



RECORD OF CONVERSATION

Timothy W. Monville
Sr. Air Safety Investigator
Eastern Region

Date: April 15, 2021
Person Contacted: Stephen V. Beck
NTSB Accident Number: ERA21LA185

Narrative:

Mr. Beck was contacted by phone on April 15, 2021, at 1149 EDT. The call was made to [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] He provided an e-mail address of [REDACTED]

At the beginning of the interview 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 was asked at the onset of the call if he felt there was anything mechanically wrong with the airplane that caused the event?

"I do not believe so. Not that he could determine." The preflight inspection of the airplane was good, there were no discrepancies on the flight from Cincinnati Municipal Airport/Lunken Field (LUK), Cincinnati, Ohio, to the Fleming-Mason Airport (FGX), Flemingsburg, Kentucky, and the prior landing seemed good. "Nothing seemed to be an issue."

He was asked the following:

Explain in detail what occurred during the accident flight from his arrival at FGX?

He flew to FGX to practice landings. Before departure he checked the weather, and had originally planned to fly further south, but because of weather decided to fly to FGX. While en-route from LUK to FGX, he checked the weather at FGX, and the wind he was given favored landing on runway 25. He entered the traffic pattern for runway 25, and noted the crosswind was stronger than he anticipated so he decided to go-around. He remained in the traffic pattern for

runway 25, and performed a full-stop landing, reporting that the, “wind still felt off.” He taxied back past the windsock to check the wind¹, and noted at that time the wind was almost 90° to the runway. Adding that it was shifting around favoring either 25 or 7. The airport traffic pattern was empty and he waited for the wind to settle down. It then shifted and favored runway 7. He taxied to the approach end of runway 7, and took off remaining in the traffic pattern with the intention of performing a touch-and-go landing, and that is when things “went awry.” On touchdown the airplane did a “little bounce.” He adjusted and bounced harder. He added power and reported experiencing a hard landing. Realizing that something was wrong, he climbed in the traffic pattern and remained in close just in case there was a problem. The airplane seemed OK but he did notice a performance issue. He extended the downwind leg of the airport traffic pattern for runway 7, and turned onto base and final legs of the airport traffic pattern, making a long slow final approach. He thought there might be an issue with the nose landing gear and did a soft field landing with full flaps extended. He landed OK, and even held aft on the control yoke while taxiing. He was about 1/2 way to the parking spot and noticed it became more difficult to taxi. He continued to the ramp and secured the airplane. He then talked with the airport manager about the event.

Explain the speeds concerning the bounced landing?

He had 2 notches of flaps extended on final and maintained between 70 and 80 knots approach speed. He did not recall the altitude that he flared at, but he flared and he experienced a little bounce. He had encountered the same bounce previously and adjusted the flight controls expecting a normal landing.

How high was the 1st bounce?

I didn’t feel high. Maybe a few feet off the ground.

Explain what he did with the throttle and elevator controls during the bounced landing?

At the 1st bounce the throttle control was at idle, and after bouncing he pulled on the control yoke to bleed off airspeed. After the 2nd bounce which was harder he added power specifically to start a go-around at that point and then the 3rd bounce occurred in the middle of that. After the 3rd bounce he added full power slowly for a go-around. When he added power after the 2nd bounce he applied aft yoke but the nose of the airplane was coming up into the ground, it just felt that the nose of the airplane was pushed down towards the ground causing the 3rd bounce.

Where was the control yoke?

He was pulling aft for a go-around, and as he applied power, he pulled aft for a standard go-around. It surprised him that the airplane nosed down.

Did he heard the stall warning horn at any time?

No.

In his training was he taught how to recover from a bounced landing and what procedures were he taught?

¹ The windsock is along the taxiway back to 25, but not even halfway back to the start of 25.

Yes. If it is an initial bounce, pull on the control yoke to bleed off airspeed to land normally. He was taught to leave the power where it was for a simple bounce and to apply power to go-around for a more pronounced bounce.

Did he perceive a problem with the flight controls before any of the 3 bounces?
No.

Did he add full power to go-around?

Yes, full power. The airplane was not performing. Usually during a go-around when climbing out to remain in the airport traffic pattern he would have to reduce power, but the airplane was not performing the same as it normally did. He didn't have to reduce the power as much as normal to stay in the traffic pattern. He detected a performance issue but at that time he did not know about the propeller strike.

When did he first notice damage to the propeller?
After securing the airplane.

What restraint was he wearing?
He was wearing the lapbelt and shoulder harness snug.

Was he injured?
No.

Was he a part of the flying club?
Yes. He is one of about 20 members. About 17 to 18 are active.

He was advised that I would be sending the NTSB Pilot/Operator Aircraft Accident/Incident Report today to him and Mr. Smolinski and they had 10 business days to complete and return.

He was asked if he had any questions for NTSB?
After the event he researched the regulations and based on what he thought was damaged (Nosewheel and propeller) it was not a reportable event. He inquired why he was required to complete the NTSB report. He was advised that the FAA inspected the airplane on 4/14/2021 and noted buckling of the cockpit floor on the pilot's side which indicated structural damage beneath. He was also informed that the firewall had considerable damage. And because of that the NTSB was classifying as an accident.

The call ended at 1214 EDT.

The digest was e-mailed to him for review on April 15, 2021. He replied on April 25, 2021, at 1151 EDT with comments that were incorporated into the narrative. The corrected digest was e-mailed to him on April 27, 2021.