

TANDEM NEWS



A PUBLICATION BY STRONG ENTERPRISES
FOR TANDEM INFORMATION

11236 Satellite Blvd. Orlando, FL. 32837
Tel 407-859-9317 Fax 407-850-6978

USPA IS NOT TAKING OVER TANDEM!

USPA can not issue a license to anyone to make tandem jumps, that can only be done by a manufacture holding a FAA Exemption. USPA members who want a USPA tandem instructor rating need to have a manufacturers certification.

Tandem operations between the FAA and the manufacturers shall continue as they have for the last 11 years.

What USPA is doing is implementing standard operating procedures for tandem operations by their members at their affiliated DZ's.

Drop zone owners will have to decide if they want their tandem business operated as a USPA affiliate, or if they want to continue as they are.

USPA Tandem Instructor Rating.

This move by USPA, while the tandem is still under the

exemption, is generating a lot of questions and comments from tandem rig owners and tandem instructors. Here is a sampling:

3. I thought that USPA was only getting a program ready for when the "experiment" was over and tandem was in the public domain?

1. Why is USPA involved in "experimental test jumps" and "experimental test jumpers"?

2. When USPA's insurance carrier finds out, will our liability insurance rates go up? Will the policy be canceled?

We have been making tandem jumps for 10 years, now USPA wants to position itself to say that we can no longer make them at USPA affiliated DZ's unless we pay them a fee. That's a negative contribution to our sport! Sounds like obstruction.

4. Is somebody getting carried away here?

5. Half of my staff do not have an instructional rating and USPA now expects them to get a static line rating? Wrong! What happened to the Basic Instructor Course (BIC)? They have been working on that for years and now it seems that we are putting the horse before the cart in implementing the tandem rating first. Who's agenda is this?

6. I'll set up a separate tandem business and work directly under the manufacturer's exemption, right alongside my USPA affiliated operation.

7. \$25. for rubber stamping a rating?

8. I'll just ignore them.

9. Oh well, I guess that's progress.

Most people want to know what SE's position is. We helped USPA prepare for their eventual inclusion of tandem into their system. We actually thought that the plan

would go into effect after tandem went into the public domain. We are very concerned that tandem operations be conducted safely, and in accordance with the law. If USPA helps to accomplish this end, without getting in the way of this ongoing experiment between the FAA and the manufacturers, SE will probably not have a problem with this. What good will become of this, of course remains to be seen. If there is a conflict between our needs to operate unencumbered under Exemption 4943, and the needs of USPA, we will take the position that Dual Hawk owners and tandem instructors need only to comply with the exemption and SE guidelines to legally make tandem jumps in the USA.

Some of the comments listed above do give us food for thought, but in the long run every thing may work out just fine. While it is working itself out, just remember what rules you must adhere to legally, the FAA's and the manufacturers. The manufacturers are still charged by the FAA to "...control and supervise tandem...", and you are still charged with following their rules. Don't try the old "I thought that the exemption was over and USPA took over" trick, you've been told.

Meanwhile, on July 21-23, 1995, USPA is having a Board meeting. Write to your Regional Director and at least 2 National Directors to voice your feelings. It doesn't have to be a masterpiece, just tell them how you feel. You could get them to put the program on hold until after the Exemption is over. That doesn't seem so far fetched. If you don't write, don't gripe!

THE RIGHT SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES

The T/I's experience level was 75 tandem jumps, with this being his first out of a King Air. His first omission may have been not asking another T/I for recommended procedures for this type airplane (Ex. At what alt. to start hooking up the student in order to be in sync. with the rate of climb). Another of the contributing factors may have been the fact that there were 25 jumpers on board making it very crowded. This also being his first time hooking up while on his knees, having barely enough room to breathe. After he completed the side connectors and the ripcord, the passenger takes off her hat and goggles to fix her hair. This distracted him as it was a break in normal procedure, he was already behind the rate of climb, and exit was imminent. He

