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Partnering for Better, Faster, Cheaper, Safer Aviation Missions
DOI’s Aviation Safety and Aircraft Accident Prevention program is founded on the four pillars of an integrated Safety Management System (SMS):

Department of Interior (DOI) aviation safety and aircraft mishap prevention is based on the philosophy that all aircraft mishaps can be prevented and that mishap prevention is an inherent function of any position. **Zero aircraft accidents is every professional’s goal regardless of the challenges.** Improved aviation safety saves lives, reduces cost, and drives efficiencies across all our mission areas.

**Successful aviation programs require a partnership fostering a just culture that fairly balances safety and accountability.** An organization’s safety culture requires the assembly of characteristics and attitudes establishing safety as an overriding priority that receives the attention warranted by its significance. It also requires components of accountability including clear expectations, required actions, and a means by which they will be evaluated.
**Aircraft Accident Rate**

Based on accumulated flight data in FY14, the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) continued to **lower the historical DOI aircraft accident rate**\(^1\) to an all time low reducing the rate by 0.10 to 7.88 accidents per 100K flight hours. The **annual aircraft accident rate** was 1.92 per 100K flight hours, a slight increase 0.31 from last year yet completing **the best 9 consecutive years in DOI history**. **Zero aircraft accidents is an attainable goal**, but we must reaffirm our vigilance since we have **already suffered 2 accidents in FY15**.

The Department’s annual aircraft accident rate\(^2\) in FY14 is 1.92 accidents per 100,000 flight hours. As of October 1, 2014, flight data captured for **FY14 reported 52,012.59 total flight hours**, 9,760.10 less than the previous year. This reduction can be attributed to sequestration, the government shutdown, and reduced fire activity.

Since 1975, DOI’s aviation safety program has resulted in estimated savings of $662M to the Department and its supporting vendors in reduced losses. Over the last 10 years, DOI accident rates have exhibited a downward trend, achieving the most consistent trend in DOI’s history. This includes two of the lowest annual accident rates in DOI history (FY13, FY14).

Flight missions performed for DOI were supported in part by bureau requested and OAS supported aviation contracts that required: 1,552 vendor pilot evaluations, 1,048 vendor aircraft inspections, 383 Interior fleet pilot evaluations, and 100 Interior fleet aircraft inspections. Aviation Training supported 63,967 student hours of training and revised/created four courses in collaboration with bureau and interagency partners.\(^3\)

---

---

\(^1\)Historical aircraft accident rate is defined as total historical aircraft accidents per 100,000 flight hours flown.

\(^2\)Annual aircraft accident rate is defined as total aircraft accidents in one year per 100,000 flight hours flown.

\(^3\)Includes DOI Fleet, Commercial Vendor, and Cooperator aircraft from other agencies. Pilots receive evaluations for each specific special use mission area qualification.
Note: Fleet aircraft and pilots occasionally move their home base location, for the latest information on where they are located you can call the Fleet Maintenance Manager in OAS-Technical Services at (208) 433-5082 for lower 48, or (907) 271-4324 in Alaska.
This year we have developed two mishap rates: AVIATION and FLIGHT due to DOI having its first Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) mishap. The Aviation Mishap Rate includes UAS's, whereas the Flight Rate doesn't.

DOI's accident rate falls below DOD's accident rate and well below DOI's five-year average. Flight hours have decreased 34% over the last five years.

Accidents are defined by 49 CFR 830.2 and determined by the NTSB. An Incident With Potential (IWP) is an incident that narrowly misses being an accident and is determined by OAS.

Mishaps = Accidents + IWPs
Slide 1— Without good reporting, you don’t truly know what your mishap rate is. While BSEE’s mishap rate is high, their desirable reporting rate affords them the opportunity to prevent minor incidents from becoming accidents.

Slide 2— FY14 SAFECOM management improved although the DOI reporting rate decreased 3%, the most significant reduction from one bureau was 28%.

