

Covered Event Review

ZFW-C-2015/07/26-0002

A1. FAC ID			A2. Date UTC (mm/dd/yyyy)								A3. Start Time UTC				A4. End Time UTC				A5. Position	
Z	F	W	0	7	2	6	2	0	1	5	1	9	4	5	2	0	1	0	DEC-H-R (42)	
A6. Aircraft #1											A7. Aircraft #2									
Aircraft ID			Aircraft Type/Suffix				IFR/VFR				Aircraft ID			Aircraft Type/Suffix				IFR/VFR		
N252G			BE35				VFR													

Individual Performance		
B1. Employee #1:		
Employee Name	Position DEC-H-R (42)	ATSAP Filed ☐ Yes ☒ No
Explanation Training in progress at the time of the event. Sector SEA L-R 37 and DEC H-R 42 combined with a SEA L-D and DEC H-D working D-Side duties at 2000Z. No Altimeter was issued. Trainee was working the sector and receiving help on location of airports from the instructor and others however three different options of airports were given but the position of the third option, a private airfield was never clarified. 7. 7110.65: para 5-5-5 b. Vertical application rule between VPBBW and N950U was not applied. Seperation was never lost. 11. 7110.65: para 2-7-2 Altimeter not issued to N252G. 21. 7110.65: para 2-1-18 Operational requests. The release of control by stating approved is not proper phraseology.		

Training	
C1. Were any training issues identified? ☒ Yes ☐ No	
C2. Was OJT in progress? ☒ Yes ☐ No	
Type of trainee ☒ Developmental ☐ CPC-IT ☐ Other	If other, explain
C3. Was recertification training in progress? ☐ Yes ☒ No	
C4. Did the OJTI intervene? ☐ Yes ☒ No	
If Yes, explain	
C5. Were any pertinent training/briefing items not received? ☐ Yes ☒ No	
If Yes, explain	

Training (continued)	
C6. Were any potential systemic training issues identified?	
☐ Yes ☒ No	
If Yes, explain	

Weather	
D1. What were the prevailing weather conditions?	
☐ IFR ☒ VFR ☐ Other	
If Other, explain	
D2. Was any pertinent precipitation depicted on the radar?	
☐ Yes ☒ No	
If Yes, explain	
D3. Did LLWAS alert?	
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	
If Yes, explain	
D4. Were weather phenomena a factor?	
☐ Yes ☒ No	
Select all that apply ☐ Turbulence ☐ Icing ☐ Thunderstorms ☐ Low Ceilings ☐ Braking Conditions ☐ Wind Shear ☐ Other	If Other, explain

	Weather (continued)
	D5. Were any SIGMETs or PIREPs in effect? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	If Yes, explain

	Airspace/Airport
	E1. Were any airspace/airport issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No

	Procedures
	F1. Were any procedural issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No

	Directives
	G1. Were any directive issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No

	Equipment
	H1. Were any equipment issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No

	Resource Management
	I1. Were any resource management issues identified? ☒ Yes ☐ No
	I2. Who was supervising the operation? ☐ FLM ☒ CIC ☐ OM ☐ Unknown
	If Unknown, explain
	I3. Was the operational area under review properly staffed? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	If No, explain The FLM who had the watch came in early to obtain currency time. The CIC recognized a lull in traffic and combined up DEC R and SEA R while transitioning from the day to the swing shift. He recognized that the sectors were going to be alerted in the future and made plans to split the sectors. The sector was busy but the trainee felt a D side was not needed as actions were being taken to split the sector. However, before the sectors could get split the aircraft declared an emergency and traffic built creating a situation where the sectors could not safely be split due to volume.

Resource Management (continued)	
	14. Were any positions not properly staffed? ☒ Yes ☐ No
	If Yes, explain SEA R and DEC R should have been split off earlier/before traffic started to build. The CIC was waiting on the next controller to return from break to split the sector. This was highlighted by N252Gs initial transmissions, alerting the controller of his condition, being blocked by aircraft reporting in and making requests on the high altitude frequency.
	15. Were positions/sectors combined/decombined in an appropriate/timely manner? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	If No, explain The CIC was late splitting SEA R and DEC R.
	16. Were there any distractions in the operation? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	If Yes, explain
	17. Were any potential systemic resources management issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	If Yes, explain

Additional Comments	
	The OJTI was fully engaged and made his decision to let the trainee continue talking based on his real-time assessment of the trainees performance and ability to repeat his instructions to the traffic and the emergency aircraft. He felt it gave him a chance to offer more assistance to the emergency by allowing him to look at low altitude charts for another alternative to land while not losing any performance efficiencies.

QC Comments	
	Corrective action plan is not required on Legge.

Review Team	
	No members