

**BRITISH PARACHUTE ASSOCIATION**  
**SAFETY AND TRAINING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**COUNTY ARMS, GLEN PARVA, LEICESTER**  
**THURSDAY 9TH AUGUST 2001**

**Present:**

Jhn Hitchen	-	Acting Chairman
David Hickling	-	BPS, Langar
Andy Guest	-	Devon & Somerset
Mike Bolton	-	Skydive Redlands
Phil Cavanagh	-	Black Knights
Jhn Page	-	JSPC (L)
Tony Goodman	-	JSPC (N)
Andy Paddock	-	Silver Stars
Pat Walters	-	Tilstock
Brian Dyas	-	Skydive St Andrews
Ian Rosenvinge	-	Peterlee
Ronnie O' Brien	-	PPC
Pete Sizer	-	Headcorn
Paul Applegate	-	Riggers Committee

**Apologies** Ian Cashman (Tony Goodman represented Ian at this meeting), Mick Nealis (Jhn Page represented Mick at this meeting), Dane Kenny, Tim Andrews, Jhn Saunders, Karen Farr, Dave Wood, Dennis Buchanan, Trevor Dobson, Tony Knight, Maggie Penny.

**In Attendance:**

Chris Allen	-	Chairman BPA
Jhn Carter	-	BPA Medical Advisor
Tony Butler	-	Technical Officer
Trudy Kemp	-	Assistant to NCSO/TO

**Observers:** Lisbeth Harris, Phil Gibbs, Bernadette Whitaker, Jhn Curtis, Jhn Harding, Colin Fitzmaurice, Simon Davenport, Kev Goode.

---

**ITEM**

**1. MINUTES OF THE STC MEETING OF THE 7TH JUNE 2001**

It was proposed by Ronnie O' Brien and seconded by David Hickling that the Minutes of the STC Meeting of the 7th June 2001 be accepted as a true record.

**Carried Unanimously**

**2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE STC MEETING OF THE 7TH JUNE 2001**

**Page 1, Item 2 – Statistics Working Group.** This item would be dealt with on the main Agenda.

**Page 7, Item 8 – Permissions (f) – Goodwood.** Carl Williams had requested that Goodwood Airfield be cleared as an alternative PLA/DZ for Skydive Wales, for Tandem, Intermediate and Experienced parachutists. This had been agreed at the previous meeting subject to an inspection by the Technical Officer. The TO advised

those present that he had inspected the airfield on the 12<sup>th</sup> June 2001 and stated that the centre of the PLA (OS Sheet 197, grid ref: 864074) was located close to the intersection of the two main (grass) runways. Just within the 800 metre radius, to the north of the PLA, a power line runs approximately east to west. Also to the south of the PLA, a power line runs from the edge of the 800 metre radius for approximately 150 metres in a north easterly direction. In the TO' s opinion neither of these power line encroachments required parachuting restrictions. However, because of the location of parked aircraft, near the aero-club buildings, it was in his opinion important that all parachutists land as close as possible to the centre of the PLA. This was because of the safety implications of parked aircraft and buildings. No parachutist should intentionally land in the area close to the aero-club. There should be reference to this in the Club SOPs. A map of the airfield was also made available for inspection by those present.

**Page 9, Item 9 – AOB (c).** At the last STC meeting it was decided that a meeting should take place between the BPA and Airtec to discuss Airtecs' policy with regard to the Student and Expert CYPRES AAD.

Details of this meeting went out with an amended agenda together with a draft letter from Airtec clarifying their position with regard to the Student and Expert CYPRES.

At the last STC it was decided that centres using the Expert CYPRES on Student equipment could continue to do so until this meeting, when the subject would be fully discussed following input from Clubs and following the meeting with Airtec.

The meeting took place on the 24<sup>th</sup> July and Gerard Fetter from Airtec attended. Also in attendance were; David Hicking, Pat Walters, Pete Sizer, Roger Dearman, John Hitchen and Tony Butler. Written input had been received from; D Hickling, P Walters, P Sizer, Brian Dyas, Mick Nealis, Andy Dixon and Chris Allen. Airtec were supplied with the correspondence so that they were aware of the various comments sent in with regard to the use of the CYPRES AADs for Students.

