep maneuver while on short final for a full-stop landing. Factors include sunglare from wet paved surfaces, a visual illusion created by the size and shape of the taxiway, and the Captain's failure to adequately monitor the First Officer's approach.

#### **Findings**

Occurrence #1: MISCELLANEOUS/OTHER Phase of Operation: APPROACH - VFR PATTERN - FINAL APPROACH

Findings

- 1. (C) WRONG RUNWAY SELECTED COPILOT/SECOND PILOT
- 2. (F) VISUAL ILLUSION COPILOT/SECOND PILOT
- 3. (F) MONITORING INADEQUATE PILOT IN COMMAND
- 4. (F) AIRPORT FACILITIES, RUNWAY/LANDING AREA CONDITION WET

5. (F) LIGHT CONDITION - SUNGLARE

### **Factual Information**

On February 24, 2004, approximately 0930 Pacific standard time, the First Officer of a Southwest Airlines 737-300, N368SW, inadvertently aligned the aircraft for a landing on Taxiway Tango at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (SEATAC), Seattle, Washington. There were no injuries to the flight crew, three flight attendants, or any of the 89 passengers, and there was no damage to the aircraft, which is owned and operated by Southwest Airlines Company. The scheduled Part 121 domestic passenger flight, which departed Oakland, California, about 85 minutes prior to the incident, was being operated in visual meteorological conditions at the time of the subject event. The flight had been on an IFR flight plan, and had been cleared for a visual approach to Runway 16 Right at SEATAC.

According to the flight crew, while they were west of the airport, the flight was cleared for the Bay Visual Approach to Runway 16 Right. The First Officer, who was flying at the time, made a right turn over Elliott Bay and lined up on what he believed to be Runway 16 Right. When the aircraft was about one mile from the end of the taxiway, the first officer noticed a yellow X located just off the northern end of the surface he intended to land on. Upon realizing he was lined up on the wrong surface, he initiated a sidestep to Runway 16 Right. He subsequently completed an uneventful landing on Runway 16 Right, and taxied to the gate for a normal deplanement of the passengers. According to recorded radar tracking data, at the time of the turn to initiate the sidestep, the aircraft was approximately 600 feet above the ground (AGL).

In a post-incident interview, the First Officer said that he did not realize he was lined up to land on the wrong surface until he saw the yellow X. He also said that there were varying degrees of reflection and glare at different areas of the airfield environment, and that the size and shape of the taxiway made it look very much like a runway. He further stated that although he was eventually able to see the Runway 16 Right identification markings, he never did clearly see any markings that indicated Taxiway Tango was a taxiway. When advised that there was also a temporary lighted-X near the permanent yellow X, he responded that the only X he had seen was the solid yellow X. When told that the Runway 16 centerline lights were on in the dim position, he said that he did not remember seeing them, even after executing the sidestep maneuver.

In a post-incident interview with the Captain, he stated that he knew which surface was the runway and which was the taxiway soon after the aircraft rolled out on final, but at the time he first visually acquired the runway environment, it looked to him like the First Officer was lining up on Runway 16 Right. The Captain explained that since they had been cleared to land long, his attention was diverted from the runway environment while he explained the landing/deceleration technique he wanted the first Officer to use, and then waited for the First Officer's response. He added that almost immediately after the First Officer confirmed that he understood his instructions, the First Officer made a comment and started a shallow left turn.

At that point, the Captain briefly checked the airspeed, and then returned his attention to the runway/taxiway environment. He said that it was at that point in time when he realized that the First Officer had lined up to the right (west) of Runway 16 Right, and was now correcting to it. He also mentioned that he too briefly saw the yellow X at that point in time. The Captain said that he thought briefly about a go-around, but since the bank angle was shallow, and the runway very nearby, he elected to let the First Officer continue the sidestep.

At the time of the event, the airport's paved surfaces were wet from a recent rain shower, and although the Captain was aware of the note on the airport diagram advising crews not to mistake Taxiway Tango for a landing surface, this note was not discussed prior to or during the approach sequence. He said that because the ILS was out, they had no localizer backup. Both crew members mentioned that there was a need for a better/clearer identification of the runways, but that some type of markings making it clear that Taxiway Tango is not a runway was the most important action that could be taken.

Certificate:	Airline transport	Age:	56,Male
Airplane Rating(s):	Single-engine land; Multi-engine land	Seat Occupied:	Left
Other Aircraft Rating(s):	None	Restraint Used:	
Instrument Rating(s):	Airplane	Second Pilot Present:	Yes
Instructor Rating(s):	None	Toxicology Performed:	No
Medical Certification:	Class 1 Valid Medicalw/ waivers/lim	Last FAA Medical Exam:	November 13, 2003
Occupational Pilot:	Yes	Last Flight Review or Equivalent:	December 21, 2003
Flight Time:	25000 hours (Total, all aircraft), 12000 hours (Total, this make and model), 10000 hours (Pilot In Command, all aircraft), 240 hours (Last 90 days, all aircraft), 80 hours (Last 30 days, all aircraft), 6 hours (Last 24 hours, all aircraft)		

