Mechanic dies after plane's door flies off, hits him

FAA investigators said it is unusual for the door to fly off of a plane.

AUSTIN, Texas -- A Taylor mechanic died Friday after the door of an airplane flew off and hit him in the head.

Larry Hagerman, 41, owned Aircraft Certification Services, based at the Taylor Airport. He was opening the door to a private plane that had landed Thursday when he was seriously injured. He was rushed to the hospital but died Friday morning.

"I've spoke with him plenty of time," pilot Gene Torres said. "He's a great, well-grounded gentleman. It's really sad that he's leaving two kids behind."

Investigators with the Federal Aviation Administration are trying to determine what caused the airplane's door to fly off and hit the mechanic.

On Friday investigators grounded the Beechcraft turbo prop plane and removed the door for analysis. They said it is unusual for the door to fly off of a plane.

"Next step is to analyze all the circuits involved with the cabin pressurization, switches, controllers, everything that effects that function and determine exactly what happened," said FAA investigator John Bures.

Investigators will also try to determine if this is a safety issue concerning the whole fleet or just an isolated incident.
Officials said the investigation will continue Monday.

Hagerman is survived by two children. His wife DeNetta died last year in a car accident.

**Qantas Worker Dies In 20-Foot Fall From 747**

Believed To Be Member of Catering Staff

There’s no doubt flying can sometimes be a risky business... and alas, the risks aren't limited to taking flight. A woman assisting in restocking a Qantas airliner at Brisbane International Airport was killed when she reportedly fell to the tarmac this weekend.

The Brisbane Times reports the unidentified woman, 63, fell about 20 feet from a loading platform Sunday morning. Officials believe she was a member of the ground crews restocking the Boeing 747 for a scheduled flight to Los Angeles, who fell when she tried to load a catering cart onboard.

A spokesman for Queensland Ambulance said the victim died on impact.

The incident delayed Qantas flights to the United States and Auckland, New Zealand, according to a Brisbane Airport spokeswoman. She added members of the ground cleaning and catering crews were “totally distraught” at the news of the accident.

Foul play is not suspected, but investigators will examine a variety of factors before releasing their final report on the woman's death, authorities said.

**Atlas Air Worldwide Holdings, Inc. Unit Settles FAA Complaint from 2006**

Atlas Air Worldwide Holdings, Inc. today said that its Atlas Air, Inc. subsidiary (Atlas) has entered into a stipulated order of settlement and dismissal with the Federal Aviation Administration with respect to a maintenance issue that occurred in May 2006 regarding a single weld to an engine exhaust nozzle on one of Atlas’s 747-200 Freighter aircraft.
Resolution of the matter follows discussions between Atlas, the FAA, and the U.S. Attorney’s Office subsequent to the alleged incident, and the terms have been submitted to the federal court for its approval.

Pursuant to the terms of the settlement and without admitting or denying any violation of the FAA required maintenance requirements, Atlas has agreed to a payment of $95,000 in full and final compromise of the FAA’s complaint.

"We take our responsibility to operate safe aircraft very seriously," stated William J. Flynn, President and Chief Executive Officer of AAWW.
"We work under the oversight of and in coordination with the FAA to ensure that we meet or exceed all of their regulatory requirements and procedures. The alleged incident cited by the FAA was a one-time event that occurred two years ago, and does not reflect our continuing commitment to the highest levels of aircraft maintenance and safety.

**Offside – ASRS Report**

After multiple tests and inspections of a B737-300 at the gate, maintenance technicians were unable to duplicate a takeoff warning horn fault. The technicians asked ATC for permission to do a “power run” on an inactive runway, in an attempt to duplicate the condition the pilots had experienced.

- …We were told that we could use the inactive runway (my understanding). We taxied to the runway and I advanced throttles past 33% (to activate the takeoff warning system) with park brake released. I taxied for a short time to see if the fault would occur with the throttles advanced. No warning horn.
- I returned throttles to idle and started braking action. I was not able to make the taxiway E turnoff and deployed thrust reversers to stop as quickly as I could. I was not aware that the active runway was the next intersection. When the aircraft was stopped, it was approximately ½ airplane [length] over the hold short line.

Better planning and use of the airport diagram might have helped these technicians be aware of the proximity of an active runway to the location of the power run.
**AAR says Boeing found landing-gear parts acceptable**

AAR Corp. said parts it used for hundreds of Boeing Co. planes that the Federal Aviation Administration had said were unapproved were deemed acceptable to the aircraft maker.