managed to get her hat and goggles replaced, and people started to exit the airplane. As I see it, by now he was affected by:[1] anxiety over being behind the plane in hooking up, [2] the student distracting him by taking her hat and goggles off at such a time, [3] people in front of him were starting to exit. Picking the story up from there, it was so crowded in there that he did not notice any separation of their bodies as they headed for the door and exited (please note this! An error is not going to jump up and announce itself). The first that he became aware of any problem was upon the signal from the videographer (this is in keeping with a similar incident reported earlier. Yes it can happen!). He looked down and saw the problem, adjusted to the shock, and tried to pull the student into position to hook a shoulder snap. No way! (This is in keeping with earlier similar incidents, one of which was the 1st tandem fatality). Unlike the 1st tandem fatality, this instructor knew when to quit and open a parachute.. He held the student under the arms and around the chest during opening shock, then used one hand to give her one toggle at a time so that she would have something to help hold her upright.

So what happened to him, you ask? He was fired from

the DZ, had his tandem rating suspended and suffered the humiliation that comes with self recrimination over having fallen victim to such a boner. On the bright side, he did not go into shock in freefall upon realizing his error, he tried to make it right, knew when to stop trying, and opened a parachute. He went through a refresher course and will probably be hired by another local DZ. No, we do not plan other disciplinary action. He is a full time AFF and tandem instructor who made a serious error (without injury), but he has convinced our examiner that he understands the contributing factors leading up to his error and that he knows how to safely make tandem jumps.

What can we all learn from this? Well lets consider what it is we preach: [1] follow your procedures for each phase of the jump, [2] have the student be responsible for checking that all connections are made, [3] when you start your hook-up, complete it, no interruptions, [4] recheck all attachments, handles and drogue before exiting, [5] do not exit if you are not ready. Sounds like a lot, but it isn't.

On the subject of becoming distracted, let me offer you this: If you see a professional golfer become distracted during his pre-shot routine, you will see him walk away from the ball, come back and

start his pre-shot routine all over again. He is trying to regain his focus on the job at hand. He has his job and we have ours, but we all must be thoroughly focused. Restart your routine, regain your focus!

**ANOTHER STUDENT
SAVES HIS TANDEM
INSTRUCTOR'S LIFE**

It has happened once before but we didn't think that it would happen again.

SURPRISE!!!

In order to prepare for the deployment of a parachute, we teach the tandem instructors a handles check procedure to go through after they have deployed the drogue. This drill is supposed to serve:

1. As a check that the handles are still in place,
2. To develop muscle memory as to where these handles can be found,
3. As a review of the order in which these handles are to be activated, and
4. As a mental exercise to help remind us of what our emergency procedures are.

In both of the above cases the tandem instructors were highly experienced as both AFF and tandem instructors.

We are all wondering what can be done to prevent failure on the part of the instructor? We already require that the

instructor be current at tandem jumping. We have given the instructor a procedure, to rehearse on every tandem jump, that is designed to remind him of what he must do in the next few seconds in order to save their lives. If the instructor can't remember a procedure for a few seconds, could a once a year exercise in a suspended harness be of any help?

We must continue to address the problem of why it happens. Dr. Rene Maire, a Swiss psychologist, has written a paper, "Parachuting - Possible solutions to the problem of cut-away failure", (CISM-TECHNICAL BROCHURE NO.48e) that he has presented at the PIA SYMPOSIUM '93 and the IPC Technical Conference in Helsinki, Finland, in Oct. '93. This document deals with the psychology and physiology of freefall emergency induced traumatic shock. According to Dr. Rene Maire it's the realization of the emergency that produces traumatic shock. He does suggest that we can guard against traumatic shock by being aware of, and prepared to deal with, all possible types of emergencies. It's the unforeseen emergencies that carry the risk of us going into shock.

With that in mind:

1. We do share unusual incidents with our tandem

instructors through the Tandem News as a reminder of their vulnerability.