The Committee was advised that Gerard Fetter gave a brief history of the CYPRES and why the Student CYPRES was produced (a different need for the Student – for the AAD to operate under most malfunction situations, if the Student did not carry out his/her reserve drills). Probably the most important information supplied by Airtec and which was a surprise to most present, was that an Expert CYPRES was not designed to activate if the parachutist has a 'streamer' malfunction, but at best for a 'pilot chute in tow' .

A number of clubs in the UK have Student parachuting equipment fitted with the Expert CYPRES and wished continue with it in this mode, as they believe the Expert CYPRES was more suitable for their operation.

A letter from Scotty Milne also went out with the Addition to the Agenda.

A lengthy debate then ensued on the matter, where members presented their arguments for and against the use of the Expert CYPRES AAD on Student equipment.

Following the debate a proposal was put forward by Phil Cavanagh and seconded by Pat Walters that the Student CYPRES AAD be used on Student parachute equipment as per the manufacturers recommendations.

For: 3

Against: 0

Abstentions: 8

**Carried**

There was a great deal concern expressed by those present because of the number of CCIs who had abstained on this vote, particularly when it concerned a very important issue.

***Note: The Council at its meeting on 21 August asked STC, in the light of the high number of abstentions in the above vote, to try to obtain additional information and consider the matter further.***

Many of the CCIs who had abstained from the vote expressed the view that from the information provided by Airtec, the lack of statistical information and even after listening to the various debate on the subject, they still felt unable to make a decision either way at this time.

Some members present believed that Airtec' s comments and what they had written was contradictory and evasive. They also wanted Airtec to define more clearly the limitations of the use of the Expert CYPRES.

Following further discussion on this item it was felt by those present that a time limit be set for those clubs to make the necessary changes to their equipment. It was therefore proposed by Brian Dyas and seconded by Ronnie O' Brien that a maximum time period of 1 year be given.

For: 6                  Against: 4                  Abstentions: 1

**Carried**

The NCSO also asked that CCIs who had any further input/questions relating to issue to forward them to the BPA offices, to enable him to pass them on to Airtec.

**3                  MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE RIGGERS SUB COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE 7TH JUNE 2001**

There being no matters arising from the previous meeting, it was proposed by Paul Applegate and seconded by Pat Walters that the Minutes of the Riggers Sub-Committee Meeting of the 7th June 2001 be approved.

**Carried Unanimously**

**4.                  FATALITY 23RD JUNE 2001 – TILSTOCK**

The Committee was advised of a ' first time' jumper Iain Johnstone who was killed on the 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2001 at The Parachute Centre, Tilstock.

A resume of the Boards' report, together with the Conclusions and Recommendations went out with the addition to the Agenda.

At approximately 09:20 hrs he boarded the clubs' Cessna 206 along with three other Student Parachutists and an instructor.

After an initial pass to despatch the WDI the aircraft climbed to an altitude of approximately 3,500ft for the first of four planned ' Student' passes. Iain was to be the first Student to exit the aircraft. After the ' cut' the jumpmaster directed Iain into the door to adopt the exit position. On the instruction to leave the aircraft, Iain

was seen to execute a “ ..weak..” exit causing him “ ..to roll onto his side and back..” . The jumpmaster reported that the position of the Student during the deployment of the main static line parachute resulted in his right leg becoming entangled with the right line-set above the risers. At this point the pilot banked the aircraft to the left. Both the pilot and the jumpmaster report that they continued to watch the Student’ s descent, under a canopy that was both distorted and spinning. The remainder of the planned lift was aborted and the pilot brought the aircraft back to the ground.

*The DZ controller also observed the entire descent from the ground although the sun obscured his view of the actual exit. The DZ controller reported that he observed the Student spinning under a distorted canopy until he disappeared from view behind the hangar. He also reported that the Student appeared to be in an almost horizontal (back to earth) position whilst rotating under the canopy.*

A Board of Inquiry was convened and the BPA would like to thank Chris Allen, John Saunders and Tim Andrewes for conducting the Inquiry.