Boeing issued an April 8 notice saying that the top layer of paint on landing-gear parts AAR had installed, which the FAA had said March 25 wasn't approved for use, isn't "detrimental" to the jets' operation, AAR said Monday.

AAR, the Wood Dale-based aircraft parts and maintenance provider, said it doesn't expect to be fined by the FAA, which is reviewing the case.

The agency had said the parts didn't comply with maintenance manuals and a 2001 safety order because they used enamel paint that may block a drain hole and hide rust.

**Procedure changed:** AAR said it discontinued applying the enamel top coat to internal truck-beam surfaces of 747, 757 and 767 landing gear earlier this year to comply with Boeing's preferred method. Chicago-based Boeing didn't have an immediate comment.

**Can airport nightmare happen here?**

Critics say new Canadian safety measures mirror those causing the problems in U.S.

Transport Canada's efforts to transfer greater responsibility for safety oversight to airlines is being called into question after a similar approach by U.S. regulators allowed potentially unsafe planes to continue flying because of a "cozy" relationship with U.S. air carriers.

Amid criticism of the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration's oversight, tens of thousands of passengers were left stranded last week as airlines continue to inspect the wiring on some of its jets.

It was the second round of mass cancellations by the world's largest airline in less than two weeks as it attempts to head off any loss in confidence about safety procedures amid revelations that several U.S. airlines had not been keeping up with required aircraft inspections.
The lapses came to light earlier this month after the FAA admitted it allowed Southwest Airlines to operate thousands of flights with planes that had missed inspections for cracks in the fuselage.

"The other airlines are being proactive and the FAA is managing its image," said Marc-David Seidel, a business professor at the University of British Columbia's Sauder School of Business.

He added that rising fuel prices and a slowing economy have put pressure on airlines to cut costs – and could prompt some to cut corners by delaying certain inspections.

While the FAA has so far pointed the finger at individual inspectors who failed to do their jobs, critics have suggested there may be systemic problems with the regulator's focus on having airline "partners" self-report safety issues.

Some critics in Canada, meanwhile, say the FAA's recent problems should be setting off alarm bells at Transport Canada, which is poised to adopt a similar collaborative approach to air safety that it dubs Safety Management Systems, or SMS.

"Transport Canada, I think, is going even further than the FAA by doing away with traditional regulatory oversight," said Virgil Moshansky, a retired Alberta judge whose report on a 1989 Air Ontario crash in Dryden that killed 24 people led to many air safety improvements.

Moshansky told the Commons transport committee last year the Canadian plan relies heavily on airline personnel to report their own violations and safety worries. He characterized that as a "hard sell" for workers who may fear reprisals.

He also questioned whether cash-strapped smaller carriers could be trusted to monitor their own safety, noting that such operations are where the "greatest risk to aviation safety resides."

A 2006 investigation by the Toronto Star, the Hamilton Spectator and The Record of Waterloo Region revealed growing cracks in Canada's aviation industry, with close calls in the sky, growing numbers of mechanical defects, lax oversight of airlines and regulations allowing dangerous bad-weather landings and overwork of flight crews.

Moshansky said yesterday that the trend at Transport Canada has been toward fewer inspectors and less frequent inspections, and that recent events in the U.S. should serve as a wake-up call.

"They're introducing SMS without sufficient regulatory oversight ... and that's their Achilles' heel."
Transport Canada, however, maintains that safety plan will add an additional layer of safety to an already strong system – particularly if Bill C-7, which includes among other things a proposal to create whistle-blower protection for airline employees, is passed into law.

While Transport Canada officials declined to comment yesterday on the issues facing the US. regulator, they stressed that aviation safety in Canada has improved since the regulator first committed to a collaborative approach in 1999.

"Working together doesn't mean you can't enforce regulations," said Patrick Charette, a Transport Canada spokesperson. "By working together you build a relationship that makes airlines and other players accountable."

He said the adoption of a new system means Transport Canada's roughly 800 inspectors can perform more targeted inspections.

**Don’t Ground the Safety System**

Southwest Airlines is hit with a $10.2 million fine for neglecting to perform fatigue crack inspections on its Boeing 737s. Days later, American and Delta remove dozens of MD-80 jets from service for wiring modifications. United Airlines follows with a two-day grounding of its Boeing 777s. And last week, in the industry’s largest-ever grounding, American Airlines again pulls its MD-80s out of service and cancels some 2,000 flights. The traveling public is confused, frightened and perhaps angry.

