

ALERT BULLETIN

AB 2021:12/7-3

7/9/2021

1805907

TO: FAA (ATM MIA TRACON)

INFO: FAA (AVP-1, AVP-200, AFS-280, AFS-200, ASO-600, ATM FLL ATCT, Director of Air Traffic Operations ESA South), A4A, ALPA, AMFA, APA, ASAP, ATSG, CAPA, IAM, IATA, ICASS, IFALPA, IPA, NTSB, PAMA, SWAPA, TWU

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

SUBJ: FLL Airspace Concerns

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 a light aircraft pilot who suggested safety would be enhanced in the FLL area if the MIA Class B airspace was extended to include FLL 10L/R approach corridors. Reporter stated he believes the changes would reduce conflicts with inbound and outbound aircraft at HWO and OPF airports.

ASRS has previously alerted on this issue. Alert message 2018:34/7-3 is also enclosed.

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 Hooley at (408) 541-2854 or email at becky.l.hooley@nasa.gov.



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



ACN 1805907

DATE / TIME

Date of Occurrence	202105
Local Time Of Day	No Local Time Of Day Stated

PLACE

Locale	FLL.Airport
State	FL
Altitude - MSL	2500

AIRCRAFT / EQUIPMENT X

Make Model Name	Small Aircraft, High Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear
Operating Under FAR Part	91

PERSON 1

Function - Flight Crew	Single Pilot
ASRS Report Number	1805907

EVENTS

Anomaly	No Specific Anomaly Occurred - All Types
Detector - Person	Flight Crew
Result - General	None Reported / Taken

NARRATIVE 1

This report does not involve a specific incident but is submitted as a suggestion to improve safety for aircraft operating in the area of FLL Class C airspace. I am recommending a change to the MIA Class B airspace to include a new section of protected airspace to provide a sterile section of airspace for arriving aircraft on the FLL 10L and 10R instrument approaches. Arriving aircraft into FLL typically are crossing PIONN at or above 2,500 feet descending to cross NOVEA at 1,800 feet on the ILS 10L and RNAV Z 10L approaches, as low as 2,200 feet on the RNAV Y approach from ZIRLA to SIYOL (which could be raised to 2,500 feet to coincide with the minimum altitudes on the ILS 10L and RNAV 10L Z approaches). Aircraft arriving on the ILS 10R and RNAV 10R approaches are crossing BLAIM at or above 3,000 descending to cross the FAF LORII at 1,800 feet. If a new wedge of class B airspace from 2,000 feet to 7,000 feet were added where currently there are no restrictions to inbound and outbound traffic utilizing HWO and OPF safety would be greatly enhanced. FLL has extensive inbound traffic and operations at HWO and OPF are significant. Air carrier passengers deserve the added protection and as a general aviation pilot the changes would have minimal impact.

SYNOPSIS

Private Pilot suggesting a change to FLL and MIA high traffic airspace to increase safety.

Previous Alert(s)

ALERT BULLETIN

AB 2018:34/7-3

11/29/2018

1581081, 1537404, 1533509

TO: FAA (ATM MIA TRACON)

INFO: FAA (AVP-1, AVP-200, AFS-280, AFS-200, ASO-600, ATM FLL ATCT, Director of Air Traffic Operations ESA South), A4A, ALPA, AMFA, APA, ASAP, ATSG, CAPA, IAM, IATA, ICASS, IFALPA, IPA, NTSB, PAMA, SWAPA, TWU

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

SUBJ: FLL Class C Not Sufficient for Current Traffic Levels

We recently received an ASRS report 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 a MIA TRACON Controller expressing concern about multiple recurring airborne conflicts in the FLL area. The Controller stated that traffic volume and complexity have reached unacceptable levels given the current airspace structure. Reporter stated "FLL needs a bigger Class C airspace or a Class B."

Pilot reports 1537404 and 1533509 also describe traffic volume concerns in FLL that contributed to safety issues.

