

# ALERT BULLETIN

AB 2021:3/7-1

3/19/2021

1780556

**TO:** Airport Managers, Greenville Spartanburg International Airport (GSP), SC, Greenville Downtown Airport (GMU), SC, FAA (AAS-1)

**INFO:** FAA (AAS-300, ATM GSP Tower, ATM GMU Tower, ATM GSP TRACON, AVP -1, AVP-200, AJI-144, ASO-600, AFS-280, AFS-200, Director of Air Traffic Operations ESA South), A4A, AAAE, ALPA, AOPA, APA, ASAP, CAPA, ATSAP, ATSG, IATA, IBT, ICAO, ICASS, IFALPA, IPA, NATCA, NBAA, NTSB, RAA

**FROM:** Becky L. Hooey, Director  
NASA Aviation Safety Reporting System

**SUBJ:** Traffic Conflicts Vicinity of GSP and GMU Airports

We recently received ASRS reports describing a safety concern that may involve your area of operational responsibility. We do not have sufficient details to assess either the factual accuracy or possible gravity of the report. It is our policy to relay the reported information to the appropriate authority for evaluation and any necessary follow-up. We feel you should be aware of the following:

ASRS received a report from an Air Traffic Controller expressing concern about frequent conflicts between IFR arrivals to GSP and VFR operations at GMU. Reporter stated "this is a known safety problem" and "the Charlie and Delta airspace design is flawed." Reporter alleged "the FAA is unwilling or unable" to address the issue.

To properly assess the usefulness of our alert message service, we would appreciate it if you would take the time to give us your feedback on the value of the information that we have provided. Please contact Dr. Becky Hooey at (408) 541-2854 or email at [becky.l.hooey@nasa.gov](mailto:becky.l.hooey@nasa.gov).



Aviation Safety Reporting System  
P.O. Box 189 | Moffett Field, CA | 94035-0189



## ACN 1780556

### DATE / TIME

Date of Occurrence	202001
Local Time Of Day	1201 to 1800

### PLACE

Locale	GSP.Tower
State	SC
Altitude - MSL	1800

### AIRCRAFT / EQUIPMENT X

ATC / Advisory - Tower	GSP
Make Model Name	Commercial Fixed Wing
Operating Under FAR Part	121

### AIRCRAFT / EQUIPMENT Y

Make Model Name	Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer
-----------------	---

### PERSON 1

Function - Air Traffic Control	Other / Unknown
ASRS Report Number	1780556

### EVENTS

Anomaly	Conflict - Airborne Conflict
Anomaly	Deviation - Track / Heading - All Types
Detector - Person	Air Traffic Control
Result - Air Traffic Control	Issued New Clearance
Result - Air Traffic Control	Provided Assistance

### NARRATIVE 1

Aircraft X was on ILS approach to Runway 4 at GSP when a VFR aircraft inbound to GMU went across final under Aircraft X. Traffic was called. GMU [Tower] was called. Aircraft X was below the clouds and stated he would execute missed approach if there was a RA. The pilot seemed to stay above glide slope to avoid the RA. Both aircraft eventually got each other in sight and Aircraft X landed.

This is a known safety problem. The closest proximity of 2 aircraft in this situation is zero lateral and less than 100 feet vertical if the GSP arrival is on the glideslope and the VFR is in the GMU Delta airspace. However, it should not be taken for granted that aircraft on instrument and visual approaches will be at or above glideslope altitude. Since the VFR is under the GSP arrival, which is usually a jet, there are also wake turbulence issues.

The Charlie and Delta airspace design is flawed. The FAA is either unwilling or unable to redesign the airspace to provide for the safety of the flying public.

From my experience, the VFR aircraft involved are always inbound to GMU from SC72 (Chandelle). It is probably less than half a dozen aircraft that occasionally do this. When they depart GMU, they are instructed to fly over VPLOW when GSP Runway 4 is in use. If they were instructed to fly over VPLOW when inbound to GMU, the problem would be resolved. GMU Tower can instruct aircraft to remain outside the Delta and

instruct aircraft where to enter the Delta, so there is no reason this solution would not work. It could be agreed to, briefed and implemented in 24 hours.

This situation develops quickly and there are no guarantees that the controllers will see it before the RA or collision alert. When it is seen, or when the alarms go off, what does FAA management want the controllers to do? Should we be breaking off the approach as a preventive measure?

---

## **SYNOPSIS**

GSP Tower Controller reported an airborne conflict over intersection VPLOW. Controller stated this is an ongoing issue between IFR and VFR aircraft near VPLOW intersection.