The Conclusions of the Board were as follows:

‘ That Iain had received the required level of training during his initial course and that this initial training had been supplemented with the appropriate level of refresher training on the day of the actual descent.

At an altitude of approximately 3,500ft Iain was despatched from the Cessna 206 by the jumpmaster. During the exit Iain appeared to roll into a position that resulted in his right leg becoming caught up in the rigging lines of the main canopy. The resulting distortion of the main canopy caused the parachute to begin spinning. At some undetermined point during the descent Iain activated the ‘ cut-away’ drills. Either the manual release of the ‘ reserve ripcord’ handle or the action of the RSL lanyard caused the reserve to begin its deployment sequence. The pilot chute and bridle line of the reserve subsequently became entangled with the main parachute that was still in contact with some undetermined part of Iain’ s body.

The main canopy continued to spin throughout the duration of the descent causing severe twisting of both the canopy fabric and rigging lines. The entanglement of the main and reserve bridle/pilot chute prevented the full deployment of the reserve, despite apparent efforts by Iain to clear the lines of the reserve parachute’ .

The Recommendations of the Board were as follows:

‘ That the BPA Safety and Training Committee give serious thought and consideration into the implications of the effect of unstable exits, particularly where Student Parachutists are using RAPS equipment’ .

It was proposed by David Hickling and seconded by John Page that the Board Report including their Conclusions and Recommendation accepted.

**Carried Unanimously**

A letter from Phil Cavanagh was circulated with the Report resume, with his comments following the fatality, as he was concerned about the type of deployment system being used on RAPS reserves.

The Technical Officer advised those present that following a fatality a Panel of Inquiry is automatically convened to look at peripheral aspects of the fatality and if agreed by STC to consider any recommendations made by the Board and also any

areas STC wish to be considered.

A paper by the NCSO & Technical Officer was circulated to those present stating their concerns regarding the dangers of arms, legs etc becoming entangled in rigging lines following instability during deployment. They felt that a Panel should look into all aspects of this problem. They believed the Board of Inquiry felt the same and that that all the following areas should be considered:

- a) Might a different exit to a 'stable spread' type for the first, or first few RAPS jumps, help.
- b) At this time it is mandatory that a Reserve Static Line (RSL) is fitted to all RAPS & AFF Student equipment. Is this requirement necessary or desirable? taking into account the reliability of AADs.
- c) Can the deployment of RAPS equipment be altered, i.e. Centre Based Tie, to improve the opening characteristics of an unstable deployment on RAPS deployment?
- d) Should Student equipment be changed so that it is designed specifically for Students and their needs. i.e. Main parachutes above reserves in the containers. Also the length of reserve free bag bridles?
- e) Study RAPS type operations in other countries and determine as to whether Students becoming entangled in rigging lines is a problem elsewhere.
- f) Would round reserves be more beneficial for RAPS equipment.

Brian Dyas stated that he would like the Panel to also consider:-

- g) Whether Students should be taught an entanglement drill.

It was felt by those present that the above points should be considered by the Panel of Inquiry. They believed it was a good starting point for the Panel and obviously if any CCI had any additions to these points then that would also be acceptable.

It was therefore proposed by David Hickling and seconded by Ronnie O' Brien that the Panel of Inquiry consider the above areas.

For: 10          Against: 1          Abstentions: 0

**Carried**

The NCSO/Technical Officer asked if there was any CCIs who were prepared to be on the Panel to please let them know. This could be a time consuming job and may take some considerable time.

#### **5. FATALITY 25TH JULY 2001 – PORTSMOUTH (New Agenda item)**

The Committee was advised of a second fatal accident has occurred in the UK since the last meeting. David Paton an experienced parachutist and instructor was killed on a display at Portsmouth on the 25<sup>th</sup> July 2001.

A resume of this Board of Inquiry Report also went out with the additions to the Agenda, giving details of the accident, including the Board' s conclusions and recommendations.

This was a planned six man display by the RN Raiders display team at HMS Excellent, Portsmouth. The Sea King helicopter took off at approximately 15.00 hrs.

The reported weather conditions for the display were good; surface winds were

approximately 5 knots at 165-170 degrees and very little cloud cover.