#### **Pilot Information**

# Co-pilot Information

Certificate:	Airline transport	Age:	34,Male
Airplane Rating(s):	Single-engine land; Multi-engine land	Seat Occupied:	Right
Other Aircraft Rating(s):	None	Restraint Used:	
Instrument Rating(s):	Airplane	Second Pilot Present:	Yes
Instructor Rating(s):	Airplane single-engine	Toxicology Performed:	No
Medical Certification:	Class 1 Valid Medicalno waivers/lim.	Last FAA Medical Exam:	May 4, 2003
Occupational Pilot:	Yes	Last Flight Review or Equivalent:	November 3, 2003
Flight Time:	6700 hours (Total, all aircraft), 2500 hours (Total, this make and model), 3500 hours (Pilot In Command, all aircraft), 240 hours (Last 90 days, all aircraft), 80 hours (Last 30 days, all aircraft)		

# Aircraft and Owner/Operator Information

Aircraft Make:	Boeing	Registration:	N368SW
Model/Series:	737-300	Aircraft Category:	Airplane
Year of Manufacture:		Amateur Built:	
Airworthiness Certificate:	Transport	Serial Number:	26579
Landing Gear Type:	Retractable - Tricycle	Seats:	145
Date/Type of Last Inspection:	December 2, 2003 Continuous airworthiness	Certified Max Gross Wt.:	139000 lbs
Time Since Last Inspection:	640 Hrs	Engines:	Turbo fan
Airframe Total Time:	36024 Hrs at time of accident	Engine Manufacturer:	General Electric
ELT:	Not installed	Engine Model/Series:	CFM-56
Registered Owner:	SOUTHWEST AIRLINES CO	Rated Power:	20000 Lbs thrust
Operator:		Operating Certificate(s) Held:	Flag carrier (121)
Operator Does Business As:	Southwest Airlines	Operator Designator Code:	SWAA

# Meteorological Information and Flight Plan

Conditions at Accident Site:	Visual (VMC)	Condition of Light:	
Observation Facility, Elevation:	SEA,433 ft msl	Distance from Accident Site:	2 Nautical Miles
Observation Time:	09:56 Local	Direction from Accident Site:	340°
Lowest Cloud Condition:	Scattered / 12000 ft AGL	Visibility	10 miles
Lowest Ceiling:	Broken / 17000 ft AGL	Visibility (RVR):	
Wind Speed/Gusts:	4 knots /	Turbulence Type Forecast/Actual:	1
Wind Direction:	170°	Turbulence Severity Forecast/Actual:	/
Altimeter Setting:	29.62 inches Hg	Temperature/Dew Point:	10°C / 4°C
Precipitation and Obscuration:	No Obscuration; No Precipitation		
Departure Point:	Oakland, CA (OAK )	Type of Flight Plan Filed:	IFR
Destination:	Seattle, WA (SEA )	Type of Clearance:	IFR
Departure Time:	07:40 Local	Type of Airspace:	Class D

# **Airport Information**

Airport:	Seattle-Tacoma Inyternational KSEA	Runway Surface Type:	Concrete
Airport Elevation:	433 ft msl	<b>Runway Surface Condition:</b>	Wet
Runway Used:	16R	IFR Approach:	Visual
Runway Length/Width:	9426 ft / 150 ft	VFR Approach/Landing:	Full stop

# Wreckage and Impact Information

Crew Injuries:	5 None	Aircraft Damage:	None
Passenger Injuries:	89 None	Aircraft Fire:	None
Ground Injuries:	N/A	Aircraft Explosion:	None
Total Injuries:	94 None	Latitude, Longitude:	47.44889,-122.309448

### **Administrative Information**

Investigator In Charge (IIC):	Anderson, Orrin
Additional Participating Persons:	Harold Hutchins; Seattle FSDO; Renton, WA
Original Publish Date:	June 8, 2005
Last Revision Date:	
Investigation Class:	<u>Class</u>
Note:	
Investigation Docket:	https://data.ntsb.gov/Docket?ProjectID=58851

The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) is an independent federal agency charged by Congress with investigating every civil aviation accident in the United States and significant events in other modes of transportation—railroad, transit, highway, marine, pipeline, and commercial space. We determine the probable causes of the accidents and events we investigate, and issue safety recommendations aimed at preventing future occurrences. In addition, we conduct transportation safety research studies and offer information and other assistance to family members and survivors for each accident or event we investigate. We also serve as the appellate authority for enforcement actions involving aviation and mariner certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and US Coast Guard, and we adjudicate appeals of civil penalty actions taken by the FAA.

The NTSB does not assign fault or blame for an accident or incident; rather, as specified by NTSB regulation, "accident/incident investigations are fact-finding proceedings with no formal issues and no adverse parties ... and are not conducted for the purpose of determining the rights or liabilities of any person" (Title 49 *Code of Federal Regulations* section 831.4). Assignment of fault or legal liability is not relevant to the NTSB's statutory mission to improve transportation safety by investigating accidents and incidents and issuing safety recommendations. In addition, statutory language prohibits the admission into evidence or use of any part of an NTSB report related to an accident in a civil action for damages resulting from a matter mentioned in the report (Title 49 *United States Code* section 1154(b)). A factual report that may be admissible under 49 *United States Code* section 1154(b) is available here.