

ATPAC UPDATE

AREA OF CONCERN 120-2

7/13/05

SAFETY: No

SUBJECT: Low Altitude Alerts

DISCUSSION: When an aircraft is executing a Visual Approach and the controller receives a Low Altitude Alert, there is no phraseology to tell the pilot a suggested action.

SUGGESTED ATPAC ACTION: Change the 7110.65 to reflect phraseology to issue to an aircraft when a low altitude alert is given on a visual approach.

120 - Paragraph 5-14-2 includes the phraseology to be used. Some facilities in the field feel that this can't be used for visual approaches or VFR aircraft.

RECOMMENDATION #1: Write an ATB that will clarify the phraseology that should be used.

121 - The ATB is being rewritten to include a reference to paragraph 2-1-6.

122 - Review of the draft ATB completed by the committee. Publication will follow.

123 - ATB is in signature process.

124 - Per Dave Madison, ATO-T, status was unknown as of this meeting but possibly at the VP level for review.

125 - The committee discussed PCT NOTICE 7110.35A (or B) and has come to the conclusions that:

The committee believes that there exists among FAA personnel the idea that the provisions of this notice, particularly Para. 7-3, preclude or forbid the issuance of a safety advisory to ADIZ aircraft on their frequency. The committee takes the position that the over-arching responsibility under Section 2 – General, specifically 2-1-6, Safety Alerts, is still applicable, regardless of whether any other services are being provided, such as the “basic radar services” referred to in 7-3.

The committee further cites the Notice's paragraph 5, which states clearly that the Notice's provisions do not supersede or replace anything in existing Orders (such as 7110.65). Even without a statement to that effect in the notice, the committee believes that the fundamental responsibility for a safety alert to a known aircraft about a known hazardous situation could not be avoided or denied by such a notice anyway.

126 - Scott Proudfoot will obtain a current copy of the PCT Notice for review at 127 and this AOC may be combined with AOC 120-3.

127 - This item not discussed due to time constraints.

RECOMMENDATION 1: a. PCT Notice 7110.35A (or B) be revised to state clearly that safety alerts remain a first-priority responsibility and are not precluded by Para. 7-3 of this notice. b. Controllers at PCT be advised of this clarification by an appropriate, auditable method.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The following should be added to PCT N7110.35: ADIZ aircraft shall not be advised of radar contact, therefore they should be treated as in a non-radar environment. This provision notwithstanding, Para. 2-1-6 requirements still apply, however. Low altitude and other safety alerts shall still be issued as necessary.

IOU: ATO-R forward ATPAC recommendation to ATO-T for review.

128 – Ben Grimes briefed the committee that it is the opinion of ATO-T that sufficient guidance is available as the radar facility is required to pass alert information to the VFR tower thereby enabling the alerting of a pilot who is deemed too low for conditions.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION 1: FAA Order 7100.65, Para 2-1-6 be revised to reflect the replacement of “as appropriate” with if applicable since the current verbiage implies that the controller **MUST** use the stated methods to correct a low altitude condition when it should be only an option since during a Visual Approach none of the methods may apply regarding the DH, etc. ATPAC will submit recommendation to ATO-T

129 – Recommendation will be written by Wilson Riggan and forwarded to Rich Jehlen for consideration.

130 – A memo was written and forwarded to ATO-T for their action.

131 – A memo is being considered by ATO-T for application of ATPAC recommendation in FAA) 7110.65, Para2-1-6.

132 - ATO feels that changes are not necessary as no confusion exists with controllers. Mr. Jehlen reminded everyone that every recommendation by ATPAC will not necessarily be adopted.

CURRENT STATUS: CLOSED