

SAFE Telecon Minutes



I. Call to Order – Chair
8PM CST November 11, 2009

II. Roll Call.

Doug Stewart, Chair	Alan Davis	Donna Wilt
Pat Knight, Secretary	Arlynn McMahon - Absent	Larry Bothe, Treasurer Proxy to Doug
Mark Adams, Vice Chair	John Dorcey	Tom Benenson

III. Minutes of the last telephone conference have been emailed to board members.
Motion to accept the minutes? Alan Second the motion? Mark
Minutes have been accepted.
Board agreed that minutes would be posted on website in members only area.

IV. Treasurer’s Report – Larry (Approximate as of November 1, 2009)
Income for the month, membership sales, approximately \$550.
Expenses for the month, mostly the Sun 'n Fun booth space fee, approximately \$1450.
Balance in checking account as of 11/1/2009, according to the bank, \$19,380.58.
Jenny's bill for October website work is \$772.92.

V. Committee Reports – Rich Stowell.

Doug mentioned the importance of the membership numbers, and was concerned about the need to have insurance before we can proceed with membership initiatives.

VI. Unfinished Business.

A. Insurance – Doug. Nothing additional.

B. By-laws - Mark.

Voting can all be done online. Mark asks for \$180 to fund the voting process. Donna moved. Alan seconded. No discussion. Motion passed. Doug, Mark, and Pat will be on access for administration of the voting process.

C. AOPA Aviation Summit- Doug.
See report included in the minutes.

Motion by Doug to accept manufacturer’s offer to support the website. Seconded by Mark. Alan called the question. Motion passed by vote.

D. Website design. – Rich.

Doug has an issue that we are not showing up on the search engine results.

- E. FAR 61 & 141 NPRM – Pat and Donna. They will clean up some grammatical errors and a paragraph using “T”. The group agreed to publish the comments to the FAA site.
- F. Sun n Fun – Doug has signed contract. On AirVenture John will check on timeframe for exhibit space signup.
- G. SAFE Mentoring program – Doug, Donna, Doug and Mark will work on this project.
- H. SAFE Library – Doug
 Alan, Tom, Pat, and Rich will be on the Library editorial review committee. Alan will head the committee, and we will ask for volunteers from the membership although they will be screened by Alan. We need to work out policies for the submissions to the library. Donna will help Alan with this. There is already a structure available on the website for this.

VII. New Business

A. FAA/SAFE Interaction to New Business – Doug. SAFE needs to become known to the FAA. SAFE isn’t necessarily known when new issues or projects, etc. come up.

B. Move by Alan to change “charter” membership name to “supporting” membership effective January 1, 2010 and form a committee to solicit these members to continue their support. Donna seconded. Discussion followed. The charter membership only runs through 2009.

Alan withdrew this question and moved two separate motions.

First motion, change the name from “charter” membership to “supporting” membership. Motion was seconded. Motion carried.

Moved by pat and seconded by Mark to table the motion to form a committee to solicit members to continue their support. Motion tabled.

VIII. Next meetings

Wednesday, December 9, 2009
 Wednesday, January 13, 2010

Wednesday, February 10, 2010
 Wednesday, March 10, 2010

IX. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn? Alan Second? Donna

Motion passed to adjourn at 2155.

SAFE Board of Directors		
Tom Benenson Email: TBenenson@aol.com Term: 2 years	Larry Bothe, Treasurer Email: lbothe@comcast.net Term: 1 year	Doug Stewart, Chair Email: Doug@DSFlight.com Term: 3 years
Alan Davis Email: ADavis@IASAir.com Term: 3 years	John Dorcey Email: wipilot@new.rr.com Term: 2 years	Mark Adams, Vice Chair Email: adamsmark@earthlink.net Term: 1 year
Arlynn McMahan Email: arlynn@aerotech.net Term: 3 years	Donna Wilt Email: dfwilt@aol.com Term: 2 years	Pat Knight, Secretary Email: pknight@earthlink.net Term: 1 year

SAFE Board Mailing list: TBenenson@aol.com; lbothe@comcast.net; Doug@DSFlight.com ;
ADavis@IASAir.com; WIPilot@new.rr.com; adamsmark@earthlink.net; arlynn@aerotech.net;
dfwilt@aol.com; pknight@earthlink.net