2. We have updated our TICC to include the prospect of premature main container opening with the D-bag being extracted.

3. We do train our tandem instructors to touch both drogue release handles, the breakaway handle, and the reserve handle, immediately after deploying the drogue, in the order in which they should be activated.

4. In consideration of the traumatic shock syndrome, we designed our breakaway handle to automatically release the drogue just before it releases the main, and

5. We have mandated the installation of the Cypres AAD.

**MANDATORY TANDEM
CYPRES USE AFTER 1
JULY '95**

In the first of the above two "student saves" cases the breakaway handle was activated but the breakaway/drogue release mechanism had not yet been developed. In the second case the breakaway/drogue release handle was in place but the tandem instructor did not activate it. In both cases the reserve pilot chute entangled with the main lines and/or drogue bridle. In both

cases the student saved their lives by activating his drogue release handle.

The Dual Hawk comes with a student drogue release ripcord as standard equipment. Although hundred of thousands of tandem jumps have been made with this, the primary drogue release, installed on the student harness, some tandem instructors still "feel" that it is not a good idea to give the student "anything".

No one has being able to present factual argument as to why the student shouldn't be given the means to save his own life. To that end, the Tandem Proposal Project Team adopted the policy that all tandem students be given a drogue release ripcord, an altimeter, and the training to use both. Guess what? USPA adopted that policy when they approved the TPPT report as USPA Doctrine. Strong Enterprises is moving forward by making mandatory, as of 1 Sept. 1995, the drogue release ripcord, an altimeter, and training to use both, on every student/passenger on every tandem jump.

The dropzone where these incidents occurred had the foresight to place a ripcord and an altimeter on the student, which resulted in saving four lives. Count 'em!! "Dropzone policy saves four"

We continue to invite comments pro and con on all tandem issues.

THE DRUG ISSUE

I am told that outside the USA drug use in skydiving is not a problem, and that within the USA, if a problem exists, it is probably on the East and West coasts, and then it is probably restricted to just a few DZ's. I don't know. What do you guys think?

I'm also advised that drug use is tolerated because, in the case of cocaine, it is not obvious, as opposed to a falling down drunk.

Additionally, we don't know the effects cocaine has on performance. Drug use may or may not be a problem of function, but it most certainly is a legal problem.

The tandem fatality investigations that we have been involved with have included testing the tandem instructor for drugs. Think about the ramifications of finding out that the tandem instructor on drugs just took an innocent passenger in. Can you afford to let that happen? We certainly can not!

We don't have a choice. We are in the process of gathering information from the FAA and our attorney in order to formulate a plan of action. This plan could very well include putting all

tandem instructors on notice that if we have reason to request it, that SE certified tandem instructor must submit to a drug test, or give up his SE representative status, no representative status - no tandem jumping under our exemption.

Representative status is a privilege not a right. (Privilege - A benefit granted to an individual.) If we do something that is not in keeping with being representative of Strong Enterprises, then SE can and should drop us as a representative. Would you have someone representing your company that put your company at great risk? There is probably a long list of things that you would consider reason enough to terminate someone's representative status. We too have an end to our tolerance. It may be drug use or it may be something else that we deem significant. As representatives we have responsibilities, if we don't live up to those responsibilities we will probably lose the privileges we now enjoy. The FAA can take away the Tandem Exemption anytime they want to, no recourse, no hearing, no appeal. Sorry, but sometimes we must act similarly. We recently had to suspend a "representative status" because the "representative" refused to

