

Covered Event Review

ZBW-C-2024/06/30-0001

A1. FAC ID			A2. Date UTC (mm/dd/yyyy)							A3. Start Time UTC				A4. End Time UTC				A5. Position	
Z	B	W	0	6	3	0	2	0	2	4	1	7	1	9	1	8	1	3	R24
A6. Aircraft #1										A7. Aircraft #2									
Aircraft ID			Aircraft Type/Suffix			IFR/VFR				Aircraft ID			Aircraft Type/Suffix			IFR/VFR			
N85PG			PA46/G			IFR													
Individual Performance																			
2. Employee #1																			
Employee									Position					ATSAP Filed					
Gillem, Kevin D (KK)									SUPA					No					
Explanation The operational supervisor reported that the area's complexity and volume was higher than normal. Two sectors, sectors 8 and 22, were open which typically are not. Prior to the event, the supervisor did not believe volume or complexity were high at sector 24. The Supervisor believes they requested aircraft be capped to keep them within sector 8's altitude stratum, but no other TMI implemented. The Supervisor was alerted to the event in sector 24 by the OJTI. The Supervisor believed they saw the aircraft initially at 8,400 feet and coordinated with the Operations Manager-in-Charge providing known information. The Supervisor was asked by an area CPC if they would like them to staff the radar associate position when the situation unfolded, the supervisor agreed. The Supervisor misunderstood a report from the OMIC that the aircraft was still air borne via ADSB exchange. After a delay, the Supervisor questioned the OJTI if they needed a break instead of assigning a CPC to work the position. The Supervisor and the OMIC determined to sterilize the airspace 7,000 feet and below.																			
2. Employee #2																			
Employee									Position					ATSAP Filed					
Jadis, Myles E (MI)									R24					Yes					
Explanation Subsequent controller providing on the job the training. An uninvolved aircraft, N45RH, was issued NOTAM information for runway 24 at N66. As the approach allows for circling to runway 06, the controller needed to issue required NOTAMs impacting both runways. A five and five PIREP was not requested. Seven aircraft checked in on frequency while working the position. Four aircraft required depicted weather calls, two were issued. Four Hazardous Inflight Weather Advisories (HIWAS) required broadcast. Three HIWAS broadcasts were timely, however, none included "Hazardous Weather Information" in the broadcast. Two broadcasts did not include the specific weather phenomena as required. An Urgent PIREP was received at the sector impacting operations ninety miles east of the sector. This HIWAS product became available approximately one minute prior to the event involving N85PG, it was not disseminated. The controller solicited assistance from N12MW to reestablish communications with N85PG. N12MW agreed and reported experiencing updrafts. The sector entered the report into the EDST.																			

Covered Event Review
ZBW-C-2024/06/30-0001

Individual Performance (continued)		
2. Employee #3		
Employee Nason, Anthony L (HD)	Position R24	ATSAP Filed Yes
Explanation Initial controller. Seven aircraft required depicted weather calls, four were issued. No PIREPs were solicited for turbulence. Two PIREPs were received at the position, one for tops at Flight Level 240 and bases near 12,000 feet. Neither PIREP was entered into the EDST or disseminated to N85PG. N85PG's mode c was not validated. The aircraft was not provided the local altimeter setting. The clearance limit did not state airport. A depicted weather call was issued using plain language with an accurate description of the precipitation's length. Intensity of the precipitation was described as moderate to heavy, while a small area of extreme precipitation was present. The greatest intensity of the depicted weather fluctuated between heavy and extreme during the review. The position relief briefing met the facility's expectation. Additional information found outside of event review time: EJA240 was issued a new beacon code without proper coordination. No call sign was used in subsequent call to N474TT concerning a fix on their new route. No call sign used in subsequent call to EJA240 about deviations No facility identification used in initial call with N85PG.		
2. Employee #4		
Employee Parker, Whitney R (WU)	Position R24	ATSAP Filed Yes
Explanation Subsequent controller receiving on the job training. An uninvolved aircraft, N45RH, was issued NOTAM information for runway 24 at N66. As the approach allows for circling to runway 06, the controller needed to issue required NOTAMs impacting both runways. A five and five PIREP was not requested. Seven aircraft checked in on frequency while working the position. Four aircraft required depicted weather calls, two were issued. Four Hazardous Inflight Weather Advisories (HIWAS) required broadcast. Three HIWAS broadcasts were timely, however, none included "Hazardous Weather Information" in the broadcast. Two broadcasts did not include the specific weather phenomena as required. An Urgent PIREP was received at the sector impacting operations ninety miles east of the sector. This HIWAS product became available approximately one minute prior to the event involving N85PG, it was not disseminated. The controller solicited assistance from N12MW to reestablish communications with N85PG. N12MW agreed and reported experiencing updrafts. The sector entered the report into the EDST.		
Training		
1. Were any training issues identified?		
☐ Yes ☒ No		
Weather		
1. What were the prevailing weather conditions?		
☐ IFR ☐ VFR ☒ Other		
If other, explain VFR with scattered thunderstorms throughout sector 24.		

Covered Event Review

ZBW-C-2024/06/30-0001

Weather (continued)

2. Was any pertinent precipitation depicted on the radar?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, explain

Three areas of moderate to extreme precipitation were scattered in sector 24.

