

Hey Shane,

Everything is well in the now sunny Vancouver (Thank you Global Warming/Climate Change!...lol). Thanks, and I'm sure Vegas was awesome too.

My replies are in blue below:

1-Essentially, the NTSB report and Sheriff Dupont said they believed that because the plane was upright when found on the bottom of the lake, that the plane landed upright on the water, that the leading edge of the right wing and engine cowling were damaged, and you exited, were able to grab your bags from the back, and swim to shore. Is this correct?
Pretty much, although the part about me grabbing the bag (there was only one bag that floated out), exiting, and swimming to shore was mostly Dupont's embellishment. The NTSB report also stated that I "egressed" from the plane, but did not specify exactly how.

2-Your passage about Sherlock infers that over the years, law enforcement in Flathead County came to believe there was more to the story: They believed that because the right wing was damaged, that the wing contacted the water first while you were attempting to make a shallow right turn, correct? Yes. That the leading edge of the wing hit first, then the engine cowling came into contact with the water. Wrong on their part, but yes. But there was nothing at the time of the NTSB report about this, right? There was... see page 11 and 12 of the NTSB report: <https://ambrozuk.com/Detail.aspx?id=3127>. What the NTSB report assumes is that the aircraft never flipped over (because they found it 240 feet below in a right-side-up position), and hence why I think Dupont ran with that fact. This was a conclusion that they came to over the years. Help me if I'm wrong there. Because I don't want to make any assumptions in the first animation that weren't made by Feith. Dupont based his opinions largely on what was found in the NTSB report, and filled in the rest with speculation, rather than actually doing his job and looking at the evidence himself (you know that Sheriff Dupont was the Flathead County investigator on this case in 1982, right? He wasn't just some deputy with limited access to facts/evidence—he had access to everything). But unfortunately, the NTSB investigator didn't do a thorough investigation, and when he made his conclusions in his report, Dupont ran with it and filled in the blanks. As I stated before, they saw/had the photos of the tail-fin damage, but neither Feith nor Dupont ever tried, or could explain how that damage occurred. Kind of important to explain it, if you're adamant about the plane not flipping over, don't you think?

3-Based on what Feith knew at the time, why would it be inaccurate for him to believe the passenger was incapacitated after impact and then drowned when the plane sank? Is it because of her broken collarbone?

- 1) First, my transcript with Tom. By the time he filed the report on April 21, 1983, eight months had passed since the accident. I called Tom on Sept 13, 1982 and so by then he had access to the transcript, but ignored what I was saying in it. In there I tell Tom how Dianne was calling out "I can't get my seatbelt off". I don't know if you read the entire thing, but I was pretty messed up and the dialogue clearly shows that. In my state of mind, do you really think I would make all that up? That should have been a pretty good glue for an investigator to dig deeper!
- 2) But more importantly, yes, there is the broken collarbone. How do you explain that, if according to Feith she was NOT wearing a shoulder harness (again read page 11 and 12 of the NTSB report)? How can she be unconscious, and yet, somehow, her shoulder harness was disattached from the waist belt buckle, and the waist belt buckle was flipped inside-out? (see <https://ambrozuk.com/Detail.aspx?id=7199>)

4—In the second animation (your version) I want to make sure I have this correct. You claim that as you passed the middle of the lake heading south, still hundreds of feet above the water, you made a slight turn to your left (a backwards J, if you will) toward the shore, and were heading north when the 2 wheels hit the water first. (right?) The tail didn't hit first but the wheels did?

Yes, we were getting too close to the south shore so I used the rudder of the aircraft to change direction (more of a 180 U-turn than a "J"), for the purpose of having more runway for landing as the aircraft continued to descend. The answer to your question is: I believe the wheels hit the water first, but because of the attitude of the aircraft, even if the tail touched first, the result would have been the same.

Take a look at this video <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PGSjruFkN0E>, specifically around 50 seconds, where it shows the aircraft attitude during landing (minimum speed, flaps down, flying at the Critical AOA). The video is about do's and don't's (Ballooning and Bouncing), but the important part here is what the aircraft looks like during landing from the side (a pretty good visual representation of what happened in our case). Notice at around 50 seconds, they clearly show the Critical AOA (angle of attack), that we were flying at when we hit the water (I tried to describe this in the book). That is also how David Firth described the procedure for an emergency landing on water in my ground school, including the nose-up, tail down attitude.

4a- You say that when the wheels hit the water, the plane pivoted around its central axis. What does that mean? That it did a 180?

My bad. When I refer to central axis, I meant the Lateral Axis (pitch), but I didn't think most readers will know what that is/means. By Central Axis I meant around it's center (https://www.skybrary.aero/index.php/Axis_of_Rotation).

Regarding the 180 rotation, try to visualize this: when the wheels jam into the water and instantaneously stop the aircraft's forward progress, what do you think will happen to the rest of the aircraft? A bit of physics here, but that momentum will have to be transferred into something!

What happens—because the wheels have just dead-stopped the aircraft—the nose will lunge forward and down, and the tail will come up, thereby flipping it up-and-over the aircraft itself, literally doing a 180 degree rotation. Because of the abrupt/violent stop, that is why there was such significant damage to the bottom of the engine cowl, why there was damage to the tail-fin, and why Dianne suffered a broken collarbone. This should have been deduced by the NTSB investigator, and even by Dupont, who was a novice pilot himself.

Also, as I mentioned before in my previous email, this is what my "1980 Flight Training Manual" (<https://ambrozuk.com/Detail.aspx?id=1401>) also said about landing on water and flipping over.

