



RECORD OF CONVERSATION

Timothy W. Monville
Sr. Air Safety Investigator
Eastern Region

Date: February 6, 2017
Person Contacted: Randy Shur
NTSB Accident Number: ERA16LA111

Narrative:

Mr. Shur was contacted by phone on January 4, 2017, at 1408 EST. He was called at [REDACTED] and left a voice mail message. He returned the call the same day at 1733 EST, and provided an e-mail address of [REDACTED]

He was advised that I had taken over the investigation of the accident in which he was the pilot-in-command from Paul Cox, who retired. I informed him that in reviewing the documents I received from Paul regarding the investigation, I did not see the NTSB Pilot/Operator Aircraft Accident/Incident Report. He indicated that he had a lot of difficulty with completing the form on a computer, so he and Paul spent considerable time on the phone going over the data fields, and during that time he believed Paul was filling in the form.

He indicated that at the time of the accident his airplane was not insured. Before the accident, his airplane had been sitting for years, and because he was having a recurring problem with the airplane and it was not being flown, he elected to drop his insurance.

He indicated that after the accident, the engine was not examined in an effort to determine the reason for the loss of engine power. The airplane was sold in April 2016, to a person named Johnny, who can be reached at [REDACTED]

The digest was reviewed with him during the call and he agreed to the content.



RECORD OF CONVERSATION

Timothy W. Monville
Sr. Air Safety Investigator
Eastern Region

Date: March 13, 2017
Person Contacted: Jonathan Escarzaga
NTSB Accident Number: ERA16LA111

Narrative:

Mr. Escarzaga was sent an e-mail to [REDACTED] on January 4, 2017, at 1456 EST, and advised that I was the new NTSB investigator-in-charge concerning the investigation, and asked him to contact me at my work phone number to get information from him regarding the engine work he had performed. He called the same day at 1619 EST, from his cellular phone number of [REDACTED]

He indicated that the work he did to the airplane was the first that he had ever worked on that airplane. He indicated that the then pilot/owner had brought the airplane to him complaining of performance issues, and the previous mechanic attempted to correct the problem with adjusting the valves. The pilot's complaint was that when he reduced throttle to land, the engine would almost quit. He confirmed he did adjust the valves, but after the work was performed he did not make a logbook entry. It was his understanding that after the work was performed, the pilot would taxi the airplane to the tie-down spot, and he would then provide him with the logbook entry the next morning. He confirmed that the pilot would then fly the airplane that morning.

He also confirmed that the logbook entry was not in the maintenance records when the accident occurred. He was not sure if he made the logbook entry that night, or the following morning, but believed it was made the same night.

On the morning of February 25th, after arriving at North Perry Airport, he noticed the airplane on the north side of the airport sitting on a trailer.

He was asked if he knew whether the airplane and engine were inspected postaccident in an effort to determine what caused the reason for the loss of engine power. He advised that he did not inspect the airplane or engine postaccident, and although he did talk with inspectors from the

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), they never contacted him to assist with a postaccident inspection.

At the end of the call he was advised that the NTSB is a federal agency mandated by Congress to investigate aircraft accidents, and NTSB has no authority to take any action against any individual. He was also informed that the purpose of an NTSB investigation is for safety only, and any person NTSB talks with has the right to representation; he agreed to the interview without representation.

The digest was e-mailed to him for review on February 6, 2017, at 1457 EST. He did not reply.



RECORD OF CONVERSATION

Timothy W. Monville
Sr. Air Safety Investigator
Eastern Region

Date: February 6, 2017
Person Contacted: Johnny Millon
NTSB Accident Number: ERA16LA111

Narrative:

Mr. Millon was contacted by phone on January 6, 2017 at 1141 EST. He was called at [REDACTED] and left a voice mail message. He returned the call the same day at 1235 EST, from the same number.

He provided an e-mail address of [REDACTED]. He bought the accident airplane (N6449P), from the previous owner about 4 months after the accident (FAA records later determined he purchased it on April 15, 2016). He has the maintenance records, and indicated the engine has about 1,200 hours since last overhaul. In May 2016, while assembled, he had his mechanic (Luis Acosta) with certificate number [REDACTED] inspect it in an effort to determine the reason for the loss of engine power. His mechanic found the left fuel vent line blocked by an insect nest. The blockage was between the opening and the check valve. He confirmed that both fuel tanks were equipped with vented fuel caps. His mechanic also checked the timing of the magnetos and reported no discrepancies, and verified there was no blockage of the fuel supply lines. They confirmed the fuel lines from the strainer to the carburetor were free of obstructions. The fuel line at the carburetor was disconnected, and there was plenty of fuel in the line. With respect to the engine, they have not yet performed a run-out check of the crankshaft flange.

The airplane was repositioned to Airglades Airport, in Clewiston, Florida, where it is in the process of being repaired.

The digest was reviewed with him during the call and he agreed with the content.