Slide 3— SAFECOM reporting for the period (1998-2014) increased 36% and accidents decreased 80%.
FY14 SAFECOM Overview

SAFECOMs by Category

- 36% Incident
- 13% Hazard
- 5% Airspace
- 4% Mishap Prevention
- 13% Management
- 29% Maintenance

Well represented Hazards Include:
- Pilot Action
- Communications
- Policy Deviation
- Verbal Communication
- Mission Equipment
- Instructions
- Other

Top 6 Maintenance Issues:
- Engine
- Electrical
- Chip Light
- Airframe
- Mission Equipment
- Oil

SAFECOMs by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14 SAFECOMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Last June we introduced the first SAFECOM Mobile Web App. It gave users the ability to submit SAFECOMs using smart phones, tablets and most other mobile devices. The SAFECOM Mobile Web App also provides users with the ability to fill out a SAFECOM without internet connectivity and submit it when connected.

We’ve seen a modest increase of traffic with mobile devices since the introduction with Apple products (iPhone and iPad) leading the traffic. The SAFECOM Mobile Web App also works well with Android devices where we’ve seen an increase there as well.

The SAFECOM management and search functionality was introduced last month which completes the SAFECOM Mobile Web App by affording the user with the same capabilities as the legacy system. In other words, these changes enable all of the administrative functions Aviation Managers need to review, annotate and manage SAFECOM submissions. Those with manager credentials can login and see additional fields to categorize reports, record notes, provide the corrective actions that are used in the field.

SAFECOM reporting is a critical component of our safety program. Early identification, correction and reporting of hazards can save time, money, and most importantly, lives. There is a direct relationship between the reporting of all incidents, occurrences, and hazards which directly impact aviation operations.

The SAFECOM Mobile Web App is the first step in enabling mobile technology to improve aviation operations. These new developments are geared to make it easier for our Aviation Managers to review and respond to SAFECOMs using the same mobile device access. This type of access improves SAFECOM reporting, reviewing, and follow-up by allowing it to be quicker and more responsive with devices that are more ubiquitous amongst field operations.
Cont. SAFECOM Mobile Web App Upgrades

Where is the SAFECOM Mobile App?

www.safecom.gov/mobile

Remember that you can just navigate to www.safecom.gov and you'll find the link on the front page.

To use the form offline, you need to bookmark it!

The SAFECOM Mobile Web App allows the user to save the submission while off-line. Using your browser, bookmark the SAFECOM Mobile web app address.

The SAFECOM Mobile Web App has been designed to save the form and your inserted data on your mobile device so it is available when you’re off-line. When internet connectivity is restored, select “Continue in-progress SAFECOM,” then select the SAFECOM Incident, and “Jump to” to edit and submit the SAFECOM.

The SAFECOM Mobile Web App won’t be available on your device if you clear your history, cookies, and data. If this happens, you will need to visit www.safecom.gov/mobile to add it back into your device’s memory.

Manager Login

Manager access is only available when you are connected to the internet.

To access the admin functions from any page,

1. Choose “login” at upper right,
2. Enter SAFECOM manager credentials and click LOGIN,
3. Navigate to the search page.
4. Enter the search criteria and choose SEARCH,
5. Review the search results and choose the SAFECOM to review/edit
6. Review SAFECOM, note that the Admin-only fields are shaded blue
7. Make edits.
8. Choose SUBMIT and review edits.
FY14 Aviation Overview

DOI FY14 Mishap Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson, TX</td>
<td>9-30-14</td>
<td>IWP</td>
<td>Contractor BSEE GOM Region</td>
<td>AS350 B2</td>
<td>Front and rear passenger doors popped open during flight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, OR</td>
<td>9-14-14</td>
<td>IWP</td>
<td>Contractor BLM Oregon Region</td>
<td>Bell 206 L-1</td>
<td>During fire suppression operations the aircraft experienced a sudden updraft, pilot reduced power, bucket draped over the tail boom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallon, NV</td>
<td>7-3-14</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Contractor BLM Nevada Region</td>
<td>AS350 B3e</td>
<td>Pilot lost control of helicopter, substantial damage no fatalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangirsuk, Canada</td>
<td>6-12-14</td>
<td>IWP</td>
<td>Fleet FWS Region 9</td>
<td>Kodiak AS350 B3e</td>
<td>Aircraft traveled beyond the end of the runway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Lake, NV</td>
<td>11-5-13</td>
<td>IWP</td>
<td>Fleet FWS Region 8</td>
<td>RQ-16C T-Hawk</td>
<td>UAS– Substantial damage, engine failure, no fuel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo, CA</td>
<td>11-11-13</td>
<td>IWP</td>
<td>Contractor BSEE Pacific Region</td>
<td>Bell 407</td>
<td>Engine chip light, lost oil pressure, number four engine bearing failed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Alsworth, AK</td>
<td>10-21-13</td>
<td>IWP</td>
<td>Fleet OAS Alaska Regional Office</td>
<td>C-206</td>
<td>Bucking bar (repair tool) left in the aircraft flap well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidental Cost associated with Mishaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Input</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost Input</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Investigation</td>
<td>$ 7,670</td>
<td>OAS Investigation (reimbursable)</td>
<td>$ 7,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI Losses (i.e. a/c repair, recovery, loss of availability, loss of life)</td>
<td>$ 207,973</td>
<td>Vendor Losses (i.e. A/C repair, recovery, loss of availability, etc.)</td>
<td>$ 2,407,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Actual Costs (7 Mishaps) $ 2,630,163