The helicopter climbed to approximately 2,000ft AGL, where WDIs were released. The helicopter then climbed to approximately 7,000ft AGL and 'ran in' over the top of the arena, (which measured approximately 50 metres by 100 metres, with good overshoot areas on three sides). Once the helicopter was near the exit point the parachutists commenced their exit procedures. All six parachutists exited close together, after which they built a five person freefall formation, the sixth team

member videoed the formation. At approximately 4,000ft AGL the parachutists separated and deployed their parachutes at approximately 3,000ft AGL. All parachutes deployed normally.

The parachutists then flew their parachutes in a 'stack' type of formation, in order to stagger their landings.

The first team member to land was the team leader who was trailing a large flag, he landed successfully near the centre of the arena. He was followed shortly after by another team member who also landed successfully in the arena. At about this time David was seen to be flying his canopy 'down wind' near the edge of the arena. He was then observed to initiate a radical left turn, impacting with the ground after about a 180-degree turn. The remaining three parachutists landed in the arena without further incident.

A Board of Inquiry was convened, comprising of John Hitchen, Tony Butler and Ian Cashman.

The Conclusions of the Board were as follows:

'David Paton made an uneventful free fall descent, deployed his main parachute at a suitable altitude, remained 'up wind' of the intended landing area until he commenced the final 'down wind leg' of the descent. At a low altitude, probably below 150ft AGL he initiated a radical 180 degree left turn in order to face into wind for landing.

He then struck the ground at high speed before he had fully completed the turn.

The Board do not know why the deceased made such a radical turn (which was probably a front riser turn) so close to the ground, but it was initiated at an altitude that was too low.

It was noted that this descent was only the fourth the deceased had made using this main parachute, Though his own personal parachute was of a higher performance. He was also a very current parachutist, having completed 100 descents within the previous three months.'

The Recommendations of the Board were as follows:

'That parachutists should be reminded of the dangers of performing radical manoeuvres close to the ground, especially if they are not fully familiar with the flight characteristics of their parachutes' .

It was proposed by Andy Guest and seconded by Tony Goodman that the Board Report including their Conclusions and Recommendation be accepted.

**Carried Unanimously**

The Technical Officer advised those present that normally a Panel of Inquiry is automatically convened after a Board of Inquiry, but the Board of Inquiry would like to recommend to STC and Council that in this instance it is not necessary to set up a Panel.

It was therefore proposed by John Page and seconded by Andy Guest that a Panel of Inquiry need not be convened.

**Carried Unanimously**

Phil Gibbs wished to record his thanks to the Board of Inquiry members for the way in which they had dealt with the inquiry.

## **6. INCIDENT/INJURY REPORTS – RESUME (Previously Item 5)**

Prior to giving the regular statistical information regarding the Incident/Injury reports received since the last meeting, STC was advised of another fatal accident to a BPA member; Robert Monk, an experienced parachutist who was killed skydiving at Ampuriabrava on the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2001. Also on the same jump John Carew another experienced parachutist was badly injured. It was believed the incident was a mid-air/canopy collision.

- i) There had been 47 Student injuries reports received since the last meeting, 26 male and 21 female. 2 Students were hurt during ground training and 2 were hurt on exit (1 caught elbow on static line, the other caught arm in risers). The other 43 injuries were on landing. 35 of the injuries were on ram-air canopies and 8 were on round/conical canopies.
- ii) There had been 15 injuries reported to Intermediate or Experienced Parachutists since the last STC. 10 male and 5 female.
- iii) Since the last meeting there had been 25 Student Parachutist Malfunctions/Deployment Problems reported. 21 male and 4 female. All were on ram-air canopies.
- iv) There had been 38 reports of Malfunction/Deployment Problems to Intermediate or Experienced Parachutists since the last meeting. 35 male and 3 female.
- v) There had been 16 Tandem Incident/Injury reports received since the last meeting, 4 were Student injuries (fairly minor). 3 were 'off landings'. 8 were malfunction/Deployment problems, including one where the instructor had a semi-streaming malfunction, cutaway and had a hard pull on the reserve, just after the reserve had deployed the AAD fired.