3. Did LLWAS alert?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

4. Were weather phenomena a factor?

☒ Yes ☐ No

☒ Turbulence ☐ Icing ☒ Thunderstorm ☐ Low Ceilings ☐ Break Conditions ☐ Wind Shear ☐ Other

Covered Event Review
ZBW-C-2024/06/30-0001

Weather (continued)

5. Were any SIGMETs or PIREPs in effect?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, explain

CONVECTIVE SIGMET 94E
VALID UNTIL 1755Z
MA CT NY NJ PA
FROM 30WNW ALB-10WNW BDL-10SSW SAX-EWC-30WNW ALB
AREA SEV TS MOV FROM 27020KT. TOPS TO FL450.
HAIL TO 1.5 IN...WIND GUSTS TO 65KT POSS.

CONVECTIVE SIGMET 95E
VALID UNTIL 1755Z
NJ PA DE AND DE NJ NY CSTL WTRS
FROM 50S HTO-120SSE HTO-30ENE SBY-30S ETX-50S HTO
AREA SEV TS MOV FROM 26020KT. TOPS ABV FL450.
HAIL TO 1.5 IN...WIND GUSTS TO 65KT POSS.

CONVECTIVE SIGMET 03E
VALID UNTIL 1855Z
MA CT NY NJ PA
FROM 10NW ALB-30ENE BDL-SAX-30SE EWC-10NW ALB
AREA SEV TS MOV FROM 27020KT. TOPS TO FL450.
HAIL TO 1.5 IN...WIND GUSTS TO 65KT POSS.

CONVECTIVE SIGMET 04E
VALID UNTIL 1855Z
NJ AND DE NJ NY CSTL WTRS
FROM 40SSW HTO-110ESE CYN-30SSW SIE-10NE CYN-40SSW HTO
AREA SEV TS MOV FROM 26020KT. TOPS ABV FL450.
HAIL TO 1.5 IN...WIND GUSTS TO 65KT POSS.

CONVECTIVE SIGMET 11E
VALID UNTIL 1955Z
MA CT NY NJ PA
FROM 10ENE ALB-30ENE BDL-20SSE SAX-30SE EWC-10ENE ALB
AREA SEV TS MOV FROM 27020KT. TOPS TO FL450.
HAIL TO 1.5 IN...WIND GUSTS TO 65KT POSS.

CONVECTIVE SIGMET 12E
VALID UNTIL 1955Z
NJ NY CSTL WTRS
FROM 40SSW HTO-140SSE HTO-30SE SIE-40SSW HTO
AREA SEV TS MOV FROM 26020KT. TOPS ABV FL450.
HAIL TO 1.5 IN...WIND GUSTS TO 65KT POSS.

ZBW CWA 101 VALID UNTIL 301900 FROM 40ESE YSC-50NE ALB-50SW MPV-30SSW YSC-40ESE YSC AREA TS WITH
ISOL SEV TS CONTAINING HVY TO EXTRM PCPN MOV FROM 27040KT. TOPS TO FL380. TREND...INCR. LARGE HAIL
AND SFC WIND GUSTS OVR 50KT POSS. ME NY VT NH

1752 GI E7 PIREP UUA /OV PUT /TM 1749Z /FL 190/TP SF50 /TB SEV CAT /RM
ZBWTMU301752ZM

1637 GI E7 PIREP UA /OV ALB280040 /TM 1636Z /FL 110 /TP B737 /TB OCNL LGT CHOP 290-110 /RM
ZBWTMU301637LS

1638 GI E7 PIREP UA /OV ITH330020 /TM 1635Z /FL 260 /TP M600 /TB NEG /RM ZBWTMU30

1808 GI E7 PIREP UA /OV HNK /TM 1805Z /FL 090 /TP FA7X /RM UPDRAFTS

Covered Event Review

ZBW-C-2024/06/30-0001

Airspace/Airport
1. Were any airspace/airport issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Procedures
1. Were any procedural issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Directives
1. Were any directive issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Equipment
1. Were any equipment issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Resource Management
1. Were any resource management issues identified? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Additional Comments
N85PG departed Albert S Nader Regional Airport (N66) VFR and requested an IFR clearance to West Virginia International Yeager Airport (KCRW). R24 issued a discrete beacon code, radar identified the aircraft, issued an IFR clearance and instructed the aircraft to climb to 10,000 feet. The R24 position issued a depicted weather call using nonstandard phraseology. N85PG was issued a climb to their requested final altitude of 12,000 feet. A position relief briefing occurred using the facility's checklist. The relieving controller observed N85PG off course and questioned if they were deviating and asked where they would like to go. Numerous transmissions were received at the sector without the use of a call sign. Radar contact and communications were lost at approximately 1756Z. Adjacent facilities were coordinated with to block airspace. The aircraft was the subject of an ALNOT.
QC Comments
The facility currently has corrective action programs covering Arrival Weather and Airport Conditions, HIWAS Broadcasts, Weather and Chaff Services, PIREP Classification, Dissemination and Information. ZBW-CAP-2023-0032 Arrival Weather, Airport Conditions ZBW-CAP-2023-0008 HIWAS Broadcast ZBW-CAP-2023-0030 Weather and Chaff Services ZBW-CAP-2023-0012 PIREP Dissemination and Classification ZBW-CAP-2023-0013 PIREP Information

Covered Event Review
ZBW-C-2024/06/30-0001

Review Team	
	Daniel Obert Andrew Acerra Brian Howard Carly Daring