

AFS-600

Regulatory Support Division

Vol. 16, No. 3

JULY 2004

A quarterly publication designed to serve the Examiner, Designee, and Instructor Community.

IN THIS UPDATE

IMPROVING THE DPE PROGRAM	1
SPORT PILOT PROGRAM.....	2
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES HANDBOOK.....	2
CIRCLING APPROACHES DURNING AN INSTRUMENT PROFICIENCY CHECK	3
HUMAN NATURE.....	4
CFI REINSTATEMENT.....	5
WHAT TO STUDY	6
ATP AIRPLANE NONPRECISION APPROACH	6

IMPROVING THE DPE PROGRAM

The Federal Aviation Administration Flight Plan 2004-2008 is on the FAA main website <http://faa.gov> and is available for all the public to read. It lists as its Second Objective, "Reduce the Number of Fatal Accidents in General Aviation." One of the Strategies listed to accomplish this objective is to improve general aviation flight training while maintaining or lowering costs. There are two Initiatives that are listed to accomplish this goal; we are going to discuss the second.

"IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF THE PILOT EXAMINER PROGRAM"

This objective will have a direct impact on you the DPE and how you do business. Wouldn't it be a good idea to get involved in the process of improving this program? If you want to get involved in this process send me an E-mail with your recommendation(s), and I will forward it to the appropriate office and put you in contact with the right Aviation Safety Inspector. Paul.J.Maenza@faa.gov

SPORT PILOT PROGRAM

By Marty Weaver Sport Pilot Branch Manager, AFS-610

The Sport Pilot/Light Sport Aircraft regulation was signed by the FAA administrator on July 16th and will become effective on September 1st. The Light Sport Aviation Branch (AFS-610) is in the process of developing a new Sport Pilot Examiner Handbook, a new airman application, and a new Sport Pilot Examiner Application. The goal is to have this document and forms available to the public by October. The new handbook will address procedures for current examiners and the new Sport Pilot Examiners on how to conduct sport pilot practical tests. The new forms will be used to support these efforts.

The four new practical test standards that will be used in the sport pilot program are scheduled to be available to the public in October. More details concerning these PTSs will be discussed in the October issue of this newsletter. The new knowledge tests for sport pilot, sport pilot flight instructor, and sport pilot examiner will be released in mid October. The initial sport pilot certification activity is not expected to occur before January 2005. As you can see we are very busy trying to get the program on the road. You can monitor the Light Sport Pilot Branch web site at afs600.faa.gov to stay up with the latest information concerning the development of the various products.

INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES HANDBOOK

The FAA is pleased to announce that the FAA-H-8261-1, Instrument Procedures Handbook (IPH) is available on the AFS-420 web page at: <http://av-info.faa.gov/terps/IPH.htm>. The IPH has been an extraordinary undertaking for the FAA with its scope, depth, and quality of content. The IPH will soon be available from GPO also.

The IPH expands upon information contained in the Instrument Flying Handbook and introduces advanced information for IFR operations that will help pilots and flight crews keep up with the changes that are taking place in the NAS. The IPH is designed as a technical reference for professional pilots. Flight instructors and instrument students may find this handbook a valuable training aid since it provides detailed coverage of instrument charts and procedures including IFR takeoff, departure, en route, arrival, approach, and landing. Safety information covering relevant subjects such as runway incursion, land and hold short operations, controlled flight into terrain, and human factors issues also are included. Although the emphasis of the IPH applies to airplane operations, helicopter specific IFR operations are included. If you have any questions please send me an E-mail.

PS. The Instrument Procedures Handbook is now a reference for the Practical and Knowledge tests.

Steven E Winter
AFS-420
Steven.E.Winter@faa.gov

CIRCLING APPROACHES AND THEIR CONDUCT DURING INSTRUMENT PROFICIENCY CHECKS

By Mike Brown, AFS-840

As part of an ongoing effort to improve regulatory compliance, clarity, and safety, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) occasionally finds it necessary to implement changes to existing policies and guidance. While such changes are typically very effective in achieving their desired safety goals, clarity (and with it compliance) may not always fare as well. This recently became evident when the FAA published the new *Instrument Rating Practical Test Standards (PTS), FAA-S-8081-4D*. Effective October 1, 2004, version "Delta" has raised questions concerning the requirement to conduct circling approaches as part of the instrument proficiency check (IPC).