These rates are associated to pay item codes associated to flight hours only, doesn’t include monthly rates, availability, standby etc.

All cost associated with mishaps have not been finalized. There are ongoing investigations and repairs associated to the mishaps, these costs may rise.
### FY14 Aviation Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Annual Flight Hours</th>
<th>Annual flight Usage Cost</th>
<th>Cost per Flight Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>16,741</td>
<td>$60,250,918</td>
<td>$3,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>$6,916,089</td>
<td>$3,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLM UAS Flights 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of UAS missions</th>
<th>Horning Seed Orchard, ACEC Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raven - 1 Mission T-Hawk - 6 missions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIA UAS Flights 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of UAS missions</th>
<th>Coal Mine Flights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-Hawk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OSM UAS Flights 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft System Type</th>
<th>Flight Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-Hawk</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAFECOM**

BIA has the second highest SAFECOM completion rate in DOI at 90%. There were 20 SAFECOMs submitted which account for 7% of SAFECOMS.

**SAFECOM**

BIA flight hours are down 24% from last year.

**SAFECOM**

OSM has one of the lowest SAFECOM completion rate in DOI at 50%. There were 2 SAFECOMs submitted which account for 1% of SAFECOMS. No manned flights were recorded this year.

*BLM pilots fly commercial owned government operated (COGO) aircraft in addition to fleet aircraft.
FY14 Aviation Overview

FWS has the lowest SAFECOM completion rate in DOI at 32%. There were 25 SAFECOMs submitted which account for 9% of SAFECOMS.

NPS has a high SAFECOM completion rate at 86%. There were 57 SAFECOMs submitted which account for 20% of SAFECOMS.

FA14 Aviation Mishaps = 2

FWS flight hours are down 9% from last year.

FY14 FWS Fleet Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manned Aircraft—62% of Fleet</th>
<th>57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10 Years</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 21 Years</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Function Pilots</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot to Aircraft Ratio</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY14 NPS Fleet Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manned Aircraft—32% of Fleet</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 21 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Function Pilots</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot to Aircraft Ratio</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FWS UAS Flights 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of UAS Missions</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>Pelican Surveys, Vegetation Survey Topock Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft System Type</td>
<td>Raven &amp; T-Hawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Hours</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPS UAS Flights 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of UAS Missions</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>White Sands National Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft System Type</td>
<td>T– Hawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Hours</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flight hours remained relatively the same compared to FY13.
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BSEE has a high SAFECOM completion rate in DOI at 89%. There were 93 SAFECOMs submitted which account for 32% of SAFECOMs.

FY14 Aviation Mishaps = 2
Flight hours remained relatively the same compared to FY13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Annual Flight Hours</th>
<th>Annual flight Usage Cost</th>
<th>Cost per Flight Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSEE</td>
<td>8,050</td>
<td>$32,659,226</td>
<td>$4,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These rates are associated to pay item codes associated to flight hours only, doesn’t include monthly rates, availability, standby etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Annual Flight Hours</th>
<th>Annual flight Usage Cost</th>
<th>Cost per Flight Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>$1,983,877</td>
<td>$906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY14 BIA Fleet Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manned Aircraft—1% of Fleet</th>
<th>Makes</th>
<th>Models</th>
<th>0-10 Years</th>
<th>11-20 Years</th>
<th>&gt; 21 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Function Pilots</th>
<th>Pilots</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Pilot to Aircraft Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USGS has one of the lowest SAFECOM completion rate in DOI at 50%. There were 2 SAFECOMs submitted which account for 1% of SAFECOMs. Reporting went down by 250%.