While all of this unfolds, the Federal Aviation Administration becomes the target of intense scrutiny. Critics point to the agency’s conflicted role as both a promoter and regulator of commercial aviation. The agency is beholden more to the financial interest of the airlines, we are told, than to the safety of passengers. Why weren’t these problems tackled sooner? What, exactly, have federal inspectors been out there inspecting?
Those are fair questions, and indeed the agency needs to be held accountable. But the dynamics of commercial flying are highly unusual, and a close, working relationship between airlines and their regulators will remain essential to the evolution of air safety. A more hostile or antagonistic relationship would stifle research and is liable to encourage, rather than prevent, more serious lapses and scandals.

The Federal Aviation Administration has worked with airlines and pilot unions very well over the years, studying problems and developing new technologies and protocols. The cargo-fire suppression systems developed after the ValuJet crash in the Everglades in 1996 and the Traffic Collision and Avoidance Systems hardware that monitors airspace to avoid mid-air collisions are two good examples in which carriers, pilots and Washington worked together to improve safety.

Granted, changes don’t always come as quickly as they ought to, and the government has an irritating fondness for enforcing regulatory minutiae. But on the whole the system works. Airlines have spent tens of billions of dollars complying with thousands of agency mandates and directives, few of which ever make the newspapers, resulting in what is arguably the safest transportation system in the world. For the average traveler, unfamiliar with the nuts and bolts of airline operations (pun intended), it’s easy to misconstrue these recent events as indicators of danger and crisis. Airline scandals have a unique way of stoking people's anxieties by preying on an innate fear of flying that is shared by virtually everyone. Had the planes not been grounded, the thinking goes, a month from now they’d be bursting into flames and dropping from the sky.

The truth is much more complicated. None of the grounded aircraft, it seems, was in a dangerous condition, and it’s extremely unlikely that lives were ever put at risk. The planes were taken from service as a preventive measure, not to ward off some impending catastrophe. Thus these incidents are less a portent of disaster than a preventive shake-up that can help us avoid one. A bit of controversy can be helpful, lest we grow complacent.
Lost in all of this is an acknowledgment of just how safe air travel has become — a reality seldom mentioned in the news media, but especially pertinent at a time when conventional wisdom holds that flying is increasingly dangerous. In the United States, there has not been a large-scale accidental crash involving a major carrier since November 2001, the longest such streak in the modern history of civil aviation — despite enormous financial pressures at almost every carrier.

If, by that measure, the airline business is a hive of negligence and poor regulatory oversight, then perhaps all industries should be so corrupt.

**AirSafe.com**

*A Discussion of Concerns After a String of Airline Safety Events - 1 April 2008*

A roundtable discussion on National Public Radion station WAMU from 1 April 2008 featuring Dr. Curtis, the Editor-in-Chief of Aviation Daily Jim Matthews, and the vice president for operations and safety of the Air Transport Association Basil Barimo.

Audio: [MP3](length: 47:56)

**Engineer 'horrified' helicopter tail incorrectly assembled**

An engineer charged with manslaughter after a man died in a helicopter crash near Murchison, says he was "horrified" when he found out the helicopter’s tail rotor mechanism was incorrectly assembled. The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) believed the cause of the crash in August 2005 was because a coupling was incorrectly assembled.
Pilot and father of nine, Phillip Devon Heney, 52, died in the crash, about 130km southwest of Nelson.

A jury trial for two men in relation to the crash began at the High Court at Nelson last month.

John Arthur Horrell, 56, owner and managing director of Skytech Aviation (2003) Ltd, and Ronald David Potts, 60, the company's contract licensed aviation maintenance engineer, have denied a charge alleging the manslaughter of Mr. Heney and of injuring the passenger by an unlawful act.

Both the men carried out maintenance work on the Robinson R22 helicopter.

Potts' lawyer Philip Hall said his client's action was not a criminal offence, but one of negligence.

Horrell's lawyer, Philip Morgan QC, said his client had a duty of care to ensure the maintenance was supervised, and he performed his duty.

The only passenger on the day, and friend of Mr. Heney, Hamish Teddy, was the first crown witness called.

He said they had been on a flight to shoot deer.