SAFE/AOPA SUMMIT 2009 REPORT

1. Met with a major manufacturer to discuss sponsorship of the SAFE website. The company can offer \$5,000.00. Pending the BoD acceptance of this offer, the representative will write up terms of agreement. The company will provide the appropriate logos and links, and would like input on placement of logo on webpages. The company asked that we not make the company's name public until all the t's are crossed and the l's dotted.
2. Met with Matt Mathias of Lightspeed. Lightspeed would like to partner with SAFE to provide safety information to the aviation community. I suggested that we could partner with the FAASTeam: SAFE would provide content and presenters, the FAASTeam would provide the venues on a national scale, and Lightspeed provide the sponsorship as well as some form of incentive to get pilots to attend, i.e. discount coupons, etc. In exchange for SAFE services I asked that Lightspeed provide sponsorship to SAFE by providing us with our tents, tables, chairs, etc. at Sun N Fun and AirVenture. Matt thinks that Lightspeed would be willing to do that, but he will have to check with his superiors. We also met with Bryan Neville who administers the Wings program. He thought the idea had merit and suggested we contact Kevin Clover for approval. I have sent an email to Kevin with our proposal.
3. Met with Bryan Neville to discuss SAFE members volunteering to review and critique the new Wings website that is in beta form. I told Bryan we would try to recruit members beginning with the next update to be emailed.
4. Met with Rod Machado to bring him up to speed with what SAFE is doing. He really didn't know too much about us, even though he had joined. He asked how he could help SAFE, and I suggested that anything he could do to help promote us would be a great help. He said he would endeavor to get an article written about SAFE, our goals, mission, and what we have to offer the aviation community.
5. Held a "Meetup" on the Summit exhibit hall floor. About 10 SAFE members were in attendance. Unfortunately technical difficulties prevented the feed to AOPA LIVE from working as planned. Jim Anderson, Senior VP of Starr Aviation, the underwriter of the SAFE insurance plan did attend and answered numerous questions about the program. He apologized for the slow speed at which we are moving, but promised all in attendance that we would have the plan in place sometime in the first quarter of 2010, and definitely no later than the end of March. He said that what was taking all the time was getting approval in all fifty states, which Chubb, the insurance carrier requires, before it will give the go ahead. He also said that the insurance plan would provide all the coverages we are currently listing on the website. Jim personally told me that he would keep in direct

communication with me relative the progress being made, rather than our having to rely on Ryan Birr for our information.

6. Held a SAFE "Gathering" in a room in the Marriott which JJ Greenway arranged for us. About 15 people attended, including Hal Shevers. Informal discussions were held about a variety of topics, and I brought those in attendance up to date on SAFE news.
7. Attended the GAJSC meeting. The most important areas, from my perspective, in which SAFE can have input, are in efforts to establish a better more effective means by which pireps, in particular those relative to icing, can get disseminated, and to update and make more meaningful, the knowledge exams. SAFE is already a member of the Personal Aviation sub-group, but a new sub-group has been formed to address Light Sport Aircraft, and I asked the chair of that group to please include SAFE.
8. Attended the GA Awards Committee meeting. Seven of the fourteen member groups were represented. There is a move within the committee to have the FAA do all the administration of the program, including selection of the final award winners. I opposed this, as I feel that the FAAS Team is still too dysfunctional to be able to do that effectively. In other matters, Jason Blair, executive director of NAFI made the suggestion that he and I work together on several different suggested projects. I gladly accepted his suggestion. A telecon will be held before the end of December to discuss the many issues that were raised during the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Doug Stewart



-----SAFE Committees Report, 11 November 2009-----

Submitted by Rich Stowell, Committee Coordinator.

1. New Website:

- The new site has been deployed, thankfully with few glitches. We have made a number of changes to some content based on comments received.
- Members-Only is now live. An e-mail was sent to all members with detailed instructions on how to register for Members-Only access. Overall, registrations have gone smoothly; difficulties with the registration process were typically the result of failure to follow directions. To date, we have close to (160) subscribers (roughly half of all SAFE members).
- State-by-state and international Member Listings are live. SAFE has members in 44 states; therefore, links from the six states with no SAFE members go to a page that says "Sorry, no member listing for the requested state." Whenever Brian Robbins receives new or updated member information, he generates a new PDF for that state and e-mails it to Jenny Furst to be uploaded to the site.
- The domain name transfer is complete: "safepilots.org" and "safepilots.us" both point to the new website.
- **Areas requiring Board action/direction:**
 - How to handle Store transactions on the new site vs. the current method. The current method uses an off-site provider to process memberships (SkipJack.com, <https://vpos.skipjack.com/ezPay/order.asp>). The new site allows us to choose from three methods that are available as part of the e-commerce package: Paypal, Google Checkout, and/or Chronopay.com.

2. Membership & Membership Growth:

- Based on the previous telecon and interaction with Vice Chair Mark Adams since, work continues on the details of the proposed membership drive. One area that is deemed a "must have" for the effort is a CFI Liability Insurance plan in place first.
- Brian Robbins has established dialogue with SAFE member Tim Metzinger and others about developing a software interface to make database management much more efficient.

Respectfully,

Rich Stowell

SAFE submits the following comments on Docket No. FAA-2008-0938 Pilot in Command Proficiency Check and Other Changes to the Pilot and Pilot School Certification Rules. This is a compilation of comments from SAFE members.