Specifically, this latest version of the PTS includes a new paragraph (page 16, following the Rating Task Table) that states in relevant part, "*The person giving the check shall use the standards and procedures contained in this PTS when administering the check.*" Some viewed this language as mandating tasks that were voluntary under the current PTS, version "Charlie." While this (current) version lacks the explicit text cited above, the FAA always intended for the table to be used in the conduct of IPCs. Of course "intent" lacks the precision to which we aspire, so the latest version "Delta" was modified to clarify existing Flight Standards policy. In short, the FAA always expected instructors to conform to the task table when conducting IPCs, and version "Delta" now makes that clear.

This brings us to the main point of contention. Similar to its predecessor (issued in 1999), version "Delta" of the Instrument PTS contains a task table that includes a column for the IPC. While some of these tasks vary between versions "Delta" and "Charlie," both specify circling approaches under Area of Operation VI. However, because some flight training institutions consider circling approaches to be a new requirement, they are concerned they may no longer exclusively use FAA-approved Flight Training Devices (FTDs) to conduct IPCs.

Again, the PTS change poses no additional burdens on flight schools, instructors, or pilots. The FAA never envisioned, nor has the FAA ever approved, the use of FTDs and other similar devices for a complete instrument proficiency check. Flight Training Devices need not contain a visual system, and those that do lack the visual cues necessary to replicate a circle-to-land procedure (circling approach). As a result, it is inappropriate to credit a complete IPC in such a device absent supplemental flights in an actual aircraft. As a practical matter, it is difficult to imagine that any ground-based training aid, short of a full level-qualified flight simulator approved for circling approaches, could substitute for instruction received during actual flight operations. That is not to say FTDs have no place in the pantheon of instrument flight instruction, or for that matter IPCs. In fact, many of these devices serve as excellent procedure trainers, and are a proven means of evaluating certain piloting skills. However, as with all such resources, it is important they be used in a manner consistent with their design and limitations.

And finally, for those who say circling approaches are too dangerous and shouldn't be emphasized, consider these facts. Currently there are over 1,100 instrument approach procedures with only circle-to-land minima. Combine this with literally thousands of other approaches with published circling minima, and it's clear that an instrument pilot needs to possess such skills to be a complete aviator. Moreover, the skills needed to transition from instrument to visual flight while maintaining precise aircraft control are critical...At least as critical as those required to execute a hold or recover from an unusual flight attitude. Again, circling approaches provide for the maintenance of these skills. Also, it should be noted that most accidents involving circling approaches were attributed to poor piloting technique and failure to maintain the requisite visibility and cloud clearances

for a given procedure. This fact alone provides a clear and compelling incentive to make circling approaches a part of any instrument training and proficiency regimen, thus the FAA's rationale for their inclusion as part of a comprehensive IPC.

HUMAN NATURE

By Ed Galasso, ASI/Instructor AFS-640

It is a moonless night. The hour is late. The traffic light a block away turns red. The street is desolate. Instead of braking to stop, you look left and right and accelerate through the light. This is a rare situation for some, and common practice to others. Where do you fall in this scenario?

How are our certification rides measured with regard to the FAA's standards?

Do we put our conscience aside in light of greater profit or the easier way out? Do we provide the path of least resistance to applicants, or do we provide complete and concise quality control measures in the certification process? Are we seeing that proper training has occurred?

Aviation accident rates will lower if we all work together to eliminate shortcuts and inadequate practices.

You have heard me say in my seminar appearances that we should feel confident about putting our loved ones in the aircraft with our newly certificated applicant. We should know with confidence that this loved one will come back alive!

The National DPE Improvement Team is currently implementing a National Pilot Survey of newly rated pilots. The purpose of the survey is to ascertain the method and completeness of DPE certification check rides.

It is better if we police ourselves before a national task force team enters our workspace posing as applicants. No one wants to have inspectors posing as applicants sitting in their offices. If we cannot clean up our own acts, it may come to this.

In administering the test we must use the PTS, its references and a concise written plan-of-action (POA). By two recent examples, it appears to me that this is not happening. I received two phone calls from the field in as many days, which indicated to me that we have some problems.

The first phone call questioned whether the applicant could pick the second pylon in a Pylon Eight Maneuver, after the maneuver has begun. The reference in the commercial PTS (FAA-H-8083-3) states on page 6-13 – "**Before beginning the maneuver, select two points on the ground along a line which lies 90 degrees to the direction of the wind.**" If the examiner did the homework in preparing the written POA, this call would have been unnecessary.

The second phone call concerned a question about examiners cutting power to idle on one engine at the moment of a stall in a twin-engine aircraft. Again, the reference (FAA-H-8083-3) states on page 14-13 – "*Because of possible loss of control, stalls with one engine inoperative or at idle power and the other engine developing effective power, should not be practiced by applicants for multiengine class ratings.*"

If we develop effective written plans-of-action, administer the test strictly by the PTS guidelines and its references, and if we effectively police ourselves, maybe no one else will have to do it for us.