Mr. Teddy said Mr. Heney and his son, Keiran, had carried out pre-flight checks on the helicopter before the flight and had not mentioned that anything was out of the ordinary.

He said they were only nine meters off the ground when the helicopter started spinning anti-clockwise.

"It felt like it spun two-and-a-half or three times", Mr. Teddy said.

"I kept my eyes open until I saw the main rotor blade strike the ground, then I closed my eyes and bang, we hit the ground."

He said he had been concerned about aviation fuel pouring onto them, and had tried to reach for his knife to cut the seatbelt.

Keiran had helped them from the wreckage, he said.

Mr. Teddy said he was aware that Mr Heney had died at the scene.

The crown will call nine witnesses during the trial which is expected to last two weeks.
'Just Culture' System for Nurses Takes Focus of Medical Errors from Penalties to Solutions

Classifying human behaviors

**Console**

Human error — Inadvertent action: slip, lapse, mistake.
Manage through changes in:
- Processes
- Procedures
- Training
- Design
- Environment

**Coach**

At-risk behavior — A choice: risk not recognized or believed justified. Manage through:
- Removing incentives for at-risk behaviors
- Creating incentives for healthy behaviors
- Increasing situational awareness

**Punish**

Reckless behavior — A conscious disregard of unreasonable risk. Manage through:
- Remedial action
- Disciplinary action

About 98,000 patients die each year because of medical error, according to the Institute of Medicine report “To Err is Human.” But when nurses are involved in errors, should they be counseled, disciplined, or educated. The “Just Culture” paradigm provides a set of practical tools — a middle-ground decision-making methodology that reconciles the old, punitive culture of blame with personal and professional accountability.

“We’re hardwired to the smoking gun theory that the last person to touch [the gun] is guilty and deserves punishment, with severity dependent on the result of the error,” says David Marx, JD, president, Outcome Engineering, LLC, in Plano, Texas. Rather than focus on the error and its ramifications, Just Culture classifies human behaviors into three groups — human error, at-risk, and reckless.

Safety evolving

“For the past five years, executives and clinical practitioners have been exhibiting a tremendous level of understanding about promoting safety and demonstrating the evolution of a culture of safety in health care,” says Barbara Summers, RN, PhD, CNAA-BC, vice president and CNO, head of the division of nursing at the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center in Houston.
“The issue is complex, with many pathways to be taken to promote a culture of safety and offer the necessary assurances to the public that they are going to receive safe, effective care.”

An infrastructure that promotes analyzing all contributing factors to errors and a philosophy that incorporates human behavior into error analysis is important to developing a culture of safety.

“Many errors result from at-risk behavior, such as, for example, when nurses cut corners to save time,” says Marx, who has expanded the Just Culture concept, which has been widely used in the aviation industry and provides guidance for healthcare organizations. When a nurse knows an action is dangerous but does it anyway, this behavior becomes reckless.

Should an adverse event occur, the Just Culture paradigm provides an algorithm for resolutions. “We console the human error, coach [those with behaviors classified as] ‘at-risk’, and punish reckless behaviors,” says Marx.

**The Texas collaborative**

The Institute of Medicine called on the National Council of State Boards of Nursing to develop and design standardized processes to better distinguish human error from reckless and intentional misconduct. MD Anderson Cancer Center heads up the Healthcare Alliance for Safety Partnership (HASP), which was developed in partnership with the Texas Board of Nursing and the Institute for Patient Safety at MD Anderson. Summers, along with chief nursing officers at Houston-based St Luke’s Episcopal Hospital and Texas Children’s Hospital, participated in the initial HASP program to explore the efficacy of nonpunitive systems.

HASP, Summers says, is an example of how leaders can collaborate to create a culture of safety and fairness.

“In our organization, creating a nonpunitive, fair, and just system does not mean doing away with individual accountability,” says Summers. “It emphasizes acceptance of personal and professional accountability of one’s practice actions and accountability for actively engaging in activities that will improve the processes of care.”

Summers describes the Just Culture practice milieu as one in which managers talk to staff about risk factors to safety and contributing factors to error. Nurses are taught to recognize safety risks and report them.

In a safe haven atmosphere surrounding reporting, incident reports may increase but are viewed as learning experiences and trend identifiers that will provide opportunities to address latent safety problems.