Flight hours remained relatively the same compared to FY13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Annual Flight Hours</th>
<th>Annual flight Usage Cost</th>
<th>Cost per Flight Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>$544,846</td>
<td>$1,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOR flight hours have increased 18% from FY13.
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DOI-OS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Annual Flight Hours</th>
<th>Annual Flight Usage Cost</th>
<th>Cost per Flight Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOI-OS</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>$472,620</td>
<td>$864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OAS flight hours have increased 8% from FY13.

FY14 OAS Fleet Statistics

| Manned Aircraft—1% of Fleet | 1 |
| Makes                        | 1 |
| Models                       | 1 |
| 0-10 Years                   | 0 |
| 11-20 Years                  | 0 |
| > 21 Years                   | 1 |

Dual Function Pilots (Inspectors) Pilots: 13

FY14 Aviation Mishaps = 1

Aviation Training 2.0 Information Update

On September 29, 2014, Aviation Training 2.0 (AT 2.0) was launched and made available to DOI bureaus, the USFS and our interagency partners.

In the first 60 days of the launch, there were 1,729 online course completions in AT 2.0. Over 300 new users created accounts in the system during that same period.

We have also seen significant activity from the new roles being offered, such as the Unit Aviation Training Administrators and Supervisors. Users with these roles have been busy getting folks aligned with their correct unit, getting training plans assigned, and performing compliance checking. Managers now have visibility into the aviation training activity of their personnel. We’ve received positive feedback on better usability and new features like compliance checking.

Listed below are some of the frequently asked questions providing additional information on AT 2.0. These are also being posted to the support section of the web site.

Why were changes made to the site?

Originally the legacy site was developed to give students some basic tools for managing their aviation training along with delivering some online course content. Since its original inception over 10 years ago, there has been a growing need for new functionality. Some requests could be incorporated into the legacy system and some could not. In order to meet a larger number of needs the underlying structures of the aviation training online system needed to be changed.

Was beta testing done prior to launch?

Yes. We appreciate the bureau/field personnel the personnel who participated in each of the three beta test groups prior to the launch. This was done over a 6 month period. Through their efforts, we received valuable input on functionality and usability.

Do some browsers work better than others when using AT 2.0?

Yes. The site was designed and tested to work with Google Chrome or Internet Explore version 9.0 or later. Users may experience problems with functionality if they are using a different browser.

(continued next page)
Are there new user roles in AT 2.0?

Yes. AT 2.0 is a role based system. When you log onto the system you choose a role that suits the specific tasks you are there to perform. For example, logging on as a student allows you to sign-up for course offerings, view your training records, or take online courses. Logging on as a supervisor takes you to a different set of tasks you can perform, such as viewing your direct report’s upcoming training requirements. AT 2.0 gives you the option to sign on as a specific role so that you only have to see the functionality that specifically applies to the tasks you need to perform. It gets rid of the clutter and lets you focus on what’s important right now.

What roles are available to users?

Below is a basic description of each of the roles available in AT 2.0:

- **Student** – any user whose purpose is to take aviation training
- **Instructor** – qualified users that have completed the instructor certification process required by OPM 4 for DOI personnel or the IAT Guide for USFS personnel.
- **Supervisor** – users with direct reports in the system
- **Leadership** – an executive level user that requires a dashboard of information to assess the overall health of an organization’s aviation training.
- **Unit Aviation Training Administrator (ATA)** – a user that manages the aviation training needs for a specific local unit, such as a District Office, Field Office, Forest, Park, etc.
- **Aviation Manager** – a user that oversees the aviation training on a regional or national level. This user is usually equivalent to a Regional or National Aviation Manager.
- **Aviation Manager** – a user that oversees the aviation training on a regional or national level. This user is usually equivalent to a Regional or National Aviation Manager.

Can a user have more than one role in AT 2.0?

It is very common for a user that is a student to also have the role of aviation manager, supervisor or instructor. AT 2.0 allows you to toggle between all of your assigned roles easily. The purpose of the role segregation is to simplify the task decisions you make when using the system for a specific purpose. Student and Supervisor roles are created at sign-up. Other roles, such as Aviation Training Administrator, are assigned by your organization’s management in conjunction with the OAS Training Division or the USFS National Aviation Training Manager.