pay a \$57. dept incurred by his dealership. He enjoyed this dealership status by virtue of owning a Dual Hawk Tandem System. Although he later claimed that he divorced "her" and "she" got the business: 1. Our dealerships don't get passed along to someone else, 2. He never notified us that he was leaving that company. The ex-wife says that he used the materials, our field rep. appealed to him face to face to pay it off \$10 at a time, which he refused to do, so what choice did we have. It was interesting, and somewhat admirable, that his friends came running to his defense, calling us all kinds of names and questioning our ethics, all without considering that all stories have two sides. The sad part is that even after we explained our position, we are still bad guys because we don't want this type of person representing our company. The real world really is a two way street. The fact remains that we are prepared to lose gear sales if that is what it takes to field responsible representatives, and to let the others go. Drug issues, safety issues, financial issues, when it's time to drop someone as a representative of this company then they will be dropped. If that means that you can no longer make tandem jumps under Exemption 4943, then that is part of the consequences of

your actions. If you lose your driving license then you can no longer drive for a living. A harsh reality!

WEAK BATTERIES IN CYPRES RESULTS IN DEATH

9 April '95, Teuge, Holland. The batteries were strong enough to turn the Cypres on, but not strong enough to fire the cutters. Airtec did tests on this rig for the Dutch police. When a one year old battery was installed, the cutters fired. Since 10 Jan. '91, Airtec has asked that the Cypress battery be changed every 2 years (from date of installation) or 500 jumps, or when the self tester indicates that the battery is dead. Bottom line - there is a weakness in the system. It is incumbent on us users to know how old the battery in our Cypres is, and change it even though the Cypres is telling us, by presenting that "0" in the window, that the unit is ready to be jumped and that the battery is OK! STAY AWAKE OUT THERE!!!!

CHECK LIST / HOOK KNIFE POCKET

Buzz Fink of Air Adventures Skydiving Inc. in San Diego, CA., tells us that the Jack the Ripper" pocket that we now

put on the back of the passenger's harness, came in very handy when he had some broken lines hanging below him. Knowing that getting past broken lines during a cutaway has resulted in those lines wrapping around the jumpers or abraiding their bodies, Buzz opted to use the now conveniently located hook knife to eliminate the potential problem.

These pockets are free to owners of older Dual Hawks that do not have them already installed. The top flap of the pocket has a tandem instructor's check list printed on it, detailing the prejump cockpit procedures.

PIA '95

QUAD POD

Creating quite a stir at Strong Enterprises booth were the Quad-Pod itself and the video of it's recent test flights.

On 21 March 1995, at Air Adventures drop zone near Clewiston, Florida, Strong Enterprises made the first two test flights of their new four-person parachute system from the tailgate of a CASA 212. Aboard for the first flight were SE president Ted Strong, pod system designer Robbie Conway, chief tandem instructor Bill Morrissey, and DZ owner Marty Jones. Substituting for Jones on the

second drop was Air Adventures instructor Jerry Cook.

Exit weight was 1,300 pounds. Static lined at 14,000 feet the welded aluminum frame, with two people facing forward and two facing aft on bench seats, fell under a stabilizing 10-ft. drogue ribbon chute to 10,000 before releasing the drogue to activate the 1,200 sq. ft. main canopy. Through a joystick, main canopy control was maneuvered by Conway utilizing servo-powered spools that wound six feet of control line on either side. The first flight recorded performance data while the second flight was primarily for photo coverage.

The original design planned to extract the craft from the tailgate, but aircraft owner concerns over limited door clearance required the change to static line drogue deployment and the addition of alignment guides to the ramp of the aircraft. The first flight was an unqualified success; on the second the canopy sustained minor damage. Strong anticipates both civilian and military applications.

Strong Enterprises would like to thank: Marty Jones of Air Adventures, Clewiston, Florida; who saw the vision and allowed us to do all of the test drops at Clewiston.

Specialty Transport International of Melbourne, Florida and their 212 CASA; who worked with us in developing a very successful method of dropping the QUAD POD, and understanding that someone, somewhere, sometime has to be first.

All the cameramen who dedicated hours of their time and skills for no compensation to see that this event would be properly documented

“TANDEM SIDE-SPIN PHENOMENON”

This 22 minute video presentation that was delivered, to much acclaim, at Symposium '95 by Bill Morrissey. This presentation is the result of a study of actual tandem side-spin emergencies, solo side-spin research jumps, and a premeditated tandem side-spin jump with recovery using procedures developed during the solo portion of the project.