The organization communicates the value of nurses as leaders and credits them for their work, Summers says.
“Just Culture’s message for nurses is to have a better work environment and be dealt with in a fair and just way,” says Marx. “On the front end, coaching and mentoring on how to make good choices minimizes the likelihood that they’ll make an error.”

Summers and Marx will address Just Culture at the American Organization of Nurse Executive’s annual conference in Seattle in April.

**FAA Identifies New Sources for 8130-3 Tags**

Many mechanics rely on 8130-3 tags to confirm that an aircraft part is airworthy before they install it – the tag has become an important part of the receiving inspection program for many companies. But the 8130-3 tag is not always easily available for new parts when the production certificate holder does not issue the tag. The FAA has released two changes to its advisory documents that are intended to make it easier for certain aircraft parts distributors to make sure their parts have appropriate 8130-3 tags when they are exported.

Under current law, certain Accredited distributors are allowed to apply to FAA Designated Airworthiness Representatives (DARs) in order to obtain 8130-3 tags for demonstrably airworthy aircraft parts. This FAA service helps to assure that the parts have the right documentation to meet most receiving inspection programs. But some distributors have had trouble finding a DAR with the appropriate function codes to support their needs, because of inconsistencies in the way that the FAA interprets the designee guidance.

FAA Headquarters has resolved these differences by making it clear that maintenance DARs with function code 32 privileges are permitted to issue export 8130-3 tags to distributors under FAA exemption 8696.

Historically, DAR function code 32 has permitted DARs to issue export 8130-3 tags for class II products. A Class II product is a major component of an aircraft, aircraft engine, or propeller, the failure of which would jeopardize the safety of the aircraft, engine, or propeller. Class II products include wings, fuselages, empennage assemblies, landing gears, power transmissions, control surfaces, etc. Class II also includes any part, material, or appliance, approved and manufactured under a “C” series Technical Standard Order Authorization.

Most parts that are exported are class III products, which means that they are not able to use the legal provisions related to class II export tags. Class III applies to anything that is not a class II part or a complete aircraft, engine, or propeller.
Although exemption 8696 granted distributors authorization to apply for class III export tags, many DARs were not allowed to issue those tags. FAA Headquarters has changed the language of function code 32 so that it applies to both class II and class III parts, in order to greatly expand the number of DARs who are permitted to issue class III export tags under exemption 8696. Mechanics working outside of the United States will appreciate this new guidance, which is designed to support the FAA’s commitment to global aviation safety.

The recent changes are found in Order 8100.8C change one, which expands the scope of function code 32 to include class III products, and Order 8130.21E change two, which adds new language to makes it more clear that function code 32 permits maintenance DARs to issue 8130-3 tags under exemption 8696.

**FAA Scrutiny Of Airline Maintenance To Continue**

**AAL the Latest, But Probably Not Last, To Feel Agency’s Wrath**

American Airlines has returned to a normal schedule, after a regulatory crackdown by the Federal Aviation Administration which resulted in the cancellation of more than 3,300 flights scheduled on MD-80-series airliners in less than a week.

While the sudden and aggressive FAA action has cost American an estimated $30 million dollars -- and inestimable damage to its image -- the airline may not be alone for long. Reuters reports the FAA is still investigating a handful of airlines for possible lapses in maintenance as part of its unprecedented industry wide review of compliance with its safety orders.

For now, FAA spokeswoman Laura Brown says the audit found overall industry compliance at 99 percent, and we’re not likely to see another catastrophe like what happened to American.

"Based on the high compliance we saw, we're optimistic we're not going to see problems like this again," Brown said.

As ANN has reported, the FAA was criticized by two of its inspectors for becoming "too cozy" with the airlines it is charged with regulating, following news that Southwest Airlines was allowed to skip mandatory fuselage fatigue checks last year.
Many industry analysts see the crackdown as having more to do with FAA politics than with genuine safety concerns... though it's worth noting American Airlines CEO Gerard Arpey said last week, "The FAA is stepping up surveillance and doing their job."

It may be comforting to travelers to note that nearly all the MD-80-series planes subject to the wiring harness errors have now been checked for compliance with the FAA’s airworthiness directive.

But Robert Mann, an airline consultant, warns we may have seen just the beginning... as airlines adjust to a new, stricter regulatory environment.

"There are thousands of directives out there that require absolute compliance. When the FAA casts a wider net... whether it’s next week or next month we could see another episode with another aircraft type with other operators."