One report concerned an incident where a Tandem Instructor who had a main drogue 'in tow' and after a number of attempts finally managed to dislodge it and deploy the main. The CYPRESAAD had fired and cut the loop!

The DZ Controller provided the meeting details of the Tandem incident as he had been on the telemeters at the time.

The CCI then provided STC with details of the disciplinary action that he had taken concerning the instructor. He had grounded him for a period of 3 weeks and he had also written to him reminding him of his

responsibilities and that any further incidents of this nature he would be grounded and the matter brought to STC.

The instructor concerned was present at the meeting and was able to provide the meeting with the details of the incident.

Following some discussion on this matter, it was agreed by those present that the action taken by the CCI concerning this matter was adequate.

- vi) Apart from the two Tandem AAD firings already mentioned, there have been 2 other reports of an AAD firings. A Student on a 10 second free fall who had been pulling early on previous jumps, decided, without telling his instructor to count to 20. As the main deployed his FXC fired! Also a Cypres fired on the equipment of a 70 year old experienced jumper with 972 jumps, just after main canopy line stretch. The CCI stated that he was investigating the incident further.
- vii) A few reports of canopy entanglements have been received, all whilst taking part in 'Canopy Formations' .
- viii) A few reports have been received of display misfires, including one where it was reported that the WDI landed in the Prime Ministers lap while he was in the garden of 10 Downing Street.
- ix) Also received have been 2 'off landing' reports. Both at Clubs.

## **7. INJURY STATISTIC WORKING GROUP REPORT (Previously Item 6)**

The STC Working Group to look into the Results of the 1999 Injury Statistics Report by Dr John Carter, completed their report on the 28<sup>th</sup> June 2001. The report was sent to CCIs with the agenda for that evenings meeting. The Chairman thanked the members of the Working Group for the hard work that went into the report.

Ian Rosenvinge, the Working Group Chairman was present and gave the meeting a detailed presentation of his report. Dr John Carter was also present and was able to answer questions relating to the report.

An Addendum to the Recommendations had been received from Ian, which was circulated to those present. Also circulated to those present were details of 'Performance Designs' canopy weight limit guidelines.

The Recommendations of the 'Group' were as follows:

- a. The Introduction of a "Solo Student Parachutist Declaration of Fitness to Parachute" illustrating a maximum BMI of 27.5. This need not be used by Intermediate and above parachutists who could continue to use the current BPA 114 Declaration.
- b. The introduction of a Poster illustrating BMIs for a range of weights and heights with implications for student parachutists.
- c. The introduction of the following Wing Loading criteria (for main canopies):



i)	Ab-initio Solo Student Parachutist	= 0.8lbs/sqft.
ii)	Solo Student Parachutists not including Ab-initio	= 0.85lbs/sqft
iii)	Intermediate Parachutist <i>(This recommendation withdrawn)</i>	= 0.9lbs/sqft

*N.B. The following exceptions to apply to the above:*

- (1) Where the Canopy' s Manufacturer has published advice that a higher wing loading is suitable (when the manufacturer' s higher limit will apply).*
- (2) Where the person has logged previous relevant parachuting experience.*

*Pete Sizer entered the meeting room at 9pm*

A great deal of discussion ensued with regard to the report and its recommendations. CCI's present commended the report as it provided good guidelines. However, they did not want to see hard and fast rules and it was felt that CCI's should be able to exercise their discretion.

A paper from John Carter was then circulated where the Working Group had made the same recommendations, but with the addition of a number of exceptions to the recommendations.

Following further discussion on this item, the Recommendations of the Working Group were voted on individually.

#### **Recommendation A**

The Introduction of a " Solo Student Parachutist Declaration of Fitness to Parachute" illustrating a maximum BMI of 27.5. This need not be used by Intermediate and above parachutists who could continue to use the current BPA 114 Declaration.

It was proposed by Ian Rosvinge and seconded by Andy Guest that the above recommendation be accepted.