After a tandem side spin, a phenomenon peculiar to tandem jumping, resulted in one tandem fatality and several serious incidents, Strong Enterprises resolved to attempt to take a close look at what causes these side spins, and how to recover from them. This presentation addresses those issues.

The objective of this program

is to make tandem instructors aware of the side-spin phenomenon in order that they may prepare themselves for this type of encounter by:

1. Practicing solo side-spins as depicted in Phase II of the video.
2. Being able to recognize this phenomenon when one occurs.
3. Having the knowledge necessary to attempt recovery from a side-spin by following the procedures outlined in this program.

This video and written description of the events and procedures used in this project are now part of the Strong Enterprises Tandem Instructor Certification Course. Additionally, the video and accompanying 27 page document are available to all interested parties through Strong Enterprises @ \$20., PN 570013, specify NTSC or PAL

IMMEDIATE RESULTS
During a TICC immediately following the PIA Symposium we had the candidate/passenger doing one thing and the candidate/instructor doing another thing on a Level V jump, and they wound up spinning on their side. At least they knew that they were involved in a side spin and that they should not do what might otherwise come natural, which is to arch hard. Side-spin research did reveal

that arching hard only makes matters worse. These candidates managed to get themselves slowed down and in a position to deploy the drogue. They appreciated having the prior training to handle it.

Another fellow tells us that having attended the tandem side-spin lecture at the symposium, he recognized that he was in a side-spin but he could not remember what to do to effect a recovery. He wound up deploying the drogue behind him, because his right side was facing the ground. If you don't want to wind like him, wondering "what do I do now?", you should take the time to practice solo side-spins as depicted in the Phase II portion. We went to a lot of trouble to help you prepare yourself to save your own life, take advantage of it!

TANDEM INSTRUCTOR'S MEETING

On the evening of 22 March, SE hosted a meeting of Tandem instructors. This meeting was scheduled far in advance of the Symposium so we were not sure if we would be putting in an appearance to explain how SE was put out of business by this lawsuit in California, or we would be conducting business as usual. Fortunately it was the latter (see following update on the lawsuit). The purpose of this meeting

was to give our Dual Hawk owners and tandem instructors an opportunity to get brought up to date on new equipment, improvements still in prototype form, and to have their questions answered. Some of the topics of interest were:

1. Safety improvements to the Dual Hawk focusing on preventing premature opening of the main container due to a broken closing loop or inadvertent extraction of the closing pin. These are in prototype form.
2. Semi-elliptical, zero-p, tandem main canopy is still in test phase, and hopefully will be available in a couple of months.
3. Marketing your tandem business: Ted Strong has offered to set up a table at the SE booth at OSHKOSH '95 airshow in order to display your brochures. Just send them to SE. Oshkosh is a gathering of a couple of million aviation oriented people who may want to make a tandem jump. Don't miss out!!!
4. The FAA didn't show but they said that they were still far from making any changes to Part 105 and you can expect to be under an Exemption for quite a while.
5. We reiterated the importance of having tandem passengers sign the SE tandem waiver and being informed of the experimental nature of tandem jumping.

Additionally, the wording of the Exemption that states that the passenger ".....must be enrolled in a course of instruction...", has created a problem so we offered a document titled "First Tandem Jump Enrollment" which also listed the first jump targeted learning objectives approved by the Tandem Project Team. This form may prove useful to you, at least you'll have a copy of the TLO's.

**MANDATORY TANDEM
CYPRES USE AFTER 1
JULY '95.**

STRONG FIGHTS ALONE!

The Relative Workshop was dropped out of the case by the court.

USPA's insurance co. bought their way out of the Flinkingshelt vs. Tandem lawsuit for \$25,000.