**Los Angeles Teens Solo Six Planes, Helicopter In One Day**

Last Month, two Los Angeles-area teenagers completed what they hope will be a record-setting solo marathon, flying six airplanes and a helicopter on the same day. Kelly Anyadiki and Jonathan Strickland, both 16, are among the more than 800 young flight students who participate in aviation-themed after-school aviation programs provided by Tomorrow's Aeronautical Museum at the Compton/Woodley Airport in Compton, Calif. The museum, founded by Celebrity Helicopters chief pilot Robin Petgrave, offers subsidized flight training to underprivileged and inner-city children in grades K-12. Kids earn credits toward instruction by washing planes and other volunteer activities. "If you see the lives of some of these kids, the museum is really an opportunity for them to do something positive," he said.

Within the span of about six hours, Strickland soloed a Cessna 172RG, a glass-panel 172SP, a Cessna 152, a Piper Warrior, a Sting Sport, a Remos light sport aircraft, and a Robinson R44 helicopter. Anyadiki flew the 172SP, 152, Remos and the Warrior. It was her first solo and her sixteenth birthday. Strickland has logged about 150 hours of flight training and had previously soloed in Canada at age 14. Several flight instructors, including Petgrave, were on hand Saturday to coach the students and sign their logbooks.
Maj. Levi H. Thornhill, 85, one of four original Tuskegee Airmen, also attended. "We gotta keep the kids off the streets," he told the Long Beach Press-Telegram.

Actor Michael Dorn, who played Lt. Commander Worf on the television show "Star Trek: Deep Space Nine," was also there to cheer the kids on, Petgrave said. "We weren't pushing them or anything," he said when asked about the day's schedule, adding that he told both of the anxious teens, "there's a hundred and one things that will make this not happen. The Tuskegee Airmen are getting their dreams fulfilled just by you making the effort."

**Midnight Shift Nugget**

**Great Nighttime Shacks: Fruits & Vegetables**

Working the night shift you are probably aware that your digestive system tends to slow down at night making it harder to digest certain foods (think greasy, fried and spicy). If you're looking for a great nighttime snack that provides energy try eating some fruits and vegetables.

Sadly, the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture estimates that up to 55% of Americans don't eat the recommended daily servings of vegetables and more than 70% don't eat enough fruit. Considering fruit and vegetables are high in nutrients, low in calories, and have proven cancer fighting properties, it's never too late to begin adding more to your diet. Just watch out for citrus fruits on the night shift, which can upset your stomach.

**Food for Thought**

**Choose tricklers not gushers**

Because there have been inconsistent findings from observational studies, the controversy over the effects of GI and the risk of lifestyle diseases has had that 'how long is a piece of string quality' about it.
The first meta-analysis to evaluate the association between the GI of the diet, and the risk of developing common lifestyle-related diseases, was published in the *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* in March and provides additional evidence that diets with a high GI or a high GL will increase your risk of type 2 diabetes and heart disease.

It also shows there is evidence for links between high blood glucose and gallstones and even some types of cancer. ‘The key message,’ says lead author Alan Barclay, ‘is that the GI of your diet is a predictor of your disease risk. Grandma was right, you are what you eat.’

Low GI foods (the ones that trickle glucose into your bloodstream) have benefits for everybody. Not only can they keep you feeling full longer, they help you achieve and maintain a healthy weight and provide you and your brain with more consistent energy throughout the day. They can also have a major effect on the way the body functions and whether or not you develop health problems. Alan Barclay explains why: ‘If you have constantly high blood glucose levels from eating a high GI diet, you may literally “wear out” your pancreas over time and eventually this can lead to pre-diabetes and type 2 diabetes.’

‘There’s also evidence from the studies that have been done that high blood glucose levels are linked to certain types of cancer, as well. This is because constant spikes in blood glucose from eating high GI gushers cause the body to release more insulin, and also increase a related substance called insulin like growth factor one (IGF-1). Both these hormones increase cell growth and decrease cell death, and have been shown to increase the risk of developing some types of cancer.’

‘Other research shows that a high GI diet tends to reduce “good” HDL cholesterol levels and raise triglycerides levels; bad news for cardiovascular diseases. And people with low HDL cholesterol and high triglyceride levels are more prone to gallstones.’
'What it comes down to is that there’s a simple, cost-effective way for everybody to reduce their risk of developing diabetes and heart disease and enhance their quality of life. *We all need to eat a healthy, low GI diet.* I guess that simply means when it comes to carb-rich foods, choose the tricklers and reduce the overall GI of your diet.’