What if my training compliance record doesn’t show credit for a course equivalent I took?

The legacy system did not have a way to track the equivalencies for courses completed elsewhere that might be granted equivalency for required courses. Examples would include NWCG courses or the DOI pilot ground school. AT 2.0 currently has very limited ability to determine equivalency, mainly granting equivalency for the old B3 curriculum. A more robust equivalency capability is planned for a future release. In the interim, users are encouraged to provide to those reviewing their compliance a record of the training completed they believe is equivalent in accordance with existing policy.

Will there be additional enhancements in the future?

Our development strategy is to provide updates and enhancements to the system periodically throughout the year. This way we can get new high demand functionality to you quickly and still continue to work on other added features that will make your aviation training experience even better. Just like you, we want to have a system that is continually improving and adaptive to the ever changing needs of our aviation community.

What if I need help with AT 2.0?

Please send an email to iat_admin@ios.doi.gov.
Achievements

Secretary’s Award for Outstanding Contribution to Aviation Safety

This award is established to recognize an individual, group, or organization for outstanding contribution to aviation safety or aircraft accident prevention within DOI. This year, a group was selected based on their work on a critical policy that will positively impact aviation safety for years to come. This group consisted of a diverse set of individuals that worked collaboratively to achieve a policy that provides minimum standards for management plans and Project Aviation Safety Plans. Their great work (OPM-6) can be located here: http://oas.doi.gov/library/opm/CY2014/OPM-06.pdf

Dave Underwood - Bureau of Indian Affairs Regional Aviation Manager
Blaine Moriarty - Office of Aviation Services Aviation Program Evaluator
Meg Gallaher - National Park Service Eastern Regional Aviation Manager
Brian Mullin - Fish and Wildlife Service Aviation Training and Safety Specialist
Anthony Lascano - Fish and Wildlife Service Aviation Safety Specialist
Steve Rauch - Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement National Aviation Manager

In-Flight Action Award

Jayson Danziger
Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement Contract Pilot

Airwards

Clay Voss
Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement Contract Pilot
Clayton Mitchell
Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement Contract Pilot
Matt Goertz - National Park Service Contract Pilot

Unmanned Aircraft System

UAS SAFECOM Reporting, Completion & Mishap Rate

Overall percentages are based on an average of completion rate and reporting rate scores.
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Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement Contract Pilot
Matt Goertz - National Park Service Contract Pilot

UAS Flight Usage by Bureau

RQ-11A Raven
RQ-16 T-Hawk

Promotions

Secretary’s Award for Outstanding Contribution to Aviation Safety

This award is established to recognize an individual, group, or organization for outstanding contribution to aviation safety or aircraft accident prevention within DOI. This year, a group was selected based on their work on a critical policy that will positively impact aviation safety for years to come. This group consisted of a diverse set of individuals that worked collaboratively to achieve a policy that provides minimum standards for management plans and Project Aviation Safety Plans. Their great work (OPM-6) can be located here: http://oas.doi.gov/library/opm/CY2014/OPM-06.pdf
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DOI Accident Free Pilots

Bannister, Gene
Barry, Andrew
Brennan, Gary
Bussard, Joe
Castillo, James
Foster, Ed
Fowler, Dale
Howell, Gilbert
James, William
Kearney, Patrick
Kornfield, Ed
Mancano, Maria
Miller, Arlyn
Palmer, Earl

Bell, Donald
Calderoni, Diego
Curl, R. Ryan
Doherty, Jonas
House, Greg
Lenmark, Paul
McCormick, Robert
Duhrsen, Jeffrey L.
Lazzaro, Joseph R.
McMillan, Seth
Meierotto, Martin
Warbis, Rusty

Heywood, Charles
Pali, Chris
Peacock, Calvin
Rabine, Virgil
Wright, Wayne

Anderson, Anna Jo
Barnett, Heather
Bayless, Shawn
Bredy, James
Earsom, Stephen
Ellis, James
Flack, Andrew
Fox, Kevin
Guldager, Nikola
Hamrick, Harry
Hink, Mike
Hurd, Shay
Kadrimas, Neil
Koneff, Mark
Liddick, Terry
Lubinski, Brian
Mallek, Ed
Moore, Chuck
Mullin, Brian
Olson, Nathan
Powell, Doug
Rayfield, John
Rees, Kurt
Rhodes, Walt
Richardson, J. Ken
Rippeto, Dave
Roberts, Charles
Roetker, Fred
Scotton, Brad
Shults, Bradley
Sowards, David
Spangler, Robert
Spindler, Michael
Sundown, Robert
Thorpe, Philip
Twitchell, Adams
Van Hatten, Kevin
Wade, Mike
War, James
Wittkop, Jim
Wortham, James
Yates, Sarah

