

**Aviation Safety Investigation Report
198801381**

Pitts S1E

Pitts S2A

16 January 1988

Readers are advised that the Australian Transport Safety Bureau investigates for the sole purpose of enhancing transport safety. Consequently, Bureau reports are confined to matters of safety significance and may be misleading if used for any other purposes.

Investigations commenced on or before 30 June 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the CEO of the Bureau in accordance with Part 2A of the Air Navigation Act 1920.

Investigations commenced after 1 July 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the CEO of the Bureau in accordance with the Transport Safety Investigation Act 2003 (TSI Act). Reports released under the TSI Act are not admissible as evidence in any civil or criminal proceedings.

NOTE: All air safety occurrences reported to the ATSB are categorised and recorded. For a detailed explanation on Category definitions please refer to the ATSB website at www.atsb.gov.au.

control and was forced to limit engine power due the control difficulties. As a result of the damage, the aircraft was unable to maintain height. A ditching was made in a clear area adjacent to some yachts. The pilot escaped from his sinking aircraft and was assisted by a person from a nearby yacht. He was subsequently taken on board a rescue vessel. The weather was fine with good visibility, the temperature was 18 degrees and there was a light westerly wind. The leader's aircraft was not recovered, but he reported there were no operating problems with it prior to the collision. About 70 percent of the number two aircraft was recovered. Examination of this did not reveal evidence of any pre-existing defects which might have contributed to the accident. The aircraft used for the display were all of the the same general type but had different performance capabilities. This was primarily because of different engines and aircraft weights. As was normal procedure, the leader flew the aircraft with the least performance, the aim of which was to allow a performance margin for the other two aircraft which in most team manoeuvres, had to be positioned with respect to the leader. A disadvantage in this type of manoeuvre is that it is necessary for the other two pilots to limit the engine power and ensure that they fly the same path. In his predisplay briefing the leader made a point of drawing attention to this aspect. An amateur video was taken of the accident flight and this indicated that the total time from the start of the pull-up by the number two pilot, until the collision, was about 15 seconds. The video showed that on the pull-up, number two aircraft climbed much higher than normal and that during descent it completed some two and three quarter rolls to the left prior to the collision with the number one aircraft. Because of the relative positions of the two aircraft from the top of their respective climbs it would have been very difficult for either pilot to have seen the other in time to avoid the collision. Opinions were obtained from experienced aerobatic pilots concerning the rolling manoeuvres of the number two aircraft. In the main these opinions indicated that the manoeuvres were controlled and that the aircraft maintained the required line during descent. Earlier in the display sequence, a team manoeuvre with some similarity to that on which the accident happened took place. On this occasion, however, the number three pulled up first, followed by the number one, both of which then completed a manoeuvre similar to that during which the accident happened. Number two pulled up last and because he has to delay before his next sequence, he sometimes executed a large diameter pull-up followed by a diving manoeuvre which included one and a half rolls. A possible explanation for what happened on the accident sequence was that the pilot inadvertently employed a procedure generally similar to that he sometimes used earlier in the display. The accident manoeuvre had only recently been added to the sequence, being completed three times previously, including once at an air display two weeks earlier and twice during practice sessions. In aerobatic terms the accident manoeuvre was not difficult. All pilots in the team were experienced aerobatic pilots with approvals to conduct aerobatics down to a height of 500 feet above ground level. The pilots in numbers one and three aircraft had been in the team from its formation some ten years earlier. The pilot in the number two aircraft had joined as a part-time member in 1982 and had been a full-time member since 1985. Air displays of this type require that the performing aircraft not track or manoeuvre towards spectators within a horizontal distance of 500 metres or pass within 200 metres horizontally from spectators. There were many official, spectator and competition boats in the area. The leader indicated that there were also large clear areas of water. He reported he conducted the display with the aim of remaining over the clear areas. At times there were water craft moving into the display area and he altered the path of the runs to avoid these.

Significant Factors:

The following factors were considered relevant to the development of the accident

1. The flight path for the number two aircraft was significantly different to the path needed to correctly perform the manoeuvre. The reasons for this could not be determined.

2. The final flight paths of the two aircraft were such that it was unlikely that either pilot could see the other.