A counter proposal was tabled by Andy Paddock, seconded by Ronnie O' Brien that the above recommendation be accepted, but with the addition of the following exceptions:-

- i) The person has logged previous relevant parachuting experience and/or*
- ii) The person is of a high standard of fitness, can convince an advanced instructor/their CCI of that fitness and the advanced instructor/their CCI has recorded their approval on the students Record of Training.*

For: 5                      Against: 6                      Abstentions: 1

#### **Not Carried**

The original proposal put forward by Ian Rosvinge and seconded by Andy Guest was then voted on as follows:-

For: 2                      Against: 6                      Abstentions: 4

**Not Carried**

**Recommendation B**

The introduction of a Poster illustrating BMIs for a range of weights and heights with implications for student parachutists.

It was proposed by Ian Rosenvinge and seconded by Andy Paddock that the above recommendation be accepted.

For: 3                      Against: 7                      Abstentions: 0

**Not Carried**

**Recommendation C**

The introduction of the following Wing Loading criteria (for main canopies):

- i)        Ab-initio Solo Student Parachutist                      = 0.8lbs/sqft.
- ii)       Solo Student Parachutists not including Ab-initio       = 0.85lbs/sqft

*N.B. The following exceptions to apply to the above:*

- (1)       *Where the Canopy' s Manufacturer has published advice that a higher wing loading is suitable (when the manufacturer' s higher limit will apply).*
- (2))      *Where the person has logged previous relevant parachuting experience.*

It was proposed by Ian Rosenvinge and seconded by Andy Guest that the above proposal be accepted.

A counter proposal was tabled by Brian Dyas, seconded by David Hickling that the above recommendation be accepted but with the addition of the following exception:-

*'When the student is of above average fitness, their CCI believes a higher wing loading is appropriate for them and the CCI has recorded clearance for a higher specified wing loading on their Record of Training' .*

This was voted on as follows:-

For: 10                      Against: 2                      Abstentions: 0

**Carried**

The Committee wished to record an official vote of thanks to be included in the minutes to the Working Group for the considerable amount of time and work that had been put into producing their report and recommendations.

**8. TANDEM INSTRUCTOR COURSE – JUNE 2001 (Previously Item 7)**

The BPA wished to thank Target Skysports for hosting the Tandem Instructor Course that ran from the 11<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup> June 2001.

The Course Report was circulated with the Agenda and was for information only, as there is nothing that needs voting on.

The Committee was advised that the instructor who had not carried out all the required descents, has at this time still not completed them.

9. **PERMISSIONS (Previously Item 8)**

- a) A letter from Tim Andrewes was circulated to those present requesting an exemption from the 60 jump rule for Dave Brown to enable his instructor rating to be renewed. Tim had also informed the office that the centre had been closed for many months, which had caused further problems. Dave had completed approximately 1000 jumps and was only about 19 jumps short of the requirement.

It was proposed by Brian Dyas and seconded by David Hickling that the above permission be accepted.

**Carried Unanimously**

- b) Circulated to those present was a letter from Ian Cashman requesting a six month extension to the CSBI rating of Ben Gauci. Mr Gauci had planned to attend the August CSI Course, but due to an injury, he was unable to attend.

It was proposed by Ronnie O' Brien and seconded by Brian Dyas that the above permission be accepted.

**Carried Unanimously**

- c) Another letter from Ian Cashman was circulated to those present asking for Jason Grime to be re-instated as an AFF Instructor. The Committee was advised that Jason was a very experienced Instructor, but due to military commitments he had to take a year off from jumping. Jason was now a full member of the BPA and was jumping on a regular basis.

It was proposed by Pete Sizer and seconded by Ian Roseninge that the above permission be accepted on the basis that Jason's AFF Instructor rating be re-instated after the successful completion of an AFF practice jump with an Examiner nominated by the NCSO.

**Carried Unanimously**

- d) Circulated to those present was a letter from Dane Kenny requesting that Wayne Lemar be re-instated as a Tandem Instructor, as his rating was not renewed last year due to a 'clerical' error.

It was proposed by Dane Kenny (proxy) and seconded by John Page that the above permission be accepted.