On a side note: Thanks for the need of explanation: I will change the verbiage in the book also to say Lateral Axis (pitch) and let the reader look it up if they're confused... ☺

4b-You say that when the plane pivoted around its central axis, the nose plunged, and the tail rotated up and over. You say the plane was no upside down in the water. Yet when you talk about getting to Diane, you don't say that she was hanging upside down in the aircraft, secured by her belts. Can you help me out here? How can the plane be violently flipped upside down and she not be upside down in the aircraft when you get to her? Of course she was upside down—isn't that a given? I wasn't in the cabin after I was catapulted through the front windshield, so I only describe what I personally saw and experienced. Any assumptions about Dianne, I make through deductive reasoning, based on facts:

- 1) She was obviously upside down, because the aircraft was flipped upside down, and she was wearing/being suspended by the seatbelts.
- 2) She was obviously wearing the shoulder harness (because of her broken collarbone), and managed to remove it as shown by the evidence in the photos: showing the shoulder harness disconnected, and the waist seatbelt flipped inside out in order to get to the latch.
- 3) When I eventually got to the door and opened it, it was the pilot's door, NOT the passenger door. And therefore I never really "Got to Dianne". I only managed to get to the door, eventually opened in, and tried to reach in with the water rushing around me as it was pouring into the cabin. I never saw Dianne (or even touched her) because of the rushing water, and where I was relative to her—I was at the opposite door from her, and submerged in the water, holding the door open with one hand and trying to reach in with the other.

But you're right Shane, I should explicitly add that she was upside-down just to make it more clear for the reader. This is what I've added, that hopefully will spell-it-out for the reader:

I was sure I would be able to get to her once the pressure equalized around the cockpit door. But that was not to be because what I thought was the passenger door was actually the pilot's door! During the impact and my disorientation, I did not realize that when the plane flipped over, the pilot and passenger positions had been reversed, as viewed from the rear of the plane. This not only put Dianne farthest from the door I had opened, but now she was also suspended upside-down by her seatbelts.

Trying to describe/visualize all this is not easy. They say, "picture is worth a 1,000 words", so hopefully your video will be helpful... ☺

I just want to be thorough and accurate and I know you want the same. The sooner you can get me these answers, the better. Thank you!

If I didn't know better Shane, some of these sound like the questions Keith will be asking me in the interview...☺ Do you already have a question list, or when you, can I have it beforehand? As you can probably tell, I'm still working on my public speaking...☺, so I'd like to be a bit prepared and avoid the stutters and the "Ummm's" during the interview. I think someone from The Fifth Estate told me/offered me this once (years ago) when they were trying to get me to do an interview back then, and hence the question.

I also have another question about Genea: I was curious about how much of the Genea chapters/story you intend to cover? As I said in the book, she was the one who brought me back to my family after 24 years, and changed the course of my life (180 if you will, just like Dianne did), and hence why I thought adding our relationship, and the reasons she turned me in, was important. Do you need more photos/videos of her/us, or do you have enough? Unlike with Dianne in 1982, there is plenty of Genea from 2006 from Japan...☺

Oh, and BTW, after speaking to the attorney (and some friends who read the manuscript), they too agreed I should take the explicit details of Genea out. So I did. I left enough about her abuse to show why our relationship failed, but it's much more tame now... ☺

Thanks Shane.

Cheers,
Jarek...

From: Bishop, Shane (NBCUniversal) [mailto:[redacted]@nbcuni.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 8:31 AM
To: Jarek
Subject: Animation questions

Hi Jarek, I hope this finds you well and ready for summer to begin. My wife and I just spent six days in the sun in Vegas so I'm getting back to this now..!

A few questions on the animations.

1-Essentially, the NTSB report and Sheriff Dupont said they believed that because the plane was upright when found on the bottom of the lake, that the plane landed upright on the water, that the leading edge of the right wing and engine cowling were damaged, and you exited, were able to grab your bags from the back, and swim to shore. Is this correct?

2-Your passage about Sherlock infers that over the years, law enforcement in Flathead County came to believe there was more to the story: They believed that because the right wing was damaged, that the wing contacted the water first while you were attempting to make a shallow right turn, correct? That the leading edge of the wing hit first, then the engine cowling came into contact with the water. But there was nothing at the time of the NTSB report about this, right? This was a conclusion that they came to over the years. Help me if I'm wrong there. Because I don't want to make any assumptions in the first animation that weren't made by Feith.

3-Based on what Feith knew at the time, why would it be inaccurate for him to believe the passenger was incapacitated after impact and then drowned when the plane sank? Is it because of her broken collarbone?

4—In the second animation (your version) I want to make sure I have this correct. You claim that as you passed the middle of the lake heading south, still hundreds of feet above the water, you made a slight turn to your left (a backwards J, if you will) toward the shore, and were heading north when the 2 wheels hit the water first. (right?) The tail didn't hit first but the wheels did?

4a- You say that when the wheels hit the water, the plane pivoted around its central axis. What does that mean? That it did a 180?

4b-You say that when the plane pivoted around its central axis, the nose plunged, and the tail rotated up and over. You say the plane was no upside down in the water. Yet when you talk about getting to Diane, you don't say that she was hanging upside down in the aircraft, secured by her belts. Can you help me out here? How can the plane be violently flipped upside down and she not be upside down in the aircraft when you get to her?

I just want to be thorough and accurate and I know you want the same. The sooner you can get me these answers, the better. Thank you!

Shane