**10 tips for reducing the GI of your diet**

- Aim to eat at least two serves of fruit and five serves of vegetables every day, preferably of three or more different colours. *Tidbit: Fill half your dinner plate with veggies.*
- If you are a big potato eater, either have one or two Nicola, Almera or tiny chat potatoes. *Tidbit: Make ‘mash’ replacing half the potato with cannellini beans.*
- Choose a low GI bread. Look for the GI Symbol or choose a really grainy bread, true sourdough bread or a soy and linseed bread.
- Replace high GI breakfast flakes (real glucose gushers) with low GI alternatives like natural muesli, traditional porridge oats or one of the lower GI processed breakfast cereals.
- Look for lower GI rices such as basmati, Doongara Clever Rice or Moolgiri medium grain rice and choose less processed foods or low GI wholegrains such as traditional rolled or steel-cut oats, or quinoa for porridge or pearl barley, buckwheat, bulgur, whole kernel rye, or whole wheat kernels.
- Eat legumes (beans, chickpeas and lentils) often – home cooked or canned.
- Include at least one low GI carb with every meal. You’ll find them in four of the food groups: fruit and vegetables; bread and cereals; legumes; low fat dairy or soy alternatives.
- Choose low GI snacks – fresh fruit, a dried fruit and nut mix, low fat milk or yoghurt.
Vinegar and lemon or lime juices slow stomach emptying and lower your blood glucose response to the carbohydrate with which they are eaten. *Tidbit: Get the salad habit and toss it in a vinaigrette dressing.*

Limit refined flour products – cookies, cakes, pastries, pies, crumpets, crackers, biscuits irrespective of their fat and sugar content.

**Two extra tips to reduce blood glucose spikes**

- Incorporate a lean protein source with every meal – lean meat, skinless chicken, eggs, fish or seafood, or low fat dairy, legumes or tofu if you are vegetarian.
- Remember portion caution with carb-rich foods such as pasta, noodles and low GI rices. It's all too easy to over-eat them. While they may be low GI choices themselves, eating lots of them will have a marked effect on your blood glucose.

**TOP 10 Resume Mistakes**

Resume writing is one part art and one part science. The art part is distilling a career's worth of accomplishment and personal qualities into a few sheets of paper. The science part is avoiding mistakes. Here are the 10 most common resume mistakes, according to [Monster.Com](http://Monster.Com).

1. **Typos & Grammatical Errors**

   Nothing says "this guy is sloppy" or "this gal doesn't care" like a misspelled word or incorrect punctuation.

2. **Lack of Specifics**

   The details aren't just filler. They bring your story to life and communicate your accomplishments.
3. One-Size-Fits-All

Although the essentials don't change, you must tailor each resume to the position you're seeking.

4. Highlighting Duties Instead of Accomplishments

Employers are more interested in your achievements than a job description.

5. Going Too Long or Too Short

Did you ever hear of Procrustes? He was this guy from Greek mythology who had a bed that he would make his guests lie on. Procrustes was pretty particular about fitting the bed to the guest. If the guest was too tall for the bed, he'd chop off his legs; if he was too short, he'd pull out his rack and stretch the guy out to the proper length. Don't treat your resume like a procrustean bed. Say what you need to say and tailor the length accordingly.

6. A Bad Objective

The objective statement at the top of the resume shouldn't be generic. "Seeking a responsible position that will enable me to grow" doesn't cut it. But don't err in the other direction. "Seeking a managerial safety position in a large corporate setting" won't work if you're trying to hook on with a small construction firm.

7. Lack of Action Verbs

Describe yourself acting. "Responsible for" is much less effective than "managed," "ran" or "accomplished."

8. Omitting Important Information

Monster's advice: Mention those "soft jobs" like the position you took to earn extra money in school because they might prove more influential than you think.

9. Visual Overkill

Go easy on the fonts. Pick the one you like and stick to it.
10. Incorrect Contact Information

It may seem obvious, but make sure you list your phone and e-mail accurately. Ditto for the contact information for your references.

PICTURE THIS!

Is this anyway to preparing for a nap? The worker who set up this ladder appears to be determined to take what the cowboys used to call a "dirt nap." It's not the kind of rest we're recommending, and this isn't any way to use a ladder. Remember, when safety falls from a high position at your workplace, so will other things. And people.