Bill Norman, the uncertified skydiver who killed Susan Flinkingshelt, had a \$300,000. insurance policy payoff to the victim's family and he is no longer in the lawsuit.

Milt Burton, the Dual Hawk owner who allowed his tandem system to be jumped by Bill Norman, has no assets and did not even show up for the settlement hearing.

The "Bad Guys" have admitted their guilt, yet the plaintiff continues to throw good money into the fight to "Stop Tandem". They are seeking 3 million dollars.

Guess who's left to fight the fight? Strong Enterprises.!

The first step in the family's war on tandem is to financially cripple Strong Enterprises so that we can no longer continue in the tandem business. We are fighting to prevent their achieving this first objective. **WE NEED YOUR HELP!**

I was recently asked, " Tell me, why I should contribute to a legal defense fund?" Being unprepared for such a question I tried to just feel my way thru it. Some of the reasons that came to mind were:

1. You are able to make a livelihood from tandem because someone else has maintained an exemption from the FAR's since June '84.
2. Maintaining that exemption costs approximately \$60,000. per year.
3. The holder of this exemption expected that he would only have to have this exemption for about 1 1/2 years, it has now been over 10 years.
4. You have never been charged any amount of money for the privilege of operating under this exemption. Maybe a user fee will be a necessity!
5. Are you prepared to allow tandem jumping to be suspended?

Whether you have made, or will make, 10 or 10,000 tandem jumps, surely you can invest your income from a few of those jumps in saving the "Goose that laid the golden egg" which is tandem.

We are asking each tandem instructor to contribute \$25. each for 4 tandem jumps (\$100.), and Dual Hawk owners to contribute \$200. per rig, to the S E Tandem Legal Fund. A small investment in securing a future for your tandem jumping career.

Send your donations to:
or directly to the bank???

**MANDATORY TANDEM
CYPRES USE AFTER 1
JULY '95.**

Relative Workshop announces that they will not renew their tandem exemption. In a letter to the USPA Board of Directors, dated 20 January 1995, Bill Booth stated that "...at the end of this exemption period, ...if there is not a rule change, Relative Workshop will not apply for another exemption. Either USPA will take the ball, or we will be forced to ask each of our rig owners to apply for their own exemption."

Mr. Booth goes on to say “ We wish USPA to take over COMPLETELY, every aspect of the training, administration, and policing tandem jumping in the United States”.

The FAA has stated that they can not give the responsibility of tandem jumping to USPA. So it appears that each individual owner would have to apply to the FAA for their own exemption. This issue may be more complex than meets the eye.

Strong Enterprises wants to be out from under this exemption entirely but we are not prepared to force our Dual Hawk owners to seek their own exemption. We don't even know if the FAA would issue the hundreds of individual exemptions that would be necessary. SE would certainly like to have some of the wording of the current exemption changed in order to be relieved of the workload of administration, and the liability attached to the “experimental” aspect of this exemption.

We believe that there has to be order and responsibility in tandem operations, hence the “Control” vs “No control” philosophies on the subject of “Tandem After the Exemption”. We feel that we must get some relief from this burden, but how to get it without sacrificing safety, or

creating a logistical nightmare is the question.

SE 's concern is that the only way that we can protect ourselves is to assure that the TI receives adequate training by training him ourselves, using SE Examiners and SE programs. We also believe that there has to be a policing power, with enforcement backed up by the FAA.

MANDATORY TANDEM CYPRES USE AFTER 1 JULY '95.

Changing trends?
Several instances have caught my attention regarding a trend for some older tandem operations and some new ones. Where the trend had been for the DZ to own the tandem rigs and hire tandem instructors to make the jumps on DZ gear, we see more operations where the DZ does not want the responsibility of owning the equipment. They are happy to keep it simple. They hire tandem instructors who own their own Dual Hawks, pay so much for the rig use and so much for the instructor. The DZ owner doesn't have to worry about maintenance or packing. If the gear is not maintained to proper standards he can tell the owner that it cannot be used at his DZ until it is fixed, or hire another free-lancer. He

doesn't have to worry where the money for repairs will come from, that's the owners problem!