Society of Aviation and Flight Educators (SAFE) is a member-centric, professional organization for aviation educators. SAFE facilitates the professional development of aviation educators, seeks improved learning materials for all aviation students, and seeks a safer aviation environment. SAFE seeks to create a safer aviation environment through enhanced education. SAFE provides aviation educators with mentoring, support, and professional accreditation. By providing quality educational materials and other resources, we seek a reduction in aviation accidents, increased professionalism among aviation educators, and lifelong learning by everyone involved in aviation.

(Proposal 1) Redefining Complex Aircraft and moving the definition to 61.1

1. Concur with moving definition of complex aircraft to § 61.1.
2. If the FADEC is added to the definition of complex, it needs to be clear that this is an alternative to a controllable pitch propeller not a replacement. Recommend the definition read “an airplane that has a) a retractable landing gear, flaps, and either a controllable pitch propeller or a FADEC system; or, in the case of a seaplane, flaps and either a controllable pitch propeller or a FADEC system.
3. Recommendation: Add a grandfather clause to the proposed regulation. Perhaps allow pilots to continue flying aircraft designated as complex because of the FADEC if the pilot has already logged, say, 10 hours in a newly defined “complex” aircraft. As soon as we expand the definition of complex airplane, pilots of the airplanes newly identified as complex will have to be endorsed for complex aircraft operation under 14CFR61.31e. For example, today I can fly my aircraft with retractable gear and flaps and a FADEC system with no complex endorsement. The day the proposed regulation becomes effective, I can’t fly my airplane until I find an instructor, receive training, and receive the complex aircraft endorsement. I may have flown that aircraft for hundreds of hours, but tomorrow with the regulation change I can’t fly it.
4. Recommend that the definition of complex include two definitions: a mechanically complex aircraft and an electronically complex aircraft. The definition of complex aircraft

should encompass more than a mechanically complex aircraft as perceived in the 1940's. Today, technically advanced aircraft are, in many ways, more complex than a mechanically complex aircraft. The definition of a mechanically complex aircraft would define the triad of gear, flaps and prop controls as a mechanically complex aircraft. The definition of an electronically complex aircraft would define the aircraft to include a Primary Flight Display, Multifunction Display, Autopilot, and an Integrated Navigation System. Requirements regarding complex aircraft could refer to mechanically or electronically complex aircraft.

Advanced Instrument Training

Recommendation: Create a definition of Advanced Instrument Training in 61.1 that defines Advanced Instrument Training as being in an Electronically Complex Aircraft and is scenario-based, with scenarios that are realistic of commercial operations, with non-normal and emergency procedures, and that exercise the full capability of the advanced avionics.

Discussion: "Advanced Instrument Training" is not well defined. References to "approaches, arrivals, departures, holds" don't go far enough in explaining 'advanced'. A list of instrument procedures is not advanced training. The definition says nothing about the capability of the aircraft avionics. As currently defined, it appears an aircraft with only dual VHF transceivers and a glideslope could be used to meet the advanced instrument training requirement.

(Proposal 5 and 10, 12, 14) Replacing 10 hours of complex training with ten hours of instrument training for Commercial pilot Airplane Single Engine Land.

1. Recommend that the 10 hours of complex training be retained but be allowed in a flight simulator, flight training device, or aviation training device that replicates a complex single engine airplane rather than in an aircraft. Single-engine, commercial pilots need to have some experience with complex aircraft. Allowing training in a simulator, FTD or ATD would be a compromise that acknowledges the need for complex training, the reality is that there are fewer and fewer complex single engine aircraft, and that the major aircraft manufacturers are not building single-engine complex trainers. This would allow flight schools to meet the complex requirement without having an actual complex aircraft.

2. Recommend the regulation be changed to require 10 hours in a “mechanically or electronically complex aircraft” (See Proposal 1 regarding defining an electronically complex aircraft.)
3. Recommend applicants for the commercial SEL certificate be able to take the practical test in a plane that is not necessarily complex and demonstrate complex proficiency on the practical test in a simulator, FTD or ATD.
4. If this proposal is adopted, there should be a grace period where either 10 hours of complex training or 10 hours of advanced instrument training can meet the aeronautical experience requirements.

