## Fokker 100, G-UKFF, 7 April 1996

AAIB Bulletin No: 9/96 Ref: EW/C96/4/3 Category: 1.1		
Aircraft Type and Registration:	Fokker 100, G-UKFF	
No & Type of Engines:	2 Rolls-Royce Tay 620-15 turbofan engines	
Year of Manufacture:	1989	
Date & Time (UTC):	7 April 1996 at 1700 hrs	
Location:	Overhead Dover, Kent	
Location:		
Type of Flight:	Public Transport	
Persons on Board:	Crew - 7	Passengers - 37
Injuries:	Crew - None	Passengers - None
Nature of Damage:	None	
Commander's Licence:	Airline Transport Pilot's Licence	
Commander's Age:	Not applicable	
Commander's Flying Experience:	Not applicable	

On departure from Stansted the aircraft climbed to and maintainedFL 070 during a Standard Instrument Departure towards Dover. Theaircraft was eventually cleared for a further climb and at approximatelyFL 085 all of the cabin crew reported feeling unwell through whatappeared to be a 'lack of oxygen and/or adverse fumes'. The commanderdeclared an emergency and returned to Stansted with all the crewon oxygen. The descent and approach were normal and the aircraftlanded without further incident.

During passenger disembarkation the cabin crew remained on oxygen. An engineer present at the aircraft when the doors were openedreported that the air in the cabin was extremely hot, stuffy andstale. Later the crew were taken to hospital for further investigation. The hospital informed the commander that the crew had ingested'something abnormal' and three crew members had to remain on oxygenfor a further hour.

Concluding his post incident report, the commander stated thatat FL 070 the aircraft was in the base of a layer of cloud andwas close to an area of the Thames Estuary where there are industrial discharges to atmosphere.

## Follow up action by the operator

The operator withdrew the aircraft from service after the event, and the aircraft manufacturer was consulted. On their advice theair conditioning system was inspected, ground pressurisation testswere carried out, and the aircraft air tested for over one hourwith no abnormalities apparent. Air sampling tests, with a certified and calibrated gas analysis machine, were also carried out. Thesystem functioned normally and the aircraft was returned to service.

The aircraft flew for a further two days without incident. On the 10 April 1996, however, the In-Flight Supervisor and her companion in the forward galley both reported feeling unwell. The flightcontinued to its destination and both crew members recovered sufficiently to operate the return service but suffered from headaches on their return.

The aircraft was removed from service from a further 24 hoursand on the manufacturers advice the company dismantled the entireair conditioning system and examined it for contamination. Toeliminate the possibility that the air analysis machine was faultya 'Livingston Gas Analyser' was obtained and full ground and airtests were carried out. The air test was flown to see whetherthe conditions of the first problem flight could be reproduced by following the same route, heights and speeds and with the samegalley service (passengers were not on board). The air conditioningpacks were operated through their full range in both auto andmanual modes. No problems were encountered with the system ordetected by the analysis machine. In fact the air quality wasfound to be at its poorest on the ramp improving throughout theflight. (Carbon Monoxide levels measured on the ramp were 7 partsper million (ppm) - normal safe maximum level is 50 ppm).

With no faults found or contamination evident the operator concluded that on the first occasion the crew appear to have encountered 'random environmental hazard' with possible exposure to toxicatmospheric pollution. Investigations following the second eventare continuing but the

company are confident that their exhaustivetrials have eliminated all technical possibilities of a recurrence.

The operator also recognises that the F100 air conditioning systemis susceptible to incidents of this nature and have issued theirpilots and cabin crew with guidelines on 'cabin temperature and air quality procedures' to obtain the best the performance from the system.

## Air conditioning system (type specification)

The F100 type specification for the air conditioning system states, along with other details, that the system shall supply an adequatequantity of air to the pressurised area of the fuselage for ventilation, pressurisation and temperature control. Conditioned air shallbe derived from the bleed air system via two air conditioningunits and the recirculation system shall form part of that system. The conditioned air shall not be contaminated by smoke or fumes. Each air conditioning unit shall be capable of supplying a freshair flow of 22.5 kg/min (50 lb/min) during initial climb fromsea level. With any number of passengers up to the maximum permitted by the standard layout, the air conditioning system shall be capable of supplying typically 20 cu ft/min of air per occupant at normalclimb and cruise; 50% of the air shall be fresh.

## **Related incidents**

Five similar occurrences have been notified to the Safety RegulationGroup of the CAA since January 1994 but there is no clear linkbetween the events. In one case de-icing fluid was thought tohave been ingested by the APU inlet duct. A more recent reportfrom another operator has drawn attention to the hazardous natureof a liquid cleaner for use on toilet bowls which was being misusedto clean the galley area. The Safety Data Sheet for "CeeBee Honey Bee Freshener 50" states that 'inhalation of theproduct may have the following effects; light headedness, headacheand nausea'. Other warnings are that 'the product may give riseto toxic fumes of nitrogen oxides, because of strong perfume keepaway from foodstuffs, decomposes when heated to liberate HydrogenChloride, and it is irritating to eyes and skin.' Such misuseof this cleaning fluid is apparently widespread and the CAA havebeen invited to alert all operators to the potential hazard arisingfrom such misuse.