Cebulski, Raymond
Drum, Gregory
Ellis, Darrell
Gilliland, Allen
Goodwin Fred
Herring, Nick
Howell, Galen
Larsen, Amy
Loach, James
Mazur, Stephen
Milone, Colin
Richotte, Richard
Sample, Scott
Stevenson, Dan
Taylor, Scott

Recognizing Excellence
Promotions
FY14 Safety Improvement Opportunities

Safety Publications
As part of the DOI mishap prevention program OAS in partnership with the U.S. Forest Service publishes a variety of safety publications.

http://oas.doi.gov/

Accident Prevention Bulletins
- FAA FSS and Flight Safety
- Is it Spring Yet?
- Seat Fares
- Rotor Strike
- Mobile SAFECOM Web App

Safety Alerts
- Copper pellets used in ACETA missions
- Gunner Strap & Tether Rigging
- AFF Inoperative
- Civil UAS Operations Conflicts

Lessons Learned
- Haste Makes Waste
- Documentation of Maintenance Actions
- Eurocopter AS350/AS355 Sliding Doors

Mishap prevention is an inherent responsibility of all employees.

Bureau Continuous Accident Free Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSEE</td>
<td>40 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSM</td>
<td>28 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>17 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>8 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>7 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOEM</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*contributed to BSEE’s 40 year accident free milestone

Bureau Aviation Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Joel Kerley</td>
<td>(208) 387-5371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Rusty Warbis</td>
<td>(208) 387-5448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>Jack Brynda</td>
<td>(202) 513-0677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEE</td>
<td>Brad Laubach</td>
<td>(703) 787-1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOEM</td>
<td>Lee Benner</td>
<td>(202) 513-7578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>Anthony Lascano</td>
<td>(703) 358-2059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Jon Rollens</td>
<td>(208) 387-5227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSM</td>
<td>J. Maurice Banks</td>
<td>(202) 208-2608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>Bill Christiansen</td>
<td>(303) 236-5513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aviation Program Evaluation Overview

DOI aviation program evaluation function serves as an integral element of the Department’s Aviation Safety Management System “Assurance” pillar and a critical Department compliance mechanism of the Federal Management Regulations, specifically DOI A-123 management controls assurance program. In collaboration with the Bureaus, OAS led aviation program evaluations are held on-site at Bureau aviation unit locations. The objectives of the program evaluations include:

- Assessment of unit compliance with DOI aviation policy and Federal regulation.
- Evaluation of OAS’s effectiveness in communicating and implementing DOI aviation policies.
- Identification of areas of potential improvement, sharing best practices, and support needs for each unit.

FY14 Results & Performance

In FY14, OAS conducted 10 aviation program evaluations amongst 8 bureaus resulting in a total of 79 findings and no material weaknesses. Findings, corrective actions, and aviation program enhancements were collaborated with bureau aviation managers and tracked using OAS’s ISO 9001-2008 certified program evaluation process (implemented in 2008). Since FY06, OAS has achieved a 71% reduction in completion time for aviation program evaluations. 100% of all Plan Of Action and Milestones (POAMs) have been fulfilled for the aviation program evaluations conducted to date in accordance with OAS’s ISO 9001-2008 process requirements.

The aviation program evaluation system is a proactive process for gathering and analyzing data to assess the health of aviation programs within the Department. Regular monitoring of key “vital signs” provides a quality assurance system to assess the safety of aviation services provided, ensures efficiency in the management of complex resources, and provides a means of sharing best practices.

From April 2005 to September 2014, a comprehensive analysis of 535 historical aviation program evaluation findings was completed within 85 evaluations. An analysis of these findings determined four major areas for improvement encompassing aviation program aviation plans, MOUs/IAAs, training, and safety.