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 Dennis Doyle at (408) 541-2831 or email at dennis.j.doyle@nasa.gov



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



ACN: 1581081

Time

Date: 201809

Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.ATC Facility: MIA.TRACON

State Reference: FL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value: 4000

Environment

Flight Conditions: VMC

Aircraft 1

ATC / Advisory.TRACON: MIA

Make Model Name: B737 Undifferentiated or Other Model

Aircraft 2

ATC / Advisory.TRACON: MIA

Make Model Name: Small Aircraft

Person 1

Function.Air Traffic Control: Approach

ASRS Report Number: 1581081

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types

Anomaly.Conflict: Airborne Conflict

Detector.Person: Air Traffic Control

Result.General: Flight Cancelled / Delayed

Result.Air Traffic Control: Issued Advisory / Alert

Result.Air Traffic Control: Separated Traffic

Result.Air Traffic Control: Issued New Clearance

Narrative 1

FLL feeder final was combined together. ROMEO was working Aircraft X inbound from the east for the 10L ILS final. Several controllers saw a 4,500 feet VFR [Aircraft Y] inbound from the north, descending southbound for the OPF/HWO area, and it was tagged as "TFC" acquiring the callsign via ADSB. Aircraft X was given an expeditious descent to get under the VFR as the Arrival Controller had numerous inbounds to both FLL parallel runways and it seemed this was the easiest way to de-conflict Aircraft X and Aircraft Y and go to immediately fix the other many aircraft who were also in conflict. Aircraft X was then also turned sharply in the descent in an attempt to join the final without crossing the projected path of the traffic, and miss a Caravan inbound for the airport too. Aircraft Y continued through the ILS approaches just west of PIONN, which has a crossing altitude of 025 and even turned back to the south and west to both miss the Bravo, but clearly also miss aircraft it saw out its window, creating even more problems for the ROMEO controller. The fact that this is allowed to happen and create unmitigated risk in the NAS is [absurd]. The traffic volume and complexity were already high, however had this event occurred during busier times of day, it would have been substantially more dangerous. FLL needs a bigger Class C airspace or a Class B! FLL airport is the 19th busiest airport in the USA, and one of the top 3 fastest growing, averaging 8% growth each of the last 5 years. FLL has a basic Class C airspace surrounding it that is beyond out of date and

unable to aid in the safety of its aircraft on the finals. Planes inbound to each of their parallel runways are not offered any sort of protection until within 5 miles of the field, which allows several dozen VFRs each day to climb, descend, and transition across each final, without ATC advisories creating a very dangerous, unsafe, and hazardous situation in the skies above, not unlike San Diego in 1978. The FLL Class C is inadequate, and out of date, and needs a major airspace change around it, whether a bigger Charlie, or a full blown Class B before it's too late, just like [an accident in 1978] where people had to die before airspace changes happened.

Synopsis

MIA TRACON Controller reported vectoring several aircraft conducting instrument approaches off course to avoid a VFR aircraft they were not in communication with.

ACN: 1537404

Time

Date: 201804

Local Time Of Day: 0001-0600

Place

Locale Reference.Airport: FLL.Airport

State Reference: FL

Altitude.AGL.Single Value: 0

Environment

Aircraft 1

ATC / Advisory.Tower: FLL

Make Model Name: B737-800

Person 1

Function.Flight Crew: Captain

Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying

ASRS Report Number: 1537404

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types

Anomaly.Conflict: Ground Conflict, Less Severe

Detector.Person: Flight Crew

Result.General: Flight Cancelled / Delayed

Result.Flight Crew: Became Reoriented

Result.Flight Crew: Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

Result.Air Traffic Control: Issued New Clearance

Result.Air Traffic Control: Separated Traffic

Narrative 1

Our aircraft was given a "Line up and wait" clearance on from Tower. While waiting for takeoff clearance, we heard a blocked transmission from Tower. We believed the Tower transmission was blocked by an aircraft checking in for landing clearance on final approach. We also believed the Tower transmission was our takeoff clearance but it was barely readable. My First Officer queried the Tower saying "Call sign Blocked, was that a takeoff clearance for Aircraft X?" The Tower responded saying heading 290. My First Officer and I were confused. We were thinking the Tower thought we were asking for the heading after takeoff but we were asking if we were cleared for takeoff.

