

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

C-32A, S/N 99-0003

89th Airlift Wing, Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland

1 June 2006

On 1 June 2006, at Andrews Air Force Base (AFB), Maryland at approximately 1138 local time (1538 Zulu), a maintenance engine run on a C-32A, S/N 99-0003, resulted in the violent disintegration and uplift of the asphalt behind the #2 engine which impacted aft sections of the aircraft. The C-32A, assigned to the 1st Airlift Squadron (1 AS), 89th Airlift Wing (89 AW), Andrews Air Force Base, was undergoing a high power engine run following the replacement of engine fan blades. No one was injured in the accident, although damage to the aircraft was significant. The accident occurred on engine run-up pad 93, a designated run pad at the south end of the airfield, and no other structures, assets, or personnel were impacted.

The engine run was carried out in accordance with DynCorp procedures and Boeing Engine Vibration Check maintenance checklists. The vibration survey called for #2 engine to be advanced to take-off power over a period of 90 – 120 seconds to determine whether vibrations remain within specified limits. As power was being removed from the engine, an approximately 8 foot by 13 foot section of the asphalt immediately behind the #2 engine at the concrete pad border separated from the apron shoulder. Parts of this asphalt impacted the aft section of the aircraft in several places. One section of asphalt, approximately 2 feet by 1 foot, went over the top of the aircraft and impacted the top of the left horizontal stabilizer.

Based on clear and convincing evidence, the Board President determined the primary cause of the mishap was the improper placement of the aircraft by the engine run team on the engine run pad with the tail of the aircraft over the asphalt. A substantially contributing factor to this accident was the lack of knowledge by the engine run team of the danger of high power engine runs over asphalt. This lack of knowledge existed because of a communications failure between airfield management, operations and maintenance, despite a similar incident in July of 2000.

Under 10 U.S.C. 2254(d), any opinion of the accident investigators as to the cause of, or the factors contributing to, the accident set forth in the accident investigation report may not be considered as evidence in any civil or criminal proceeding arising from an aircraft accident, nor may such information be considered an admission of liability by the United States or by any person referred to in those conclusions or statements.