The Top 5 Findings, 2005-2014

1. Required Line Manager (M2)/Supervisor (M3) training not conducted or current (per OPM-04). ⇒ 67%
2. Lack a basic understanding of Project Planning. ⇒ 61%
3. Incomplete or out of date aviation plans. ⇒ 53%
4. MOUs/IAAs/SLAs are missing or out of date. ⇒ 49%
5. Minimal or no SAFECOMs compared to total amount of bureau flight time. ⇒ 30%
Aviation Program Assessments

Departmental Aviation Program Evaluations are conducted via a systematic process for analyzing and reporting information with regard to aviation programs within the bureaus and their respective units. These assessments are tailored to meet departmental and bureau needs in terms of regulatory compliance and continual improvement. Bureaus that participate in wildland fire operations participate in aviation program evaluations in concert with their readiness reviews. However, non-wildland fire (i.e. wildlife, law enforcement, etc.) aviation missions are rarely incorporated into these types of reviews and are (generally) reviewed less frequently. Fortunately, departmental aviation program evaluations provide an opportunity for personnel engaged in all mission types to connect with their national, regional/state and local aviation managers.

Each bureau should, and many already have, developed roles and responsibilities within their organization to communicate and implement essential information, not only internally within their bureau but to share with other units/bureaus within the Department.

It all starts with planning. Over the past five years, we have discovered that Aviation Management Plans are either out of date or incomplete (60% of programs reviewed in the Program Evaluation Process). As a result, the Executive Aviation Committee (http://oas.doi.gov/director/EAC/eac.htm) tasked a diverse bureau and OAS work group to develop minimum elements/requirements of a bureau National Aviation Management Plan (NAMP). During this process, the work group identified a lack of standardization within Project Aviation Safety Plan (PASPs). OAS Operational Procedure Memorandum 06 (OPM-06) was released July 21, 2014 which identifies NAMP standards, standardizes PASPs, and identifies management approval requirements.

Aviation Program Evaluations provide an essential component of continual improvement through self-assessment and best practice sharing that transcends throughout all Departmental missions.

Get Your Safety Culture here!

(Continued next page)
Cultures are not a program; they are the interconnectedness that explains why efforts work, don’t work, succeed, and fail. Safety cultures need to be considered, leveraged, and managed just as importantly as contractors, projects, and key performance indicators. Organizations are either managing the safety element of the culture or are being managed by it. Stop searching to create a safety culture. You already have one, but is it desirable? Is it as effective?

Leaders at all levels must move from the desire to create a safety culture to the realization that one already exists – they just need to figure out if it’s one they want. They should focus on how to strengthen the cultural beliefs, decisions, and behaviors that influence the individual decisions carried out when no one is watching -- the most important part of cultural reality, safety or otherwise.

A company’s safety culture is a direct reflection of the organization’s overarching culture and the people who work in it. As a result, most employees will generate their perceptions of safety and its importance based on the attitude their employer projects.

Dr. James Reason has suggested that safety culture consists of five elements:

**An informed culture.** In an informed culture the organization collects and analyses relevant data, and actively disseminates safety information.

**A reporting culture.** A reporting culture means cultivating an atmosphere where people have confidence to report safety concerns without fear of blame. Employees must know that confidentiality will be maintained and that the information they submit will be acted upon, otherwise they will decide that there is no benefit in their reporting.

**A learning culture.** A learning culture means that an organization is able to learn from its mistakes and make changes. It will also ensure that people understand the SMS processes at a personal level.

**A just culture.** In a just culture errors and unsafe acts will not be punished if the error was unintentional. However, those who act recklessly or take deliberate and unjustifiable risks will still be subject to disciplinary action.

**A flexible culture.** A flexible culture is one where the organization and the people in it are capable of adapting effectively to changing demands.

For those in positions of authority, leadership is central to safety culture. The highest standards you can expect from the people you lead or seek to influence are the lowest you exhibit yourself.

By ignoring low standards you are approving them. You are communicating that low standards are acceptable. Leadership is the communication of the actions and standards you expect by words, deeds and silence.

If everyone is trained to do their job in a safe manner and proactively managing risk, you will then be approaching a new level of safety that is behavior driven. All the desirable elements within a safety culture must be actively encouraged and demonstrated by managers at all levels on a regular basis. Mangers must also encourage staff to participate if their desired safety culture is to be achieved.