The Tower then advised there was Company [Traffic] on final approach. We still did not hear a takeoff clearance. We queried Tower again if we were cleared for takeoff. Tower did not respond right away because he was talking to multiple aircraft. We asked again if we were cleared for takeoff. Finally Tower cleared us for takeoff. We replied cleared for takeoff and started takeoff roll. Seconds later Tower directed the Company aircraft on final to go around and canceled our takeoff clearance. We rejected our takeoff and exited the runway at the next available exit. Our aircraft never achieved 40% N1, TOGA was never set, takeoff thrust was never set and the aircraft never attained greater than 10 knots.

We contacted Dispatch and received an amended Release for takeoff fuel and advised Dispatch of the rejected takeoff. We took off about 15 minutes later uneventful. I submit this [report]

because I feel the Tower was undermanned. Due to the blocked takeoff clearance it took multiple transmissions to clarify our takeoff clearance. If the Tower wasn't working so many aircraft at once, we could have been able to advise the Tower their transmission was blocked and request a retransmission of the original clearance. Instead, we couldn't get our takeoff clearance in a timely manner and it caused an aircraft to go around and our late takeoff clearance canceled. I believe the Tower Controller was doing an excellent job but feel he was overwhelmed with aircraft. I want the Tower Controllers to know our Company Pilots desire to have a safe, great, and professional working relationship.

Synopsis

A pilot reported their takeoff clearance was blocked by frequency congestion causing a delay and canceled takeoff clearance.

ACN: 1533509

Time

Date: 201804

Local Time Of Day: 1801-2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport: FLL.Airport

State Reference: FL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value: 4000

Environment

Aircraft 1

ATC / Advisory.TRACON: MIA

Make Model Name: Large Transport

Person 1

Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Not Flying

Function.Flight Crew: Captain

ASRS Report Number: 1533509

Person 2

Function.Flight Crew: Pilot Flying

Function.Flight Crew: First Officer

ASRS Report Number: 1533489

Events

Anomaly.ATC Issue: All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Track / Heading: All Types

Anomaly.Deviation - Procedural: Published Material / Policy

Detector.Person: Flight Crew

Detector.Person: Air Traffic Control

Result.Flight Crew: Returned To Clearance

Result.Flight Crew: Requested ATC Assistance / Clarification

Result.Air Traffic Control: Provided Assistance

Narrative 1

Descending on the JINGL 5 Arrival, we checked on with MIAMI Approach (133.77) and requested the RNAV RNP Z 28R at FLL. We were told to "expect" that approach. We linked the RNAV Z 28R with the JINGL 5 RNAV Arrival at BEPAC intersection. BEPAC is the last waypoint on the JINGLE 5 Arrival and is also the IF for the RNAV Z 28R.

We were then switched to approach on 133.72. Passing BEPAC, the aircraft joined the RNAV course and continued on the downwind leg. ATC was very busy at the time which may have added to the situation. Upon passing CUSRA intersection, the FMC and autopilot began arcing right to join the final approach course for 28R.

That's when the First Officer and I had a discussion about how this approach was going to work, as there was a long line of traffic already on the final approach path, extending well beyond the point we would be joining final.

Since ATC was so busy, we couldn't query our situation. We were not in conflict with other

traffic even as we were turning to join final because we were level at 4,000 feet and the traffic on final was below 3,000 feet. Finally ATC gave us new instructions (which I don't recall the details of) and we used the opportunity to verify that we were on the RNAV Z Approach. ATC immediately told us, "No, turn to a heading of 070 degrees." We immediately turned back to a downwind and heading of 070 and the rest of the flight went without a hiccup, as we were vectored for a visual approach using the ILS as a backup. ATC apologized to us for the confusion.

We were maintaining 4,000 feet as assigned, and it is only our lateral clearance that is in question.

Narrative 2

[Report narrative contained no additional information.]

Synopsis

Air carrier flight crew reported experiencing a heading deviation while on the RNAV Z 28R approach to FLL due to procedure confusion and communication issues with ATC. The crew stated high traffic volume hindered the ability to clarify the situation with ATC.