We must always strive to be as thorough and fair as possible to both the applicant and the system. This will make our skies safer for everyone.

In the words of Forrest Gump, “that’s all I have to say about that!”

CFI REINSTATEMENT

To John D Lynch, Paul Maenza,

I have some input to the Examiner Branch about possibly changing the CFI Practical Test Standard (PTS), FAA-S-8081-6B. Additionally, I would like to get this issue into the next Examiner Update and see how other Inspectors and Examiners feel about the subject.

Since I am an Aviation Safety Inspector (ASI), most of the 14 CFR Part 61 Practical Tests I perform are for Initial CFI applicants. Recently however, I sat in on a practical test for a CFI reinstatement and I found that although the applicant was an excellent pilot, I had no more idea about the applicants ability to teach after the test than before. The practical test guide has a serious flaw in that regard.

I strongly agree with the FAA regulation, policy, and practice whereby the renewal or reinstatement of one rating on a Flight Instructor Certificate renews and reinstates all privileges existing on the certificate, since the demonstration of competency and currency in other category, classes, types, ratings, and operations are already regulated elsewhere.

I am not comfortable however, with FAA-S-8081-6B, page 1-viii, which does not require all CFI areas of operation be tested for renewal or reinstatement. I feel even less comfortable with the selection of the particular areas of operations omitted.

The Omitted Area of Operations in the PTS are:

- I. FUNDAMENTALS OF INSTRUCTING
- IV. PREFLIGHT LESSON ON A MANEUVER TO BE PERFORMED IN FLIGHT
- VI. AIRPORT AND SEAPLANE BASE OPERATIONS
- VIII. FUNDAMENTALS OF FLIGHT
- XII. BASIC INSTRUMENT MANEUVERS

The reason this person is taking a practical test in the first place is that he probably must. Either his flight instructor certificate has expired or he couldn't schedule a FIRC or he has had insufficient activity as a flight instructor or his duties do not include flight instruction.

Although he may not have been instructing, he probably has been flying. I cannot imagine anyone attempting a CFI practical test without some recent flight training, practice or experience. At any rate, what we should be testing for is his ability to teach and more importantly, his ability to teach while flying.

Every one of the areas above that are not required to be tested are specific areas that make the CFI test distinct from other pilot tests. With no recent teaching experience, these are areas that the applicant has not seen or

even thought about for years. Many of the CFI's I talk to say that when they have not instructed for a while, the areas above are what they need to review. This is because although they may not have instructed, many are actively engaged in other types of flying and are confident in their flying abilities.

The underlining question that must be answered however, is that if we are not testing the applicants ability to teach, why do we even require CFI reinstatement or renewal by practical test? We are already assuring the applicants competence and piloting skills by requiring Flight Reviews, PIC proficiency checks, PIC experience, instrument currency, and recency of flight experience.

Everyone knows that a good pilot may not necessarily be a good instructor. This cannot be more powerfully illustrated than by witnessing the high first time failure rates for CFI's, who in most cases had just recently passed commercial or other practical tests.

What do you think?

Emil A. Cirone

ASI

If you have impute on this article send me an E-mail and I will forward it to the appropriate inspector.

Paul.J.Maenza@faa.gov

WHAT TO STUDY?

I keep getting asked what test questions can I study for taking the DPE knowledge test after I receive my letter of authorization from the NEB. It would be unfair to ask a DPE applicant test questions about a subject in which they have no experience. The test questions that a DPE applicant should study are based on the flight instructor certificate held in the category of aircraft in which designation is desired. The exception to this is for the balloon applicants who don't hold a CFI. Example: The airplane applicant should study the flight instructor test questions for airplane flight instructors. The balloon applicant should study commercial balloon.

ATP AIRPLANE NONPRECISION APPROACH

I keep getting asked questions about a **note** in the ATP Practical Test Standards for Airplane. Take a look at AREA OF OPERATION V, INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES, D TASK: NONPRECISION INSTRUMENT APPROACHES. (Page 2-20) The second note at the end of the task states that the second approach may be waived. The question is who can waive this and whom does this apply too?

The answer is found in the introduction of this PTS on page 2. This applies **ONLY** to those crewmembers employed by 14 CFR parts 121 and 135 operators and those FAA personnel assigned to part 121 and 135 certificates. It also states that a qualified examiner or the FAA inspector conducting the check may waive the second approach.