Our experience has been that the tandem instructor who owns his own Dual Hawk, jumps it, packs it, and maintains it, has fewer malfunctions, better maintained equipment, and a longer life expectancy for his gear.

It probably has a everything to do with one man looking after one rig, his.

We would like to get some feed back pro and con on this. Let us know if this idea bears fruit or it's bull. We are always interested in getting feed back, but we also know some people who don't agree with us won't bother to voice an opinion.

THREE STRIKES AND YOUR OUT!

The Australian Parachute Federation has instituted a policy whereby if a tandem instructor has three totally unrelated complaints (that may mean 3 incidents and 3 different complainants) involving sexual harassment lodged against him, his tandem rating gets revoked. I personally know one guy who is very unhappy about losing his privilege of making tandem jumps.

MANDATORY TANDEM CYPRES USE AFTER 1 JULY '95.

Shortage of Video Persons?
Perris Valley Skydiving School feels that it is necessary to institute a policy whereby all video persons would have to have attended their camera seminar or have viewed the tape from that seminar in order to be cleared to jump cameras at Perris. The objective is to familiarize camera jumpers with recognizing and dealing with dangerous situations. Dytters will also be required for all camera persons!
This policy seems to bear out the concerns of some other tandem instructors with whom I recently spoke. Because of a lack of experienced video persons at some DZs, management may be allowing marginally skilled flyers to do video. These tandem instructors were concerned enough to bring up the subject.
I would like to hear some ideas from both the DZ owners and the tandem instructors on how to keep this from growing into a problem. Do we make a bunch of rules that are not reasonable and will be ignored, just to say that we do have rules, or is there a practical way to insure good video for the tandem student and a safe working environment for the tandem instructor.
Would a 100 video jump prerequisite for tandem work be reasonable? Documented

RW performance [docked 8th ?], testimonial signed by 3 persons [who?], are some ideas, but we would like to hear more.

MANDATORY TANDEM
CYPRES USE AFTER 1
JULY '95.

Altitude awareness problems!
Several stories have surfaced relating to low pulls attributed to the fact that for the recent past all the tandem instructor's jumps have been from 13,500 ft. and this particular jump was from 8000 ft or such. Hey it's a fact, it can happen! It's happened to me, and it's happening all too often. Tandem is such a busy time that we have to alert ourselves to anything out of the ordinary such as the possibility of running out of sky because of a change to a lower jump altitude. Preparation!, it comes in all shapes and sizes. Don't jump without it!!!

MANDATORY TANDEM
CYPRES USE AFTER 1
JULY '95.

Who is responsible for sending in the required tandem log forms and incident report forms? We all are responsible for making sure that this obligation is met. As a tandem instructor, who is probably getting paid, as a tandem rig owner, who is probably receiving some

compensation for the use of this equipment, or as a drop zone owner who's business is profiting from this activity, we must meet these obligations if we want to continue to include tandem jumping among our activities. The law requires your compliance!
For as long as Strong Enterprises must operate under a tandem exemption, and you want to enjoy the fruits of using that exemption, you will have to comply. We will understand if you decide that compliance is too difficult and you drop out of our program, but we will miss you.

Anyone can apply for their own tandem exemption. We could probably develop a "how to" guide if there was enough interest. Let us know!

IF THEY SAY THAT THEY DON'T WANT TO JUMP - LAND WITH THEM!
Some one recently asked what the company policy is if the student does not want to jump. Now we all know! Hey, your ahead of the game. They paid big bucks for an airplane ride, you have no wear and tear on your gear, and you don't have to repack. "But they tell me how thankful they are that I pushed them out, and how they feel better about themselves now." Who cares how they feel about themselves. Think about your

position if the student gets injured or killed. They certainly won't be "thankful"!