**Carried Unanimously**

*CCIs were reminded of the importance of checking carefully their instructors' BPA membership certificates to ensure that their ratings are included. The BPA are still having instances of instructors who have not got CCI/Examiner signatures on their membership renewal applications, therefore their ratings are not renewed, but because they or their CCIs are not checking the Membership card properly, they are being allowed to*

*instruct – without a rating.*

- e) A letter had been received from Mike Bolton and circulated to those present requesting permission to carry out a number of 'display' notified jumps with equipment containing a round reserve. Mike was present at the meeting and was able to give further details of his request.

It was proposed by Mike Bolton and seconded by Brian Dyas that the above permission be accepted.

**Carried Unanimously**

- f) Circulated to those present was a letter from Mike Frost requesting permission to jump without a helmet to carry out some filming for a sponsor. The Committee was advised that Mike had previously for this request in February 2000 and the exemption was granted for one year.

Mike had requested an extension to that request in order that he could complete his filming work, a copy of the extract from the STC meeting minutes of the 10<sup>th</sup> February 2000 was circulated to those present, when Mike's original request was made.

It was proposed by Brian Dyas and seconded by Pete Sizer that the above exemption be extended until the end of 2001 on the proviso that it is specifically for when Mike was filming for the sponsors only as per the previous request.

For: 11

Against: 1

Abstentions: 0

**Carried**

- g) Circulated to those present was a request from Dave Wood for an extension to the CSBI rating (until February 2002) of Simon Powell.

It was proposed by and Guest and seconded by Pat Walters that the above permission be accepted.

**Carried Unanimously**

## **10. A.O.B.**

- a) The NCSO advised those present that because of the 'foot and mouth' problems a number of clubs have had to use alternative PLAs/DZs. Wild Geese were unable to use their PLA/DZ at Ballyrogen. They were able to find an alternative PLA/DZ at Killykergan. This PLA/DZ had previously been cleared for all types of parachuting by STC (31<sup>st</sup> May 1984) with the following proviso; 'That only one student exit per pass. No student is despatched if the WDI travels more than 600 yards in any direction except north. All instructors/jumpmasters will be briefed by the CCI. DZ control will only be carried out by an instructor or experienced parachutist, briefed by the CCI' .

As there was not an STC meeting for some time, the NCSO and Technical

Officer agreed that parachuting could take place subject to approval from this STC meeting, (as had previous been agreed by STC).

As the PLA/DZ would be a ' Split PLA/DZ' it would also have operated under those requirements. This situation is only until Ballyrogan can be used again.

A letter from Maggie Penny was also circulated to those present.

It was proposed by Maggie Penny (proxy) and seconded by Phil Cavanagh that the above request be accepted.

**Carried Unanimously**

b) The Committee was advised that it was likely that the BPA would be including a Swoop Canopy Competition in the competition programme for 2002. The rules for such a competition would need to be compiled carefully. There are already rules available from other countries that have hosted these competitions, but any input would be welcome from STC members. If STC have thoughts or concerns regarding entry requirements, please contact the NCSO at the BPA offices.

c) The Committee was advised that a BPA member, David Vowles, has had his Approved Packing Certificate, suspended by the NCSO following its confiscation by the CCI of Strathallan, because he had been packing mains that he was not qualified to pack after being told he could not pack them. He had also been stopped from packing at Target Skysports. At both clubs he continued to pack after being stopped. A letter from Karen Farr giving details was tabled to those present, together with a letter from Trevor Dobson.

Following some discussion on this matter it was proposed by Ronnie O' Brien and seconded by Tony Goodman that David Vowles' Approved Packing Certificate remain suspended until he presents himself to STC.

**Carried Unanimously**

d) Circulated to those present was a letter from Dave Hickling stating that he wishes to use BOC throw out pilot chutes for BPSs' AFF programme. This was not for discussion or for a decision to be made at the meeting, but is to let CCIs know that this will be an agenda item for the next meeting. Therefore if CCIs have any input, they were requested to send it in writing to the BPA offices.

Date of next Meeting:- Thursday 11th October 2001  
At 7 p.m.  
County Arms, Leicester

13th August 2001

**Distribution**

C. Allen - Chairman BPA  
CCI' s  
Council  
Advanced Riggers  
CAA  
Lesley Gale (Editor - Skydive)  
File