Reasons why the complex training requirements should be maintained:

1. Complex aircraft training versus advanced-instrument training is mixing apples and oranges. Training in a complex aircraft accomplishes one thing and advanced instrument training accomplishes another thing. Training in a complex aircraft develops proficiency operating a more complex aircraft. Advanced instrument training improves instrument flying skills. Why would we give up one to accomplish the other? As a pilot examiner who administers commercial pilot checkrides, I find that even with 10 hours the applicants are not very good in the complex airplane used on the checkride. Recommendation: retain the 10 hours of training in a complex aircraft.
2. It is contradictory that the proposed changes expand the definition of complex airplane, but the requirement to actually train in a complex airplane for a certificate or rating is reduced (see comments on Proposals 5 and 10, 12, 14). If we expand the definition, we should retain the training time in those complex airplanes for commercial pilots. In addition, by removing 10 hours complex aircraft training requirement at the commercial level we are reducing the amount of training an applicant for a flight instructor will have in a complex aircraft.
3. There is already a requirement for 10 hours of instrument training for the commercial certificate. How would the requirements of 61.129(a)(3)(i) differ from the requirements of 61.129(a)(3)(ii)? Would this proposal now require 20 hours of instrument training for the commercial certificate? That is too much for a certificate that is not an instrument rating. Adding advanced instrument training has merits, but it shouldn't replace complex training.
4. Substituting advanced instrument training doesn't result in the same knowledge and outcomes as complex training.

5. An applicant for a commercial pilot airplane single engine rating is not required to hold an instrument airplane certificate. That applicant's commercial certificate will have the following limitation: 61.133(b)(1), "The carriage of passengers for hire in (airplanes) (powered-lifts) on cross-country flights in excess of 50 nautical miles or at night is prohibited." Since the applicant does not hold an instrument rating, how and why would we do approaches, area departures, area arrivals, missed approaches, etc. with the applicant? He isn't trained in instrument flight rules. We shouldn't be training these things with the applicant. You have removed a training requirement that would have been useful and replaced it with a training requirement that will not be useful. Recommendation: retain the 10 hours of training in a complex aircraft.
6. Dropping the complex requirement because of "Complaints from training providers about keeping older airplanes to meet the complex requirement", is ignoring the ultimate safety of flight and ignoring what are the required outcomes required from pilot training. Decisions about flight training should include what is required to train pilots that are safe, not just economics. Recommendation: retain the 10 hours of training in a complex aircraft.

(Proposal 6, 11, 13, 15) Replacing 10 hours of complex training with ten hours of instrument training for Commercial pilot Airplane Multiengine Land.

1. Recommend the 10 hours of complex training be retained. While one can conceivably make a case for deleting the requirement for the complex time in a single engine commercial certificate, it should not be dropped for the multi-engine commercial certificate. Virtually all of the multi-engine aircraft in the aviation fleet today are classified as complex. A commercial multiengine certificate should verify that the pilot has some experience to meet the requirements to operate the small twin-engine aircraft in the world today. The argument of dropping the complex requirement because of "Complaints from training providers about keeping older airplanes to meet the complex requirement" does not apply to multiengine training. So there is no real justification for changing the current regulations.
2. There is already a requirement for 10 hours of instrument training, only 5 of which is in a multi airplane. How would the requirements of 61.129(b)(3)(i) differ from the requirements of 61.129(b)(3)(ii)? Would this proposal now require 20 hours of instrument training? That is too much for a certificate that is not an instrument rating.

3. The FAA states that “this training would be more beneficial if it were devoted the development of proficiency using instruments.” This is valid if this is instrument proficiency training in a complex, multiengine airplane.

Impact of Proposed Changes on Flight Instructor Training

Under benefits, the NPRM states there would be a cost savings because they wouldn't have to keep an inventory of two kinds of airplanes to meet the commercial pilot and flight instructor certification requirements.” This NPRM doesn't address the ramifications for flight instruction.

1. If the FAA has a definition of a complex aircraft, then there should be somewhere in training where pilots, and especially instructors, should be required to have training in a complex aircraft.
2. Recommend an instructor have a minimum of 10 hours of complex experience to receive the commercial and then whatever it takes over that to prepare for the flight instructor certificate.
3. Recommend that flight instructors are required to have training in complex aircraft and demonstrate competency teaching in a complex aircraft at their practical exam.

Recommend this competency can be demonstrated in a simulator, FTD, or ATD.

Discussion– Flight instructor preparation with reduced complex aircraft training. Removing the complex airplane training requirement will reduce the number of hours an applicant has when applying for a flight instructor certificate. Currently, the applicant must bring a complex aircraft to the flight instructor practical test, but that applicant may only have enough hours to qualify for the complex aircraft endorsement. If the complex requirement is dropped, new CFI's will have no complex experience. Before they can give instruction in a complex plane, they will need additional training and an endorsement. But, if this proposal passes, there is no FAA requirement for there to be CFIs that are qualified to give the training required for a complex endorsements. Currently, immediately after the completing the CFI practical test, that new flight instructor can give instruction in a complex aircraft with very limited complex aircraft hours. While the manufacturing of complex single engine trainers is going away, the need for CFIs that can give instruction, flight reviews, and transition training in complex planes is not going away.