RECORD OF CONVERSATION

Timothy W. Monville
Sr. Air Safety Investigator
Eastern Region

Date: March 13, 2017
Person Contacted: Randy Shur
NTSB Accident Number: ERA16LA111

Narrative:

Mr. Randy Shur was contacted by phone on February 22, 2017, at 1354 EST. He was called at [REDACTED]

At the beginning of the phone call he was advised that the NTSB is a federal agency mandated by Congress to investigate aircraft accidents, and NTSB has no authority to take any action against any individual. He was also informed that the purpose of an NTSB investigation is for safety only, and any person NTSB talks with has the right to representation; he agreed to the interview without representation.

He indicated that at the time of the accident he has owned the airplane for 13 years (FAA records indicated he purchased it in December 2003). Since purchasing the airplane, he estimated he has operated it about 300 hours. Between 2003 and September 2008, the airplane was in Colorado and was not operated from 2007 to 2008. In September 2008, the airplane was flown from Colorado to its new home base at the North Perry Airport (HWO) located in Hollywood, Florida. Between 2009 and 2011, the airplane was not operated. After being idle in Florida, at the first annual inspection he spent about \$6,000.00 on parts which included replacement of vacuum system components and new seat rails. While in Florida, he found out his first mechanic was charging him for repairs that were not being performed. He subsequently found another mechanic.

Since owning the airplane, he noticed the start of an engine problem that began about 3 years before the accident, and continued to the accident date. The first time occurred during a flight from North Perry Airport (HWO), Hollywood, Florida, to Palm Beach County Glades Airport (PHK), Pahokee, Florida. About 10 minutes after takeoff with a passenger on-board he noticed that the engine rpm dropped from where set (2,250 to 2,300) to about 1,600 but the engine continued to run. He continued to PHK where he landed uneventfully but reported the engine

quit during the landing roll. He got the airplane off the runway and informed his mechanic of the issue. About 1 hour later he decided to attempt to start the engine and reported it started immediately with no issues noted. He then did an engine run-up again with no issues noted. He called his mechanic again, informed him of the findings, or lack thereof, and asked his mechanic if he should fly the airplane to HWO. His mechanic advised him that was his call. He decided it best to leave his friend behind and planned to perform touch-and-go (T&G) landings at PHK, but after becoming airborne decided to continue to HWO and did not perform any T&G's. When the flight was about 10 miles away from PHK the engine experienced the same partial loss of power. He elected to continue to HWO, and during the landing roll the engine quit. His mechanic at the time checked the fuel system and found a substantial amount of water. The mechanic drained the fuel tanks, and checked the fuel lines and found debris. As a result the fuel lines were changed. Following maintenance, he took the airplane for a test flight and again noticed a rough running engine and partial loss of power. He returned to HWO where he landed uneventfully. As part of troubleshooting, his mechanic who thought the problem was with the fuel system replaced the fuel caps adding vented types, and had the carburetor rebuilt at a facility in Sarasota, Florida. In addition, covers were placed over the fuel caps to protect from water intrusion. As part of a test flight after maintenance, he noted that the performance was better which was attributed to be from the rebuilt carburetor, but the engine again started to run rough and lost partial power about 45 minutes into the flight. He returned to HWO, and as part of the trouble shooting new cylinders and piston rings were installed. Another test flight produced the same partial loss of engine power after 40-45 minutes.

With respect to the accident flight, he reported that before the flight the engines' valves were adjusted as the mechanic thought the loss of power issues were attributed to be from misadjusted valves. He performed a full preflight check and engine run-up before takeoff reporting the airplane was, "OK, great." After takeoff he orbited over the airport at 1,300 feet for about 45 minutes and having no problem at what would be the typical time frame when the engine would begin to run rough and then lose power, he thought the issue was resolved and elected to continue flying over the airport in an effort to break in the piston rings. At about 1 hour 5 minutes into the flight while flying over the southwest corner of the airport with the active runway being 19, the engine began to run rough. He flew to the north end of the airport and started to turn to enter the traffic pattern. While operating with the mixture control full rich, and the engine rpm about 2,250, the engine "totally dropped out." He indicated that was inconsistent with the previous long term issue with the engine, and attempts to restore engine power by application of throttle did not restore power. He indicated that he did not apply carburetor heat. While on final approach lined up with the runway, he noted he was unable to reach the airport and with a clear road, opted to perform a forced landing. He climbed to clear a large bushy tree, then after clearing it descended and collided with an un-seen pole.

He indicated that historically, the engine would begin run rough before losing power. An additional step to resolve the partial loss of engine power was that the magnetos were sent for overhaul/repair to a facility in Washington state.

He was asked if there was any work performed to the airframe or engine that was done before the start of the engine loss of power issue. He indicated that to his knowledge there was no catalyst of work performed immediately before the historical loss of engine power events.

The digest was e-mailed to him for review on February 23, 2017, at 0755 EST. He did not reply.