How would you describe the culture in your organization?
In many workplaces people are hesitant to take notice of, or speak up, about conditions that cry out for improvement. People are especially reluctant to report errors made by others; and don’t even think about someone reporting his or her own mistakes.

In recent generations our society has taken on a “blame culture” that always wants to point the finger at someone else. When someone is found to be responsible for a condition that should not exist, blame and retribution follow. In that environment people do not want to single out their friends and coworkers, much less themselves. Thus, the “See No Evil, Hear No Evil, Speak No Evil” approach to personal and work relationships is widely practiced.

Although the blame culture is antithetical to a strong safety culture, it continues to exist even at organizations that have implemented a Safety Management System (SMS). The SMS relies on reporting errors and conditions to detect hazards, assess the associated risks, and devise policies or procedures to mitigate those risks. Certainly errors and conditions exist that deserve to be reported so they may not be repeated, but reports are unlikely to come in if blame and retribution will be the result.

Ever hear of a “Just Culture?” A just culture is one in which people feel free to report errors and conditions – even their own errors – without fear of retribution for themselves or their coworkers. In a just culture such reports would be met with, “Thanks for your input. Tell me a little more so we can be sure we come up with the right solution.” Reports are solicited as a way to continuously improve the Safety Management System. A just culture enhances and strengthens the SMS. While the submission of safety reports is an obvious application of just culture, the concept impacts the use of all of the tools in the safety toolbox. It encourages complete and accurate reporting of findings on internal audits, policy waiver procedures, and change management.

But, if you are thinking that a just culture is equivalent to a “No Blame Culture” think again. People are held accountable for their actions and their decisions. But rather than assigning blame, the idea is to identify shortcomings in the system that led to or enabled mistaken action.

One of the best ways to identify safety concerns in DOI is with the SAFECOM system. The “SAFECOM” ([https://www.safecom.gov/](https://www.safecom.gov/) or Form OAS-34/FS-1500-14) is used to report any condition, observance, act, maintenance problem, or circumstance with personnel or aircraft that has the potential to cause an aviation-related mishap. A SAFECOM’s sole purpose is for mishap prevention. A SAFECOM is not intended to fix blame and is not be utilized in disciplinary action against an employee or vendor.

Voluntary Hazard Reporting is a leading indicator of an organization’s Safety Culture. Ownership over workplace safety is a key indicator of an organization’s Safety Culture. SAFECOMs may be submitted electronically ([https://www.safecom.gov](https://www.safecom.gov)), telephonically, mail, fax or mobile application.

One thing to remember though, a just culture is NOT a “get out of jail free” card. It should not and will not absolve the person who engages in a willfully unsafe or illegal act, nor the individual who repeatedly shows disregard for established procedures.

Does a blame culture exist in your organization? Or are you on the road to a Just Culture?
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Take Away Sheet

POLICY: OPM-11 provides updated supplemental guidance for Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) users in order to prevent unauthorized operation of UAS. DM’s also apply.

POLICY: OAS Operational Procedure Memorandum 06 (OPM-06) was released July 21, 2014 which identifies National Aviation Management Plan (NAMP) standards, standardizes Project Aviation Safety Plans (PASPs), and identifies management approval requirements.

RISK MANAGEMENT: Voluntary Hazard Reporting is a leading indicator of an organization’s Safety Culture. Ownership over workplace safety is a key indicator of an organization’s Safety Culture.

SAFECOM reporting and management is now available for mobile device users.

PROMOTION: In flight award was given to Jayson Danziger with Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement. Several Airwards for BLM and BSEE were also awarded.

PROMOTION: Bureaus maintaining excellence in aviation safety through their continuous accident-free years record include: BSEE-40 years; OSM-28 years; BOR-17 years; USGS-8 years; BIA-7 years; BOEM-3, FWS-3 and NPS-3 year.

ASSURANCE: 100% of all Plan Of Action and Milestones (POAMs) have been completed for aviation program evaluations conducted to date in accordance with OAS’s ISO 9001-2008 process requirements.

ASSURANCE: 79 Aviation Program Evaluation findings. The top finding showed Line Manager (M2) / Supervisor (M3) training not conducted or current (per OPM 04).

ASSURANCE: Over the past five years, program evaluations revealed that 60% of Aviation Management Plans were either out of date or incomplete.

ASSURANCE: SAFECOM reporting has decreased this year demonstrating a need for continual safety awareness.